

# **THE GOVERNANCE DIVIDE**

## **The Case Study for Oregon**

By  
Andrea Venezia  
Michael W. Kirst

April 2006



The Institute for Educational Leadership  
The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education  
The Stanford Institute for Higher Education Research

National Center Report #05-7

© 2006 by The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education. Material may be duplicated with full attribution.

# Contents

Foreword.....	iv
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Context for K–16 Reform and Governance in Oregon.....	3
III. Summary of K–16 Reforms.....	11
IV. K–16 Accomplishments.....	17
V. Challenges to K–16 Reform .....	19
VI. Changes from March to August 2004.....	23
VII. Conclusion.....	25
Appendix: Oregon Interview Protocol.....	27
Endnotes.....	33
About the Authors.....	35
The Institute for Educational Leadership.....	36
The Stanford Institute for Higher Education Research.....	36
The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education.....	37

## Foreword

This report is based on research conducted by the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education and its partners, the Institute for Educational Leadership and Stanford University's Institute for Higher Education Research. The project, called Partnerships for Student Success (PSS), was funded by the Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation. Its findings are presented in four case studies and a cross-cutting report called *The Governance Divide: A Report on a Four-State Study on Improving College Readiness and Success*.

The primary goal of the research project was to examine state policies and governance structures that span K–12 and postsecondary education in order to assist states in identifying promising reforms and ways to connect their education systems. The project is based on two major premises: (1) the current disconnected systems of K–12 and postsecondary education are not effective in ensuring that sufficient numbers of students complete some form of education or training beyond high school, and (2) it is the states who are in the best position to lead efforts to align the systems, create incentives for joint budgeting, and monitor improvement through cross-system data collection and accountability.

The research was conducted in 2003 and 2004 in four states—Florida, Georgia, New York, and Oregon—each of which has a distinct approach to K–16 reform that may offer other states important options for connecting K–12 and postsecondary education:

- Florida has implemented some of the most sweeping education governance changes of any state; all levels of education are housed in the Department of Education, which is overseen by a commissioner who reports to the governor.
- Georgia was the first state to have state and regional P–16 councils, and its regents' office in the University System of Georgia oversees a variety of projects that focus on connecting K–12 and postsecondary education.
- The New York Board of Regents oversees all education in the state and has been in place for over 200 years; this lends the regents' office a stature and a historical legitimacy and tradition unlike any other state education governance structure in the nation.
- Oregon has been a leader in K–16 reform through its development of the Proficiency-based Admission Standards System (PASS), which articulated postsecondary expectations and linked them with K–12 reforms.

We hope that this research, by documenting the processes used in each state to develop, implement, and institutionalize the reforms, will assist other states in identifying opportunities for K–16 successes.

# I. Introduction

Over the past decade and a half, Oregon has embarked on several ambitious initiatives seeking to improve the college readiness of high school students. These efforts are particularly relevant to this national study on K–16 reform because of the unique ways Oregon’s initiatives were developed and implemented. K–16 reforms in Oregon were not mandated by the state, they received little state funding, and no governor was actively involved in their design or implementation. In Oregon, the reforms were spearheaded by staff members of K–12 and higher education systems, working collaboratively to create consensus around issues such as the alignment of K–12 standards with expectations for college-level academic work. Partially as a result of the locus of control for these reforms—that is, within and across educational systems rather than in the Legislature or governor’s office—the reforms have focused on programmatic and curricular issues rather than governance changes.

When our research team arrived in Oregon in March 2004 to conduct field research to better understand the extent and nature of the state’s K–16 reforms, Oregon was in the midst of a financial crisis that had a particularly significant impact on higher education. Access to college was declining, tuition was increasing, financial aid was decreasing, and a pay freeze for faculty had been in place for three years.

Prior to our arrival, on March 1, 2004, Governor Ted Kulongowski changed the make-up of the State Board of Higher Education and appointed former Governor Neil Goldschmidt as its chair. As one administrator at the Oregon University System (OUS) said:

You have come at a very interesting time... Our governor has reconstituted the higher education board. He has a new person at the lead [Goldschmidt] and many of those people have not been involved in the work of P–16 in our state. I know there are some key people who are still in place. The [Oregon University System] chancellor [Richard Jarvis] has a real passion for seeing that this work continues to move forward and sees the value of working closer together to help students ... and to open up access.

The governor and the chair articulated new goals for higher education in Oregon through the More Better Faster initiative, which focuses additional attention on such issues as dual enrollment, an integrated data system, and K–16 standards and proficiencies.

During our visit to the state, our main research questions included the following:

- To what extent is K–16 reform perceived as a state policy concern?
- What are the incentives and disincentives for improved connections?

- What are the main goals and objectives of current state-level K–16 reforms?
- Who is responsible for developing and implementing those changes?
- What have been the main successes and failures to date?

Given the changing nature of Oregon’s reforms, finances, and governance structures in 2004, many of these questions were very difficult to answer. As an appointed official said during our interview, “You’re actually asking me [these questions] right at the point of maximum uncertainty.”

The day after we left the state, major controversies brought new changes to the educational landscape. The newly reconstituted State Board of Higher Education forced out the chancellor of the Oregon University System, Richard Jarvis (although he technically resigned), and eliminated the system’s Academic Affairs Office. Soon thereafter, former Governor Goldschmidt resigned from the state board after admitting to criminal activity that had taken place 30 years earlier.<sup>1</sup> Governor Kulongowski responded by appointing himself to the State Board of Higher Education and becoming its chair.

This study, while being cognizant of these fast-paced changes, provides a snapshot of Oregon’s K–16 reform efforts as of March 2004, with additional contextual and historical information collected from previous research from Stanford University’s Bridge Project,<sup>2</sup> and with follow-up interviews with selected participants in fall 2004 to identify key changes between March and August 2004.

In presenting the findings, this report first describes the context of Oregon’s education reforms, including descriptions of each relevant agency and public education entity. The report summarizes the major statewide K–16 reforms and outlines some of the key accomplishments as well as challenges to K–16 reform in the state. The report then offers a short summary of changes in the state from March to August 2004 before concluding with thoughts about the present and future of K–16 reform in Oregon. The appendix provides a list of key questions that comprised the interview protocol for the research visit to the state.

## II. Context for K–16 Reform and Governance in Oregon

Oregon responded to the 1983 publication of *A Nation at Risk* by re-thinking its educational system and developing the “Oregon Plan for Excellence” (1984).<sup>3</sup> This plan was an important precursor for the Oregon Educational Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (1991)—legislation that mandated the development of new K–12 standards, assessments, and certificates. The work of several national groups also influenced the 1991 Oregon Educational Act. For example, the National Commission on Education and the Economy issued a report that recommended the development of high school-level certificates of mastery, primarily to focus attention on the knowledge and skills that high school students need to graduate and enter college or the workforce. Concurrently, the Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce, another national organization, was advocating for the use of certificates of mastery at the high school level. The commission wrote, “Once a student has acquired the Certificate of Initial Mastery, he or she could choose a college preparatory program, go right into the workforce, or enter a program designed to culminate in a Technical or Professional Certificate. These certificate programs would combine formal education and on-the-job training in a unified curriculum.”<sup>4</sup> Influenced by these national trends, Oregon’s Legislature, in passing the 1991 Oregon Educational Act, authorized the development of Certificates of Initial Mastery (issued after 10<sup>th</sup> grade) and Advanced Mastery (issued after 12<sup>th</sup> grade). The certificates emphasize the use of several types of assessments and other ways that students can demonstrate proficiency. To earn a Certificate of Initial Mastery, for example, students must complete requirements in English language arts, mathematics, and science through scores on state tests and on work samples.

The Oregon Educational Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, combined with a later amendment to that act (Bill 2991 in 1995), marked the beginning of a sustained period of education reform in Oregon. This legislation not only authorized the development of the Certificates of Initial and Advanced Mastery, but also authorized the creation of benchmarks for all students and assessments in grades 3, 5, 8, 10 and 12.\* The legislation did not call for the Certificates of Initial Mastery (CIM) or Advanced Mastery (CAM) to be connected to college admissions or course placement requirements; the reforms were designed to stop at grade 12.

Partially in response to the 1991 Oregon Educational Act focusing on K–12 education, the Oregon University System developed the Proficiency-based Admission Standards System (PASS) to examine how higher education’s needs fit in with the CIM and the CAM, and to ensure that high standards were developed to ensure academic preparation for students. As part of this process, PASS focused on developing proficiency-based admission standards and on shifting the admission process for Oregon’s public universities toward the demonstration of

---

\* Recent policy changes have shifted the focus from grade-level performance to overall benchmarks.

student proficiency through collections of student work in portfolios, in addition to more traditional measures. Although the CIM and the CAM were not originally designed to be connected to college and university admissions, the university system collaborated with the Department of Education to work toward that alignment.

Thus, the CIM, the CAM, and PASS have different histories, philosophies, and overall goals, but they were developed at about the same time and were linked not by legislation but by the collaborative work of the university system and the State Department of Education.

## **MAJOR AGENCIES AND ORGANIZATIONS INVOLVED IN K–16 REFORM**

Oregon stands out as a state whose K–12 and university systems established a history of strong collaboration to create a statewide agenda for improving connections between high school and college. Over the past decade, the Oregon Department of Education (ODE) and its higher education counterpart, the Oregon University System (OUS), each led and participated in several major reforms, including the development of the Certificate of Initial Mastery and the Certificate of Advanced Mastery at the high school level, and the Proficiency-based Admission Standards System at the postsecondary level.

### **The State Board of Education, the Oregon Department of Education (ODE), and the Community Colleges**

The State Board of Education, the governing body for the Oregon Department of Education (ODE), oversees the state’s K–12 school system. The board consists of seven members who are appointed by the governor for up to two four-year terms. One member is selected from each of Oregon’s five congressional districts, and two from the state at large. Board members receive no salary and cannot be involved in teaching or school administration during their tenure on the board. The state superintendent of public instruction, who is head of the Department of Education, is a nonpartisan elected official.<sup>5</sup> The board is staffed by an executive officer who serves as a liaison to the state superintendent’s office.

When the Legislature passed the Oregon Educational Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, the Department of Education was widely perceived as a regulatory- and compliance-focused organization. In recent years, however, with changed leadership at the department and diminished funds for the university system, the department has emerged as a major leader in the effort to connect the systems through developing proficiency-based standards that are aligned with college entrance requirements.

There is no community college system per se in Oregon. Although the state’s 17 community colleges are under the governance of the State Board of Education, they have significant local autonomy. The commissioner of community colleges, who is appointed by the Board of Education, is housed in the Department of Education. During our interview, the commissioner of the Department of Community Colleges and Workforce Development, Cam Preus-Braly, described her role as similar to that of the K–12 state superintendent, except that



whereas the superintendent is elected by voters, the commissioner is appointed by the state board.

The community colleges have not had much policy influence and are often not participants in deliberations about K–16 policies. An elected official said that in the next legislative session, the governor may seek legislation to transfer the governance of the community colleges to the State Board of Higher Education. Over the last few sessions, there have been legislative attempts to create a super board for all of education, but these efforts have failed.

### **The Oregon University System (OUS) and the State Board of Higher Education**

The Oregon University System (OUS) is governed by the State Board of Higher Education, which is comprised of 11 members, 9 of which have four-year terms and 2 of which have two-year terms. Almost all of the board members are new, appointed by Governor Ted Kulongowski when he reconstituted the board in 2004. Some interviewees criticized the board for having insufficient expertise in educational matters. In addition, several were concerned that the current board, unlike those under previous administrations, does not have a K–12 representative. There is a community college president on the board.

The university system includes eight universities: Eastern Oregon University (a regional liberal arts university), the Oregon Health Sciences University (an affiliated medical institution), the Oregon Institute of Technology (a polytechnic university), Oregon State University (a land and sea grant university with programs in the liberal arts and sciences), Portland State University (an urban campus with programs in liberal arts and sciences), Southern Oregon University (a regional liberal arts and sciences university), the University of Oregon (a major liberal arts and sciences university), and Western Oregon University (a regional liberal arts and sciences university).

The main office of the university system is located at the University of Oregon in Eugene, although the chancellor, who is appointed by the state board, has offices on multiple campuses. The president of each university campus reports to the board through the chancellor. The vice chancellor of finance and administration is located at Oregon State University in Corvallis.

In recent years, higher education finances have been constrained. Oregon's support for higher education declined by 10.6% in the 2001–03 biennium. As a share of the state budget, state support for higher education decreased from 12.2% in 1987–89 to 6.9% in 2001–03. In 2002, Oregon was 33<sup>rd</sup> in the nation in higher education spending.<sup>6</sup>

Although the university system office is focused primarily on regulatory issues (for example, admission requirements and permission to offer new majors), the Academic Affairs Office has played a leadership role in K–16 reform in Oregon. For example, the Academic Affairs Office developed the Proficiency-based Admission Standards System (PASS) and worked to align PASS with the Certificates of Initial and Advanced Mastery (the CIM and the CAM). Many interviewees expressed concerns about whether the collaborative efforts by the

Academic Affairs Office would survive the current political changes in the state. For example, some interviewees said that several campuses were advocating to decrease the authority of the Academic Affairs Office over campuses.

Chancellor Jarvis was, by most accounts, an outspoken advocate for students and for broad access to postsecondary education. During our visit (which occurred while he was still in office), it was clear from our interviews that his relationship with the governor and the State Board of Higher Education was strained. He expressed concerns about the State Board of Higher Education's understanding of the difficulties facing students. For example, he said, "It's just amazing that half the people on this board have no idea that we're talking about graduation rates in the 60% range. We're talking about freshman year losses of 20, 25%. They [the board] all went to Lewis and Clark, Willamette—small, private schools. That's pretty amazing to me."

The chancellor was also clear about his priorities for the state, even though his views might jeopardize his relationship with the governor and board. He said:

I'm interested in reinvestment, I'm interested in access, and I'm interested in providing support for the goals of the State of Oregon. And if you want to talk about something else, don't talk to me because that's why I came on to do this job and that's a very different board than I've ever seen before in higher ed. We are very much part of the governor's political campaign for the state and if we can get our heads around that and say, well, what are the things that you need to do to get those things done and we'll take care of the other things, then I think you have the basis for a successful relationship. It would be my hope that we see K–16 feature highly in that. I don't think it's there yet.

Jarvis also said that the only way to sustain and institutionalize K–16 reforms was through the strong support of the governor. The governance structure itself, he said, is much less important.

### **The Joint Boards of Education**

The Joint Boards of Education, comprised of members of Board of Education and the Board of Higher Education, was created by former Governor Neil Goldschmidt by executive order to establish a forum for K–12, community college, and university representatives to meet and resolve common issues and concerns. The main initiative the Joint Boards oversaw was the Articulation Commission, which monitored the implementation of the Associate of Arts Oregon Transfer degree policy and common course numbering for lower-division courses.<sup>7</sup>

The Joint Boards has faced several obstacles since its inception. It used to be chaired by a university president and a community college president, but that practice stopped several years ago. According to an administrator from the Department of Education, "It was reported as a hardship for them to dedicate time to it and so they wanted to put a provost on it. The community colleges said, 'Well, if you do a provost, I'm going to do a dean.' I think what we've done is

diminish the value because we don't have the same set of champions around articulation issues that we need.”

Other challenges have included the following: the Joint Boards rarely met, it has been understaffed, and the meetings have not focused on substantive content. As a staff member from the university system said, “We don't quite have the right organizational structure to support collaboration and partnerships in K–16... The Joint Boards of Education ... would ask for money for some staff who would be charged to do multi-sector things. Nobody wanted to donate a portion of their money toward that, toward a neutral staff. They didn't think they could get any money, and they were right, from the Legislature and so they each volunteered people like me to work in that area for many years, but we never solved that problem.” When Goldschmidt became chair of the Board of Higher Education, he did not appoint anyone to the Joint Boards; it appears to be dormant.

### **The Governor's Office**

Although former Governor Goldschmidt established the Joint Boards, the governor's office has not played a direct role in K–16 reform or education reform in general—until recently. The current governor, Ted Kulongowski, in overhauling the State Board of Higher Education, is reversing that trend. His aides expressed concerns about the status quo in education, they developed reform agendas, and they appear to be willing to use the bully pulpit to implement their vision. For example, a governor's aide, in referring to the CIM, the CAM, and PASS, said that Oregon has several promising initiatives that were driven by the education systems, but that leadership and vision from the top are now required:

What we have, in terms of statutory, legal structure, and governance structure is more of a silo. We have a K–12 silo. We have a community college silo. We have a university system silo. We have a private and independent college silo... I think it's critical that the governor is the one expanding that top down vision and I think it's critical that the Legislature and specific legislators support his vision. You've got a governor saying to your community colleges and to your universities, you're going to make this happen and, in fact, if you want to make a budget request, it's got to fit under these objectives or I'm not going to listen... The more you can come to me and show me that you are creating collaborative processes, the more likely you are for me to support ... your money needs and for me to champion your money needs.

That's a way to do it that doesn't require us redrafting all the statutes tomorrow and the Constitution... If it ends up that the governance structure we have is working just fine at reaching those goals, then we live with the structure we have.

### **The Oregon Business Council (OBC)**

The governor and his staff are working with several groups in education reform, including the Oregon Business Council (OBC), which has played an active role in K–12 education reform for

years. While the OBC works mostly on issues that affect K–12 education, it has also been involved in issues that span from K–12 to higher education, such as PASS. The council helped shape the Oregon Educational Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, the legislation that established the statutory requirements for the CIM and the CAM. The council is also the founding sponsor of E3, nonprofit organization advocating for high academic standards to support learning and achievement in Oregon’s public schools, and helping the schools meet those standards. For example, E3 operates several statewide programs focusing on small schools, community outreach, and employer engagement. Finally, companies that are members of the OBC developed a variety of partnerships with local schools concerning issues such as workforce preparation and internships.<sup>8</sup>

### **The Quality Education Commission (QEC)**

In 2001, the Legislature formally established the Quality Education Commission (QEC) to “determine the amount of funding needed to meet the state’s quality education goals.” An objective is to help the governor and the Legislature craft a finance model that supports the state’s statutory education goals (including for the CIM and the CAM) and spans K–12 and higher education.<sup>9</sup> In addition, the charge of the commission includes the following: to identify best practices with regard to high student performance and to report to the governor and the Legislature each year outlining current K–12 practices, best practices, costs, student performance, and alternatives to meeting the state’s education goals.<sup>10</sup> There is currently much discussion around creating a K–16 finance model, but when this research was conducted the plans were at a very early stage.

## **CONTEXT FOR EDUCATION GOVERNANCE**

Oregon voters have a history of turning down efforts to raise funds for public services. In February 2004, voters defeated Measure 30, a proposed \$800 million tax increase intended to help balance the state’s budget. The measure included a three-year income tax surcharge, a reduction in the senior medical deduction, an increase in corporate minimum taxes, and a reduction in the discount for early payment of property taxes. It is likely that public education will be directly affected by the defeat of Measure 30, which could result in larger class sizes and a shortened school year.<sup>11</sup>

Although Oregon has a strong tradition of local control of education, there has been a shift to greater state authority over the past two decades. This shift can be traced to the passage of Measure 5 in 1990, a voter-passed property tax initiative, and to the passage of the Oregon Educational Act in 1991, which authorized the development of the CIM and the CAM. Measure 5 limited local property tax rates as a source of revenue for the schools and shifted education funding to the state.

The shift to funding education at the state level has not been accompanied by parallel transformations in governance structures or responsibilities. According to a former university system employee:

What you have is this culture that until 10 or 15 years ago was controlled locally which, in a heartbeat, became state dominated but never made any governance changes. They never swung any of the governance structures around to reflect this change. So the school districts still think of themselves as fairly independent. The Legislature still thinks of itself as not being responsible for schools. And so what you get are these perceptions and discontinuities between what each institution thinks its charge is and who it is accountable to.

In Oregon, the culture of education governance has been described as permissive and flexible. Staff members at the Department of Education, the Oregon University System, and other agencies have significant leeway in developing and defining new projects. For example, a staff member of the university system said that the “permissive environment” has helped “new entrepreneurial arrangements to flourish.” In addition, the balance of power between the Department of Education and the university system is relatively even. There is, according to a professor at the University of Oregon, a “calculus of power that there’s no one player that’s the most dominant.” As a result, this professor said, there is no single entity that controls an activity involving K–16 issues, which in turn also allows for flexible and entrepreneurial arrangements. Some interviewees, however, expressed concerns that this culture might change under the current governor.

At the K–12 level, there is some tension between the state superintendent, the governor, and the Legislature. According to an administrator in the Department of Education, “Our relationship with the governor’s office has been a bit rocky over the past six months from a variety of topics—No Child Left Behind [NCLB] being probably the most prominent—and so the lines of communication have been less than desirable.” In addition to disagreements between the state superintendent and the governor over the implementation of NCLB, the Legislature sometimes tries to act as a “super board” for K–12 education, which does not sit well with the superintendent. The governor’s main focus for K–16 issues appears to be on school-to-career issues. The superintendent fully supports the proficiency-based standards for the current K–16 work, which includes both preparation for vocations and for college. Meanwhile, the Legislature is focused primarily on efficiency and streamlining. It remains to be seen which vision of education will predominate.

In relation to higher education, the newly formed Board of Higher Education, at the time of our research visit, was considering drastic changes such as removing the chancellor, laying off his staff, and cutting university system departments. A state higher education leader said that these kinds of board actions have been common for school boards for a long time, but not in higher education:

Look at the boards who run K–12. They are hard on administrators. They are hard on the faculty... Now look at higher education. We're [viewed as] the best in the world, and if there's a problem, it's the students—they're not properly prepared. Now at the point where we lose that [faith], we will start to get school board politics and you know what? We're there.

He said that at the same time, many people are calling for greater autonomy for each campus. He also expressed concerns that as the system becomes more driven by campus-based priorities rather than state policy directives, this will detract from the focus on aligning proficiency-based standards between the K–12 and higher education.

The state superintendent and the university system chancellor appear to agree that the emphasis on aligning proficiency-based standards must remain—that the state has worked too hard on a good idea to let it go without a fight. They also have created a culture of collaboration that is unprecedented; they meet regularly to focus on issues such as obstacles to reform, networking to move their agenda forward, and the sharing of information. According to a staff member of the university system, the heads of the systems—the state superintendent, the commissioner of community colleges, and the university system chancellor—“testified jointly at the opening of K–12’s budget hearings this year in Oregon. They sat down and said we’re here together. I don’t know of many states where that happens.” An appointed official described their effort as showing the Legislature that the education chiefs want to collaborate, focus on students, and “explore ways that we can be more efficient with the education dollars that we have.”

### **III. Summary of K–16 Reforms**

#### **THE CERTIFICATE OF INITIAL MASTERY (CIM)**

The Certificate of Initial Mastery (CIM) is one of the most visible of Oregon’s statewide reforms affecting K–16 issues. Overseen by the State Department of Education, the CIM’s standards have been included as a component of Oregon’s assessment system.<sup>12</sup> To earn a CIM, students must meet the proficiency level on the state assessment and the work sample requirement for the 10<sup>th</sup> grade (a state CIM work sample is a classroom or other assignment that is scored on a scale of 1 to 6 using the official state scoring guide for that subject). Students can complete a CIM earlier or later than 10<sup>th</sup> grade, depending on their abilities. Although the CIM was designed to convey student mastery of high school standards, it is not required for graduation.

Districts first awarded CIMs to students in June 1997 and the early years of implementation were marked by changes in timelines and requirements. The test dates changed frequently, as did the subject areas tested and the deadlines for the Department of Education to send test data back to the schools. These and other problems tested the public’s and educators’ faith in the system. In addition, the newly adopted federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation mandated that the department make further changes in an already-volatile testing environment. Because of the difficulties associated with compliance with NCLB, as well as the problematic implementation of ongoing state reforms, the state’s assessments were narrowed from five subject areas to three. The state has also transformed the CIM so that it has become a more traditional rather than a proficiency-based assessment. It is now mostly comprised of multiple-choice tests along with a classroom-based work sample requirement. Many interviewees said that they feared that the CIM could lose its proficiency-based components—one of the remaining aspects that have made Oregon’s assessments unique.

One problematic aspect of the CIM has been its lack of consequences for students, schools, or educators. There are concerns, for example, that students might not try their hardest on tests that have no sanctions. This would be particularly important if new accountability measures were put into place using CIM data to measure performance, as has been discussed. In fall 2003, a Student Advisory Team to the state superintendent, comprised of about 30 students selected from throughout the state, recommended unanimously that the CIM be made mandatory for high school graduation—but only if it is also required to enroll in college and get a job.

#### **THE CERTIFICATE OF ADVANCED MASTERY (CAM)**

The Certificate of Advanced Mastery (CAM), the next level of academic achievement beyond the CIM, was designed as a capstone to student mastery of 12<sup>th</sup> grade standards, but its design

and implementation have been controversial.<sup>13</sup> The Department of Education has conducted pilot CAM projects and several schools are experimenting with implementation, but the CAM has yet to be fully implemented across the state. For 13 years, the department has struggled to determine whether the CAM should be academic (focusing on high-school-to-college standards), vocational (focusing on high-school-to-work standards), or a combination of the two. According to a staff member from the Department of Education:

The continuing existence of the Certificate of Advanced Mastery as a concept continues to cause a problem within the high schools. Whether or not it's about preparation for college or ... career preparation ... we believe that every kid coming through the system needs to be ready for college, and we hope that every kid coming through the system is going to go to work some day and that they need to know something about that process as well.

Currently, CAM standards are divided into foundation skills and advanced applications that require the same standards of performance of all students; the objective is to help students develop the skills they need for the vocational and academic challenges of post-high school life. Students, with the involvement of parents and school staff, develop individualized plans that will build upon students' aptitudes, interests, and goals. The CAM is targeted primarily at the 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> grades.

The state board gives school districts the authority to award credits on the basis of proficiencies rather than solely on the passing of classes. A staff member from the Department of Education said that districts need to make better use of the flexibility this provides them, particularly in providing programs that encourage students to volunteer, work, and otherwise gain experience and skills in the community. Referring to the focus on proficiencies inherent in the CAM, the staff member said, "We're finally seeing the stuff getting some traction. We're making some progress and we're not ready to walk away from it."

## **THE PROFICIENCY-BASED ADMISSIONS STANDARDS SYSTEM (PASS)**

As Oregon's K–12 reforms began to focus on the CIM and the CAM, the Oregon University System launched a reform initiative of its own that also focused on student proficiencies.<sup>14</sup> The university system initiated the Proficiency-based Admissions Standards System (PASS) in 1993 to examine how higher education's needs could fit in with the CIM and the CAM, and to ensure that high standards were developed to ensure academic preparation for students. According to a former university system employee, the university system did not want to lose control of admissions. The campuses wanted a higher number of better-prepared students; they were concerned that the academic level of the CIM would require more students to need remediation, and that the CAM would be focused on preparation for careers rather than college. Neither the CIM or the CAM was perceived by the university system as being sufficiently focused on preparing students for college.



The university system adopted proficiency standards in 1994. Since then, it developed more detailed descriptions of the knowledge and skills needed to prepare for and succeed in college. Teams of faculty members from over 60 high schools, community colleges, and all the four-year campuses worked with PASS staff to develop and refine the proficiencies over a six-year period.<sup>15</sup>

The proficiency areas are broken down into six content areas: English, math, science, visual and performing arts, second languages, and social science. Proficiency in these areas is demonstrated through activities in class and through test-taking. Students receive a summary judgment score for each of the PASS standards in a content area. There are five possible scores: exemplary (E), high-level mastery (H), meets the proficiency (M), working toward the proficiency (W), and not meeting the proficiency (N).<sup>16</sup> The training of teachers and other educators to score student work is the responsibility of schools, districts, and Education Service Districts.

An original PASS goal was to shift the focus of the admission process from the courses taken by students to the knowledge and skills that they mastered. That would require that incoming students at the public universities be able to demonstrate that their knowledge and skills met or exceeded the PASS standards.<sup>17</sup> Originally, the CAM and PASS were to be implemented at the same time, but as the implementation dates for both reforms were postponed repeatedly, PASS became a recommended rather than mandatory component for admission. Although the development of PASS has helped to align the CIM and the CAM with college-preparation skills, it is unclear if PASS will become a large-scale admission system, or if it will be used by a large number of students.

## **ALIGNMENT AMONG THE CIM, THE CAM AND PASS**

While the development of the CIM and the CAM is required by statute, the development of PASS is not, and most of the collaborative work to align the CIM, the CAM, and PASS was conducted without significant state funding or leadership from elected officials. All three instruments continue to evolve in terms of their design and use.<sup>18</sup>

Through the collaborative work of the Department of Education and the Oregon University System, the CIM, the CAM, and PASS are interlocked and PASS could potentially be used for college placement or credit—but only the CIM has been fully implemented. In 2001, the State Board of Education approved a policy stating that in order for a student to earn a CAM, s/he must meet performance standards in English, mathematics, and science associated with the CIM and “the performance standard for extended application through a collection of evidence,” which is a direct link with PASS.<sup>19</sup> Likewise, the university system stated that “the Certificate of Initial Mastery (CIM) serves as the foundation for PASS. As students earn their CIM in a content area, such as math, they may already have demonstrated proficiency in one or more of the PASS standards.”<sup>20</sup>

In addition, the Department of Education and the university system collaborated to align K–12 content standards with the proficiencies needed for college preparation as determined by PASS. In working with the standards for K–12 schools, the university system sought to create “a continuous set of performance expectations for students so that they will know clearly what they need to do at each benchmark level, and, ultimately, what they must do to be acceptable for university admission.”<sup>21</sup>

Two types of assessments can be used to determine students’ level of proficiency for PASS, but only one method is necessary for each PASS standard: teacher judgment or state and national tests. Students may also use CAM collections to demonstrate PASS proficiencies if the CAM collections meet the PASS criteria.<sup>22</sup> Because the CIM and PASS standards are aligned, it is unlikely that a student could earn proficiencies in PASS and not meet the CIM standards in those areas.

The full implementation of PASS for admission purposes was projected to begin in 2005–06, two years after the full implementation of the CIM. This strategy was developed to ensure that the CIM, the CAM, and PASS could be aligned and that teacher training and assessments could be coordinated.<sup>23</sup> But the CAM and PASS have yet to be fully implemented.

The development of PASS has had some entrenched opposition within teachers’ ranks, for two key reasons: (1) its development has been perceived by some as being driven by the university and without enough involvement of teachers, and (2) it has been perceived by some as yet another reform overloading the K–12 schools. Part of the university system’s strategy in working to improve the CIM and the CAM stems from a realistic appraisal of the opposition to PASS and of the CIM’s and the CAM’s legislative status. If through its work in developing PASS, the university system could transform the CIM and the CAM into instruments that could improve student preparation for college, then PASS would not need to remain its own entity; it could fade away, if necessary, and leave an important legacy.

The Oregon Business Council has been a major proponent of aligning the CIM, the CAM, and PASS. The council ran into difficulty, however, when it tried to convince its business members and partners to recognize the CIM when students apply for jobs after high school. That effort was not successful primarily because the CIM is not required for graduation.

Although in its implementation the CIM is now more traditional and less proficiency-based, its work sample still aligns with the collection-of-evidence requirement in PASS. PASS, on the other hand, has retained its original proficiency-based model, but might never be fully implemented.

## **INTEGRATED DATA PROJECT**

In 1997, the Legislature passed HB 3636 to direct the Department of Education to update the K–12 budget and accounting systems in order to produce comparable spending information for districts and schools statewide. To fulfill this mandate, the department is overseeing the Database Initiative Project, a statewide integrated database with the goal to spur “better educational

funding decisions to support continuous school improvement and student success, greater public access to education-related data, and a model that other government organizations can follow.”<sup>24</sup> The data are to be stored in a publicly accessible database. There are concerns that without efficient and effective ways to gather comparable data statewide, performance-based assessment will not be viable over the long term.

The Department of Education is spearheading the project, with significant support from staff of the university system’s Academic Affairs Office. State funding for the project is modest, although in 1999 the Legislature allocated \$5.6 million to extend the project into all school districts in the state.<sup>25</sup> Currently, K–12 and postsecondary education have their own data systems, and much of K–12 data are on paper—not in electronic files. During our visit, staff members were developing a conceptual framework with a K–16 focus to guide the development of the system. The team was also creating a prototype to gather data in electronic formats from K–12 through postsecondary education.

## **OTHER K–16 PROJECTS**

### **Dual Enrollment**

School districts and community colleges in Oregon have a relatively strong history of offering dual enrollment courses to high school students. But as with many aspects of public education in Oregon, dual enrollment offerings are coordinated at a local and regional level—without state guidance or leadership. The community college commissioner estimated that about 13,000 students earned about 97,000 dual enrollment credits in 2002–03. The courses are offered at either a high school or community college campus, but students can only receive credit if the teacher is certified to teach the dual enrollment course. Both the high school and college receive attendance funds for each student—a practice that is perceived by some legislators as double dipping but one that the Legislature has not yet addressed.

There have been several failed efforts to pass dual enrollment legislation. In those cases, both the community colleges and the K–12 school districts were concerned about losing money, and, as a state agency representative said, the community colleges were also worried about a large influx of “unsophisticated, immature 15, 16, and 17 year-olds” on their campuses. A state education leader called the most recent legislation “a scare tactic rather than a real argument or thoughtful process to figure out how to better serve those students.” The leader said that the Legislature was not able to resolve the funding issues, “so we were left with this menagerie.”

### **GEAR UP**

The Academic Affairs Office of the Oregon University System received a five-year, \$12.5 million grant from the federal government for GEAR UP, a program that focuses on increasing the “number of low-income students who are prepared to enter and succeed in postsecondary education.”<sup>26</sup> The Oregon program, which enrolls about 4,000 students per year across the state, targets low-income students (as determined by free-and-reduced-lunch status) from the 7<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup>

grades. The participants are from diverse locations (that is, from rural, suburban, and urban schools) and have diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds. Half of the GEAR UP funds is used for college scholarships for program graduates, one-quarter is used for administrative overhead for the university system, and one-quarter is used by the schools.

There have been some discussions within the state about connecting GEAR UP with existing K–16 reforms. For example, GEAR UP staff at the state level plans to suggest that all teachers in schools with a GEAR UP presence be offered PASS training. In addition, GEAR UP staff anticipates connecting better with the federal government’s educational opportunity outreach programs (TRIO), since the programs are present in the same schools. TRIO programs are designed to motivate and support students from disadvantaged backgrounds.

### **Teacher Education**

As with many other states, Oregon has developed many teacher-centered reforms that affect the preparation of students for college. Since teacher-centered reforms were not explored in depth for this study, they are described only briefly here.

The Academic Affairs Office of the university system has taken the lead in developing and implementing many of the teacher-centered reform projects, and it collaborated with K–12 school and community colleges through the Department of Education. The main areas of focus in Oregon are K–12 administrator programs, leadership projects, the coordination of teacher education policies, the crafting of responses to NCLB, teacher licensure work, and the use of distance education in teacher training.

## IV. K–16 Accomplishments

It appears that some of the broader and more significant objectives for the CIM, the CAM, and PASS have been tempered, given their problematic development and implementation, and the finance and governance crises that have affected the state. As a former appointed official said, “I think the air has so gone out of the sails of the broader notion of education reform here that we’re left to count on the marginal change.”

Several statewide initiatives and opportunities, however, have sprung from the K–16 legacy that has developed, the most significant of which include the development of the Database Initiative Project, the partial alignment of the CIM and the CAM with PASS, and the possible use of CIM data (aligned with PASS) for placement into community college courses. The Database Initiative Project will enable the state to gather comparable education data statewide in order to better understand, for example, the relationship between high school curriculum and college completion rates.

Although the purposes and implementation of the CIM, the CAM, and PASS are still moving targets, the alignment between these reforms is substantial. Currently, about one-third of the proficiencies identified by PASS are embedded in the CIM. In addition, the rules for the collection of evidence for the CAM are the same as those for PASS. For example, students can fulfill the CAM requirements through earning college-based credits as established by PASS standards.

In addition, a study completed by the university system called “The First Year: Student Performance on 10<sup>th</sup> Grade Benchmark Standards and Subsequent Performance in the First Year of College, 2001–02,” found correlations between meeting CIM standards and being prepared for college-level work.<sup>27</sup> Staff members at the university system said they hope that this link between the achievement of proficiency standards in high school and improved abilities to perform college-level work can be used to create new opportunities to link high school proficiencies with placement into college-level courses. Officials at the K–12 and community college levels also expressed interest in this concept.

Another important legacy of the K–16 efforts in Oregon is a culture of collaboration that has developed across educational levels. Many interviewees said that this culture was encouraged through the efforts of education leaders; K–12 Superintendent Susan Castillo, Community Colleges and Workforce Development Commissioner Cam Preus-Braly, and Oregon University System Chancellor Richard Jarvis worked well together, created common goals, met frequently, and often testified on each other’s behalf before the Legislature. Many interviewees also said that the collaborative culture was developed through the work of staff members at many levels. For example, one of the governor’s aides described the environment of collaboration and creativity in the state:

What it [PASS] really led to was opening up a good dialogue between high school staff and community college and university staff to really begin to understand each other. You know: “Here are what the students are experiencing in high school and learning. Here are our expectations. How do we mesh those better?” So it has really opened up that door of communication.

Oregon is a small state and although staff members have changed positions and affiliations, many have stayed involved in Oregon education. As a university system staff member said, “This group has continued; we are still here... It’s an odd situation, but over a period of time I think you put the governance structures in place ... but you also build relationships across sectors so there’s not just one person here [in favor of a particular reform]—there’s a group of people.” Many staff members confirmed these descriptions of a proactive network of people who work across institutions to reach common goals.

Ironically, the lack of resources in the state may have contributed to some of the collaborative K–16 work. As Oregon’s financial crisis has resulted in the elimination of many educational programs, it has required educational leaders to do more with less and to forge partnerships with others to pool their resources. The fiscal challenges also prompted people to be more resourceful and creative in working across educational sectors—including collaborations with former competitors for grants—to bring in additional funding. As a staff member of the university system said:

When we get grants, we intentionally use other agencies and collaborate with them—so with GEAR UP, we have a formal tie to PASS, we have a formal tie to the Department of Education, we have a formal tie to the scholarship commission. You know, they were built in from ... day one. No Child Left Behind money is coming to [the university system] to do teacher education in higher education. We just got an Advanced Placement incentive program grant. ODE is the fiscal agent; I’m the formal consultant to that... There are things that we’re doing to leverage each other very intentionally to try to move K–16 forward.

## V. Challenges to K–16 Reform

Oregon remains undecided about the goals of the CIM, the CAM, and PASS—and about the future of K–16 reform generally. Interviewees from the Department of Education and the Oregon University System agreed on the importance of connecting high school proficiencies with expectations for college-level work. However, few interviewees outside of these agencies referred to K–16 reform in terms of high-school-to-college preparation or proficiencies. Most of these interviewees described the initiatives associated with K–16 reform—such as the CIM and CAM—as preparing students through a school-to-career focus.

For example, staff members from the Department of Education and the university system described their goals for K–16 in terms of proficiency, access to college, and college preparation—some of the original goals of Oregon’s K–16 work. A university system administrator described the Department of Education and the university system as working together to focus on “higher education for every kid. We’re focused on aligning the systems.” In addition, the interviewee reflected one of the fundamental assumptions of PASS—that an aligned proficiency-based system can help students progress more successfully from one educational system to the next. She said that the Department of Education is “trying out the credit by proficiency ... and then we can help kids move through the system in a different way and a more successful way... I do not want to revert back in the K–12 system just to a system of credits and seat time.”

The governor’s staff agreed that improving K–16 is a priority for the state. But the governor’s K–16 focus appears to be primarily on career education. He has a new initiative that requires all students to create a career path and related educational plan when they enter high school. His staff described this as a current gap in Oregon’s reform strategies. The governor’s staff is working with leaders in workforce and economic development, regional workforce teams, community colleges, and university representatives to develop the career-based reform package.

Until this general disagreement about the primary goals and objectives of K–16 reform is resolved, it is unlikely that Oregon will effectively implement the CIM, the CAM, and PASS in ways that are effective for improving high-school-to-college transitions. In the meantime, however, there are also other challenges to K–16 reform in the state.

### **FINANCES AND INFRASTRUCTURE**

The scarcity of funding is a long-term problem for education in Oregon, and particularly for new initiatives such as K–16 reform. According to an administrator at the university system:

We have such a huge budget crisis on our hands. It's very serious and it hit all levels of education in the state. Higher education is scrambling to try to figure out how they cut budgets to stop the hike in tuitions, and what they're looking at is perhaps making some reductions in perhaps some of the core areas that are in support of this work... We don't know for sure how all of that is going to play out ... as we're trying to continue to move the agenda forward.

While most interviewees said that funding scarcity can help to create collaborative initiatives, they also cited instances in which the opposite has occurred. For example, the university system and its campuses have a strained relationship around applying for grants. Some university system interviewees said that the University of Oregon has actively discouraged the system staff from applying for K–16 grants so that campus administrators could apply instead.

The lack of funds has also created limitations in addressing problems. For example, although the state has supported the creation of a statewide integrated data system, funding is inadequate to develop and implement the system. A governor's aide called the currently available data about student performance a “barrier” to K–16 reform because the state cannot track students across educational levels. In particular, several interviewees cited concerns about the reliability and validity of community college data—both because of the decentralized aspects of the data collection and the lack of funds to support high-quality databases. Although the university system examined the relationship between CIM scores, SAT scores, and college grades, it could not use available community college data because of questions about quality.

Funding difficulties have also limited access to college in the state, particularly at the community colleges. In 2003–04, the community colleges turned away prospective students for the first time. Several interviewees mentioned that the colleges had a combined enrollment drop of two to three percent at a time when enrollment was climbing by about six percent per year. An administrator at the university system said that phone registration for collegiate-level mathematics and English courses at the community colleges opens and closes in seven minutes. As a consequence, many prospective students are not able to enroll in the courses they need. In addition, highly impacted majors such as nursing have waiting lists in the hundreds. Meanwhile, the colleges have laid off 42 faculty members (2003–04) because of budget problems. In 2003–04, the university system raised tuition for its institutions by an average of over 20%, shutting out students who could not afford that increase. For 2004–05, the State Board of Higher Education approved another tuition hike for six of the seven university system institutions. The average tuition increase was 12.7%.<sup>28</sup>

At the K–12 level, the state superintendent said that due to the lack of adequate funding, superintendents and other administrators have little time or resources to focus on K–16 reforms. For example, many school districts have been closing their schools early due to fiscal limitations, thereby limiting tutorial or related activities that can occur in the afternoons. Without additional resources, the implementation of the Oregon State Assessment and the challenges associated



with NCLB compliance are time-consuming and difficult for districts, leaving few resources to direct to the development and implementation of the CIM and the CAM.

## **GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE**

The fragmented and flexible governance structure for education in Oregon has enabled many of the K–16 reforms to develop through staff-led initiatives and collaborations. Although this allowed for much creativity, it has not brought strong public policy leadership for K–16 reforms at the state level. The governor’s More Better Faster initiative, in fact, appears to be shifting authority away from the university system and to the campuses, making state-level K–16 policymaking more difficult. In addition, given the extent to which the K–16 reforms have been driven by the sectors themselves, the leadership of these efforts depends on the personalities and goals of the chancellor of the university system, the state superintendent of schools, and the community college commissioner. When we visited, the leaders in these positions stated they were committed to supporting the collaborative work needed to develop and implement K–16 reforms, but if the leadership changes, new leaders might not support the efforts.

The governance structure of the community colleges—which are under the authority of the State Board of Education but which have significant local autonomy—appears to be making K–16 reforms particularly difficult to implement. A staff member for the university system said that this governance arrangement leaves the community colleges without significant policymaking authority for the system as a whole, and serves to undermine the development of a functional K–16 system. Because the community colleges do not have strong centralized leadership, local partnerships are more prevalent than state-level policy reform at the community college level. For example, course agreements between the state’s universities and community colleges have had to be established individually through local partnerships rather than collectively through statewide policy. In addition, the community colleges and the universities have different tuition and policy structures, which can complicate the development of collaborations to reach common goals based on student needs.

## **LIMITATIONS OF THE REFORMS**

Many staff members in the Department of Education publicly support the CIM but privately agree with many administrators, students, and teachers who suggest that in its current form, the CIM has significant limitations. Some critics of the CIM emphasize the fact that there are no consequences for students who do not fulfill the CIM requirements, since it is not needed for graduation or for college applications. Others suggest that it makes little sense for an assessment that has been described as an exit-level test to be given in the middle of the 10<sup>th</sup> grade. As a governor’s aide said, “What the CIM really is, it’s a set of standards that the Legislature arbitrarily chose halfway through your 10<sup>th</sup> grade year ... and that just really screwed up the system.” The aide said that he hopes the computerized testing being implemented throughout the

schools will enable students to take the CIM test whenever they are ready rather than waiting until their senior year.

In addition, the various elements of Oregon's K–16 reforms (that is, the CIM, the CAM, and PASS) began as separate reforms by different agencies. Despite concerted efforts at the staff level to connect these elements, they are perceived by many to be disjointed parts rather than an aligned continuum. According to a local superintendent, many teachers view the reforms as “unfunded mandates and top-down directives from the Legislature or the Oregon Department of Education or from higher ed... It appears that it's ... not coming out articulated... The connection sometimes feels like an afterthought.” In addition, even though the CAM has not been implemented and there are no consequences for students who do not receive a CIM, many legislators want to see evidence that the CIM and the CAM actually improve student achievement. As an elected official stated:

What we've got right now is a system that people are defending and the Legislature says, “Okay, show me that it's working,” and if you don't have the data that kids are achieving at a higher level or they're getting through college faster or whatever the measure is, then it's pretty hollow. It's like the Emperor has no clothes.

As with the CIM and the CAM, PASS also has limitations. PASS was initiated in 1994 when the university system had a chancellor who was willing to be insistent and forceful in pushing through reforms. Soon thereafter, however, that chancellor was replaced by another who was reportedly more interested in mediating differences. One university system staff member said that PASS has needed an “aggressive stance” in order to carry it forward at the university level. He characterized the CIM and the CAM as becoming embedded in the K–12 side, but said that a similar infrastructure is not being built within higher education. Interviewees said that many within higher education believe that proficiency-based rating of students is too difficult to implement—much harder than giving grades and tracking seat time. In particular, many of those working in campus admission offices believe that scoring students based on proficiencies may be too burdensome to implement broadly.

## VI. Changes from March to August 2004

The previous sections of this report provide a snapshot of Oregon's major statewide K–16 reforms as of March 2004. This section, based on follow-up interviews with several people who have been involved in Oregon's reforms since their inception, provides information about the significant changes that occurred between March and August 2004. Those whom we interviewed spoke on condition of anonymity, and each independently reiterated the others' descriptions.

From the early 1990s until 2003, Oregon was relatively stable in terms of its education reforms and governance structures. Although the test dates of the CIM and the content areas of the CIM, the CAM, and PASS were revised frequently, the overall reform initiatives remained and there were no substantial changes in governance. When Governor Kulongowski was elected, however, he began to transform the governance structure and to articulate new goals for higher education. The governor appointed former Governor Neil Goldschmidt as chair of the State Board of Higher Education, and appointed several new members to the board. We visited Oregon in perhaps the most tumultuous and uncertain window of time in years.

Soon after our first research visit, Oregon University System Chancellor Richard Jarvis resigned and the board eliminated the Academic Affairs Office, which not only had spearheaded the development of PASS, but also had taken actions over the years that had limited the autonomy of the various campuses—which several campuses resented. After the elimination of the Academic Affairs Office, however, Goldschmidt himself resigned in the wake of a scandal in which he admitted criminal activity.<sup>29</sup> The incriminating events had occurred about 30 years earlier but had never been made public during Goldschmidt's many years of public service. After his departure from the State Board of Higher Education, Governor Kulongowski appointed himself as an ex-officio board member; the board then elected him as interim chair.

In April 2004, the state superintendent announced cuts in the Oregon Department of Education that were due in part to the failure of Measure 30 at the ballot box. As one cost-saving step, the superintendent eliminated 15% of the department's top management positions. The new structure included five assistant superintendents overseeing the following offices: system accountability and policy development; educational improvement and innovation; student learning and partnerships; assessment and information services; and finance and administration.<sup>30</sup>

Similarly, in May 2004 the State Board of Higher Education announced a total budget cut of \$7.5 million as a result of the failure of Measure 30. The campuses faced reductions of about \$6.5 million and the chancellor's office lost slightly more than \$1 million.<sup>31</sup> At the same time, the board announced that the role of the chancellor's office was to “focus on policy, advocacy, strategy, incentives, and accountability for educational outcomes, leaving the universities more

freedom to mount programs and offer services in ways consistent with their board-approved mission and the state's educational goals.”

On June 4, 2004, George Pernsteiner was appointed as university system chancellor. At the time of his appointment he was a senior administrator at the University of California, Santa Barbara, but he also had previous management experience at the Oregon University System.<sup>32</sup> At the time of this research, it was too soon to assess the direction that the new chancellor would take regarding K–16 issues and PASS.

During the time of our research in August 2004, Governor Kulongowski was serving as interim chair of the State Board of Higher Education and plans for the appointment of a new chair had not been announced. In addition, several technical issues related to higher education governance needed to be ironed out. For example, Oregon law requires that the Legislature have ultimate policymaking authority over the approval of academic programs for higher education. The Legislature had delegated that authority to the Academic Affairs Office, but with the elimination of that office that authority was transferred to a provost's council, which is comprised of provosts from each of the university system institutions, but which has very limited staff resources. The University of Oregon oversaw the management of the council during the 2004–05 academic year, but this was not seen as a permanent solution.

Within the uncertain and changing political environment from March to August 2004, several promising legislative initiatives were under consideration for K–16 reform. For example, these included the development of the integrated data system; the alignment of K–16 standards; the connections between K–12 assessments and placement into courses in college; and the awarding of community college credit for fulfilling preparatory standards while in high school. Ironically, many of these initiatives had been originally proposed by staff at the Academic Affairs Office of the Oregon University System. In 2004, however, the university system was becoming less involved in K–16 issues while the Department of Education was becoming a more active K–16 proponent and partner.

Even though some K–16 legislation appeared to be moving forward, there remained substantial confusion and concerns about the future of K–16 reform in the state. Several interviewees in higher education suggested that legislative support for higher education may be dependent upon making significant cuts to the university system office—to relieve the perception of excessive administrative costs and to provide for greater campus autonomy. An administrator described Oregon as “a great place for a sociologist or psychologist to spend time because ... there's a huge cloud of uncertainty here.” Another interviewee said, “There's no roadmap, no goals—because of the vendetta part of it.” Still another said, “There is no policy framework for [higher education] governance or institutional priorities and until one emerges, it's too hard to tell what would happen... [The governor] is the one who can run this whole thing and it's not clear what he wants to do or when he wants to do it.” A former administrator described Oregon as a state with “a governor and a former governor who like the idea of [governance change] for the sake of shaking things up.”

## VII. Conclusion

Oregon's fragmented and flexible education governance structure helped to create the conditions in which staff members at the Oregon Department of Education and the Oregon University System developed innovative statewide K–16 reforms. These reforms, however, are not yet implemented fully and they have not met their more ambitious goals, such as: reforming K–12 teaching and learning to focus on student proficiencies; aligning those proficiencies with the skills needed for higher education; linking those proficiencies with a new, mandatory public university admission system; and fundamentally altering both high school teaching and learning and the admission process for the majority of applicants to Oregon's universities. Nonetheless, the reforms have succeeded in the following more limited ways: shifting teaching and learning in a proficiency-based direction; developing standards for readiness for higher education; and embedding postsecondary standards for readiness into K–12 standards.

Although the Department of Education and the university system have been able to collaborate extensively, their goals, missions, funding streams, and governance structures remain separate. The Legislature has attempted on numerous occasions to create a super-board for K–16 education, but each attempt has failed. Superintendent Susan Castillo described the two systems as “different planets.” They collaborated around a set of reforms, but have done so in limited ways without strong leadership from the governor's office or the Legislature to create an over-arching vision for K–16 reform. The only entity that is formally designated to oversee K–16 issues is the Joint Boards, but during our visit it did not have the staff, visibility, authority, or funding to be a state-level leader in terms of K–16 governance. The senior staff members who developed the reforms did so primarily from their own collective vision and ingenuity. With a new chancellor at the university system and the demise of the Academic Affairs Office, the next steps for statewide K–16 reform are uncertain.

If the governor and Legislature decide to continue the K–16 reform efforts, this could lay the groundwork for improvements in the CIM, the CAM, and PASS. On the other hand, if the governor and Legislature act in the opposite direction, they risk losing over 10 years of collaborative work to establish proficiencies that are aligned from high school to college.

Given the funding difficulties in the state and the political instability in education governance, many major questions loom large. How can the state formalize and provide direction for K–16 reforms through statute—for example, by developing K–16 indicators for the state's accountability and data systems? Will the CIM and CAM—or the proficiency-based standards in general—survive? Will the governor develop and articulate a strong K–16 agenda? How can the state develop a more centralized governance structure for the community colleges, so that they can play a larger role in state policy issues? Will the university campuses continue to demand autonomy from the Oregon University System? How can the state bring greater stability

to higher education governance, and how can the existing governance structure better support K–16 reform? In short, how can state policymakers capitalize on the foundations that have already been laid for innovative K–16 policy and practices? With so much of the political, financial, and educational landscape in flux, it would be premature to predict the next chapter of this story.

## **Oregon Interview Protocol**

### **CONTEXT QUESTIONS**

These data to be gathered from websites and other sources:

- High school dropout rate (and accuracy of data).
- College-going rate (in-state public institutions of higher education, in-state privates, out-of-state, disaggregated).
- College persistence/completion rates (same as above).
- Projected growth in K–12 population (next 20 years, disaggregated by race/ethnicity, geography).
- Projected growth in postsecondary population (next 20 years, disaggregated by race/ethnicity, geography).

### **QUESTIONS FOR K–12 INTERVIEWEES**

[For state agencies:] Please describe the following functions in your agency: information management, education budgeting, program planning, and articulation and collaboration.

Please describe any changes in the CIM over the past four years.

Please describe your state's K–12 accountability system. Are there any stakes attached to the CIM (for students, educators, or schools)?

What is the current status of the CAM?

Has PASS had an impact on K–12 reform in Oregon (for example, creating alignment between K–12 and postsecondary expectations)?

Please describe any changes in PASS/CIM alignment over the past four years.

Please describe any impact PASS has had on student readiness for college. How is the PASS implementation progressing? (How many students have used a PASS transcript for OUS admissions? How many schools/teachers are involved?)

What roles have K–12 played in the development and implementation of PASS?

Please describe any additional collaborative projects/endeavors with postsecondary institutions/systems. How did they start? How are they governed? What are their goals and objectives? How are they working?

Is your [agency, district] brought to the table for state-level K–16 policy discussions? Please describe those discussions (content, goals, objectives, who attends, outcomes).

What kinds of K–12 data are collected? How are they used?

Is Oregon able to connect its K–12 and postsecondary education data? If so, how are they used?

Please tell me what you think about the accessibility of Oregon’s postsecondary institutions for students who are traditionally underrepresented in college. What kind of college preparatory opportunities do students who are traditionally underrepresented in college have in Oregon?

## **QUESTIONS FOR POSTSECONDARY INTERVIEWEES**

In Oregon, who is responsible for regulating postsecondary education in terms of:

- Budgeting and resource allocation?
- Review of existing programs and approval of new ones?
- Strategic planning and enrollment management?
- Information management and accountability reporting?

How well are these responsibilities currently being performed?

[For state agencies/system offices:] Please describe the following functions in your agency: information management, program planning, and articulation and collaboration with K–12.

What is the role of, and relationship between, state government and postsecondary education?

Has PASS had an impact on K–12 reform in Oregon (for example, creating alignment between K–12 and postsecondary expectations)? If so, please describe.

Please describe any changes in PASS over the past four years. Please describe any changes in PASS/CIM alignment over the past four years.

Please describe any impact PASS has had on student readiness for college. How is the PASS implementation progressing? (How many students have used a PASS transcript for OUS admissions? How many schools/teachers are involved?)

Please tell us about the predictive validity studies you have been conducting with PASS and CIM data (regarding OUS admissions and persistence). What have you found? Will your findings change the CIM or PASS in any way?

What role(s) have two-year institutions played in the development and implementation of PASS?

What is the current status of the CAM?

Please describe any additional collaborative projects/endeavors with K–12 districts or schools (dual enrollment, middle college, early college high schools). How did they start? How are they governed? What are their goals and objectives? How are they working?

Are your institutions/is your system brought to the table for state-level K–16 policy discussions? Please describe those discussions (content, goals, objectives, who attends, outcomes).

What kinds of postsecondary education data are collected? How are they used?

Is Oregon able to connect its K–12 and postsecondary education data? If so, how was that done? How are the data being used (across systems)?



How many PASS transcripts have been submitted to OUS? Have they changed the admission process or outcome for any institution? Are data from PASS transcripts being used for analyses (if so, how)?

Are there any discussions about developing a postsecondary education accountability system? If so, please characterize those discussions. Would data from PASS be used?

Please tell me what you think about the accessibility of Oregon's postsecondary institutions for students who are traditionally underrepresented in college. What kind of college preparatory opportunities do students who are traditionally underrepresented in college have in Oregon?

## **QUESTIONS FOR ALL INTERVIEWEES**

In what ways, and under what circumstances, do cooperation and conflict between the levels manifest themselves?

- Please describe education governance in your state over the past 10 years (governor, Legislature, K–12, and postsecondary). Why does your state have its current coordinating/governance structures and processes? How do all the different entities interact (legislatively, behind closed doors, territoriality)?
- What has been the role of the Joint Boards in creating and institutionalizing K–16 reforms (for example, PASS, alignment between the CIM and PASS, any work on the CAM)?
- Who are the major players for K–12? Two-year institutions? Four-year institutions? K–16? What are their roles? How do they create change? How would you characterize their working relationships? How do they fit into the new governance structure?
- Is there a history of collaboration across K–12 and postsecondary? If so, please give some examples.
- Is there a history of territoriality between education sectors? If so, please give some examples.
- Please describe the evolution and development of the CIM and CAM, including who drove the reforms. [Also answered by data from the Bridge Project.]
- Please describe the evolution and development of PASS, including who drove the reforms. [Also answered by data from the Bridge Project.]
- Please describe efforts to connect the CIM, the CAM, and PASS, including who drove those efforts.
- Would you change your state's governance system(s) in any way? If so, how?

To what extent is K–16 and K–16 reform perceived as a state policy concern?

- What are the major K–12 and postsecondary (2-year and 4-year) issues facing Oregon?

- What are the major issues facing Oregon that bridge the different education sectors? What are the major student needs? (For example, what are the biggest problems regarding school readiness, high school completion, college-going rates, remediation, college completion?) How does your state assess those needs (especially across the K–16 continuum)?
- Where do these major issues fit on the state’s education agenda in terms of the priority level? Who views them as major issues? Who is taking action?
- What are the major issues facing the exit-level CIM?
- What are the major issues facing the CAM?
- What are the major issues facing PASS?

What are the main goals and objectives of current state-level K–16 reforms?

- We have a broad sense of the relationships between the CIM and PASS. These questions try to get at specific state policies related to the connections between high schools and colleges. Please characterize any discussions about (or actions regarding) developing and implementing the following changes:
  - Restructuring state governance to reflect a K–16 frame.
  - Creating a K–16 accountability system [holding postsecondary accountable for persistence and completion].
  - Restructuring state education finance within a K–16 frame (joint budgeting).
  - Connecting data systems across K–12 and postsecondary.
  - Funding K–12 and postsecondary collaborations.
  - Broadening the scope/number of dual enrollment and related programs.
  - Alignment of K–12 and postsecondary assessments (or use of relevant cut scores).
  - Administering postsecondary placement exams to high school students (diagnostic testing across the continuum) in community colleges and four-year institutions.
  - Connecting K–12 and postsecondary standards [prompt: CIM/PASS connections].
  - Public articulation of post-secondary standards (entrance, placement, graduation/general education, major-specific) [prompt: impact of PASS].
  - Public articulation of transfer requirements.
- In each area in which there have been reforms, what have been the main goals and objectives? Have those been measured and, if so, how?
- What was the evolution of each of Oregon’s K–16 reforms? [Also answered by data from the Bridge Project.] What changes in these structures, processes, and relationships, if any, have taken place in the past four years?

What are the incentives and disincentives for improved coordination?

- What are the main barriers to developing and implementing K–16 reforms in Oregon (for example, full PASS implementation)? What are the main barriers to institutionalizing these changes?
- How institutionalized are these reforms (specifically, PASS)? What is the best way to give traction to these issues (specifically, PASS)? What are some incentives Oregon has considered using to create and institutionalize some of these changes?
- What are some incentives for postsecondary institutions and systems to work with K–12 to improve student preparation?
- What are some incentives for postsecondary institutions and systems to improve their student persistence and completion rates?
- What are some incentives for postsecondary institutions and systems to improve their placement and advising practices?

Who is responsible for developing and implementing those changes? How do governors, key legislators, and agencies influence inter-level programs?

- How did K–16 reforms get on the state agenda—what sparked the changes? [Also answered by data from the Bridge Project, but it might be interesting to ask those we did not interview before about their perspective.]
- Who has led the charge in developing these changes? In implementation? [Same as above regarding Bridge Project data.]
- What has been the role of [interviewee’s organization] in developing and implementing K–16 reforms?
- What role do nongovernmental groups play in the K–16 governance arena in Oregon? How do they interact with public governing entities? How effective have their K–16 initiatives been?
- What has been the role of the business community in K–16 reform and governance?

What have been the main successes and failures to date? What changes in education structures, processes, and relationships, if any, have taken place since the K–16 reforms were initiated?

- What have been the main successes and failures to date [and why does the interviewee consider them successes/failures—based on what evidence]?
- Do you consider PASS to be a success, failure, or is it too soon to tell? If you consider it to be a failure, is there something that could have been done to make it a success?
- What has changed since PASS’ implementation and the alignment between the CIM and PASS [at the state level, at the district and school level, for students]? Would you characterize these as positive or negative changes (and why)?

To what extent do state budgetary practices impede or encourage the establishment and viability of inter-level programs?

- Please describe how all the various education entities in the state are funded. [Please describe Oregon's Quality Education Model.]
- What is the current education budget? What financial challenges are you currently facing? How have the different education sectors been impacted by budgetary problems?
- Will the current financial problems impact the CIM in any way? If so, how? [Repeat question for the CAM and PASS.]
- Will the current financial problems reduce the capacity of postsecondary education institutions in Oregon to serve current and potential students? Equity?
- How does the state's finance structure impact the development, implementation, and institutionalization of K–16 reforms (for example, alignment of the CIM and PASS)? (To what extent does money matter? Does the structure of its flow matter? What kind of behavior does your funding stream create? What kinds of incentives and disincentives does it create?)
- Would you change your state's finance system in any way? If so, how?

What are the short- and long-term outlooks for inter-level relationships? Is legislative or gubernatorial action to promote collaboration likely? Are specific connective mechanisms operational or being proposed?

- Can you predict what will happen in 5 years, 10 years, with the K–16 reform agenda?
- How institutionalized will the reforms be? What will be the major changes for students? K–12 educators? Postsecondary education?

## Endnotes

1. Nigel Jaquiss, “The 30-Year Secret,” *Willamette Week*, March 12, 2004, <http://www.wweek.com/story.php?story=5091>.
2. See <http://bridgeproject.stanford.edu>.
3. Portions of this section are based on previous research and writing by Andrea Venezia and Andrea Conklin Bueschel at Stanford University’s Bridge Project. See <http://bridgeproject.stanford.edu>.
4. Ray Marshall and Marc Tucker, *Thinking for a Living: Education and the Wealth of Nations* (New York, NY: Basic Books, 1992).
5. See <http://www.ode.state.or.us/stateboard/boardintro.htm>.
6. David Longanecker, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, “WICHE and Oregon,” PowerPoint presentation: [http://www.wiche.edu/PPT/Or50th\\_feb03\\_files/frame.htm](http://www.wiche.edu/PPT/Or50th_feb03_files/frame.htm).
7. See <http://www.ous.edu/aca/jbac.html>.
8. See <http://www.orbusinesscouncil.org/>.
9. See <http://www.ode.state.or.us/sfda/qualityed/>.
10. See <http://www.ode.state.or.us/sfda/qualityed/charge.aspx>.
11. See [http://www.oregonlive.com/news/oregonian/index.ssf?/base/front\\_page/107589952432471.xml](http://www.oregonlive.com/news/oregonian/index.ssf?/base/front_page/107589952432471.xml).
12. Some background information in this section was provided by research conducted by Stanford University’s Bridge Project. See <http://bridgeproject.stanford.edu>.
13. Ibid.
14. Ibid.
15. Oregon University System, *The College Guidance Counselor’s Handbook, 1998–1999* (Eugene, OR).
16. “An Introductory Guide to PASS for Secondary School Administrators,” prepared by the Confederation of Oregon School Administrators, OASSA Issues Forum, and PASS, 2000.
17. “Proficiency Standards: Summary Charts of Criteria for All Content Areas,” PASS office brochure, 1997–1998.
18. Some background information in this section was provided by research conducted by Stanford University’s Bridge Project. See <http://bridgeproject.stanford.edu>.
19. See <http://www.ode.state.or.us/cimcam>.
20. “An Introductory Guide to PASS for Secondary School Administrators,” pp. 11, 13.
21. Oregon University System memo developed by PASS staff about the PASS system, 1996–1997 academic year.
22. “An Introductory Guide to PASS for Secondary School Administrators,” pp. 11, 13.
23. Oregon University System, *The College Guidance Counselor’s Handbook, 1998–1999*.
24. See <http://www.ode.state.or.us/sfda/docs/phase2report.pdf>.
25. Ibid.
26. See [www.ed.gov/programs/gearup](http://www.ed.gov/programs/gearup).
27. See <http://www.ous.edu/aca/jbac.html>.
28. Office of the Chancellor, Oregon University System, “Board of Higher Ed Approves 2004–05 Tuition with Exceptions,” May 7, 2004, news release, <http://www.ous.edu/news/press/060404b.htm>.
29. Nigel Jaquiss, “The 30-Year Secret.”

30. Oregon Department of Education, "Superintendent Castillo Announces Department Reorganization," April 7, 2004, news release, <http://www.ode.state.or.us/news/releases/default.aspx?yr=2004&kw=&rid=357>.
31. Office of the Chancellor, Oregon University System, "Board of Higher Ed Reviews Impact of Measure 30 Campus and Chancellor's Office Cuts, Construction Budgets and Legislative Concepts," May 7, 2004, news release, <http://www.ous.edu/news/press/050704.htm>.
32. Office of the Chancellor, Oregon University System, "State Board of Higher Education Appoints Executive Vice Chancellor/COO," June 4, 2004, news release, <http://www.ous.edu/news/press/060404a.htm>.

## ABOUT THE AUTHORS

ANDREA VENEZIA is senior policy analyst and project director at the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education. Her work examines education policy, particularly as related to equity and the transition from K–12 to postsecondary education. Prior to joining the National Center, she directed Stanford University’s Bridge Project and co-authored *Betraying the College Dream* and *From High School to College*. She has worked for a variety of state, federal, and not-for-profit entities, including the Stanford Institute for Higher Education Research, the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, and the National Education Goals Panel.

MICHAEL W. KIRST is professor of education at Stanford University and former president of the California State Board of Education. He is a faculty affiliate with the Department of Political Science, and has a courtesy appointment with the Graduate School of Business. Before joining the Stanford University faculty, Kirst held several positions with the federal government, including staff director of the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Manpower, Employment, and Poverty, and director of program planning and evaluation for the Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education in the former U.S. Office of Education. He was the principal investigator for Stanford University’s Bridge Project and is co-author of *Betraying the College Dream* and *From High School to College*.

## **THE INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP**

The Institute for Educational Leadership (IEL) is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization based in Washington, D.C. For more than 40 years, IEL’s mission has been to build the capacity of individuals and organizations in education and related fields to work together—across policies, programs, and sectors. The Institute provides services in the following three program areas: Developing and Supporting Leaders, Strengthening School-Family-Community Connections, and Connecting and Improving Policies and Systems that Serve Children and Youth. IEL brings together diverse constituencies, such as federal, state, and local government agencies and nonprofit organizations, and focuses on empowering leaders with knowledge and applicable ideas. The Institute facilitates dialogue across boundaries of all sorts, building alliances and partnerships for change. Its publications translate research and experience into practical recommendations about what works to improve American education.

## **THE STANFORD INSTITUTE FOR HIGHER EDUCATION RESEARCH**

The Stanford Institute for Higher Education Research (SIHER) is home to sponsored research projects that examine contemporary higher education planning and policy issues from a wide range of analytical perspectives, including those of social scientists and policy audiences in the United States and abroad. Since its establishment in 1989, SIHER has sought to understand the dynamics of systemic change, productivity, management, and effectiveness of higher education organizations, as well as to offer suggestions for their improvement.



## THE NATIONAL CENTER FOR PUBLIC POLICY AND HIGHER EDUCATION

The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education promotes public policies that enhance Americans' opportunities to pursue and achieve high-quality education and training beyond high school. As an independent, nonprofit, nonpartisan organization, the National Center prepares action-oriented analyses of pressing policy issues facing the states and the nation regarding opportunity and achievement in higher education—including two- and four-year, public and private, for-profit and nonprofit institutions. The National Center communicates performance results and key findings to the public, to civic, business, and higher education leaders, and to state and federal leaders who are in positions to improve higher education policy.

Established in 1998, the National Center is not affiliated with any institution of higher education, with any political party, or with any government agency; it receives continuing, core financial support from a consortium of national foundations that includes The Pew Charitable Trusts, The Atlantic Philanthropies, and The Ford Foundation.

152 North Third Street, Suite 705, San Jose, California 95112

Telephone: 408-271-2699 • FAX: 408-271-2697

[www.highereducation.org](http://www.highereducation.org)

### National Center Publications

The National Center publishes:

- ★ Reports and analyses commissioned by the National Center,
- ★ Reports and analyses written by National Center staff,
- ★ National Center Policy Reports that are approved by the National Center's Board of Directors, and
- ★ *National CrossTalk*, a quarterly publication.

The following National Center publications—as well as a host of other information and links—are available at [www.highereducation.org](http://www.highereducation.org). Single copies of most of these reports are also available from the National Center. Please FAX requests to 408-271-2697 and ask for the report by publication number.

***Claiming Common Ground: State Policymaking for Improving College Readiness and Success***, by Patrick M. Callan, Joni E. Finney, Michael W. Kirst, Michael D. Usdan, and Andrea Venezia (March 2006, #06-1). To improve college readiness and success, states can develop policies that better connect their K–12 and postsecondary education systems. However, state action in each of the following policy areas is needed to create college-readiness reform: alignment of coursework and assessments; state finance; statewide data systems; and accountability.

***Measuring Up on College-Level Learning***, by Margaret A. Miller and Peter T. Ewell (October 2005, #05-8). In this report, the National Forum on College-Level Learning proposes a model for evaluating and comparing college-level learning on a state-by-state basis, including assessing educational capital. As well as releasing the results for five

participating states, the authors also explore the implications of their findings in terms of performance gaps by race/ethnicity and educating future teachers.

***The Governance Divide: A Report on a Four-State Study on Improving College Readiness and Success***, by Andrea Venezia, Patrick M. Callan, Joni E. Finney, Michael W. Kirst, and Michael D. Usdan (September 2005, #05-3). This report, supported by case studies in Florida, Georgia, New York, and Oregon, identifies and examines policy options available to states that are interested in creating sustained K–16 reform.

***The Governance Divide: The Case Study for Florida***, by Andrea Venezia and Joni E. Finney (May 2006, #05-4).

***The Governance Divide: The Case Study for Georgia***, by Andrea Venezia, Patrick M. Callan, Michael W. Kirst, and Michael D. Usdan (April 2006, #05-5).

***The Governance Divide: The Case Study for New York***, by Andrea Venezia, Michael W. Kirst, and Michael D. Usdan (May 2006, #05-6).

***The Governance Divide: The Case Study for Oregon***, by Andrea Venezia and Michael W. Kirst (April 2006, #05-7).

***Borrowers Who Drop Out: A Neglected Aspect of the College Student Loan Trend***, by Lawrence Gladieux and Laura Perna (May 2005, #05-2). This report examines the experiences of students who borrow to finance their educations, but do not complete their postsecondary programs. Using the latest comprehensive data, this report compares borrowers who drop out with other groups of students, and provides recommendations on policies and programs that would better prepare, support, and guide students—especially low-income students—in completing their degrees.

***Case Study of Utah Higher Education***, by Kathy Reeves Bracco and Mario Martinez (April 2005, #05-1). This report examines state policies and performance in the areas of enrollment and affordability. Compared with other states, Utah has been able to maintain a system of higher education that is more affordable for students, while enrollments have almost doubled over the past 20 years.

***Measuring Up 2004: The National Report Card on Higher Education*** (September 2004). *Measuring Up 2004* consists of a national report card for higher education (report #04-5) and 50 state report cards (#04-4). The purpose of *Measuring Up 2004* is to provide the public and policymakers with information to assess and improve postsecondary education in each state. For the first time, this edition of *Measuring Up* provides information about each state's improvement over the past decade. Visit [www.highereducation.org](http://www.highereducation.org) to download *Measuring Up 2004* or to make your own comparisons of state performance in higher education.

***Technical Guide Documenting Methodology, Indicators, and Data Sources for Measuring Up 2004*** (November 2004, #04-6).

***Ensuring Access with Quality to California's Community Colleges***, by Gerald C. Hayward, Dennis P. Jones, Aims C. McGuinness, Jr., and Allene Timar, with a postscript by Nancy Shulock (May 2004, #04-3). This report finds that enrollment growth pressures, fee increases, and recent budget cuts in the California Community Colleges are having significant detrimental effects on student access and program quality. The report also provides recommendations for creating improvements that build from the state policy context and from existing promising practices within the community colleges.

***Public Attitudes on Higher Education: A Trend Analysis, 1993 to 2003***, by John Immerwahr (February 2004, #04-2). This public opinion survey, prepared by Public Agenda for the National Center, reveals that public attitudes

about the importance of higher education have remained stable during the recent economic downturn. The survey also finds that there are some growing public concerns about the costs of higher education, especially for those groups most affected, including parents of high school students, African-Americans, and Hispanics.

***Responding to the Crisis in College Opportunity*** (January 2004, #04-1). This policy statement, developed by education policy experts at Lansdowne, Virginia, proposes short-term emergency measures and long-term priorities for governors and legislators to consider for funding higher education during the current lean budget years.

*Responding to the Crisis* suggests that in 2004 the highest priority for state higher education budgets should be to protect college access and affordability for students and families.

***With Diploma in Hand: Hispanic High School Seniors Talk About Their Future***, by John Immerwahr (June 2003, #03-2). This report by Public Agenda explores some of the primary obstacles that many Hispanic students face in seeking higher education—barriers that suggest opportunities for creative public policy to improve college attendance and completion rates among Hispanics.

***Purposes, Policies, Performance: Higher Education and the Fulfillment of a State's Public Agenda*** (February 2003, #03-1). This essay is drawn from discussions of higher education leaders and policy officials at a roundtable convened in June 2002 at New Jersey City University on the relationship between public purposes, policies, and performance of American higher education.

***Measuring Up 2002: The State-by-State Report Card for Higher Education*** (October 2002, #02-7). This report card, which updates the inaugural edition released in 2000, grades each state on its performance in five key areas of higher education. *Measuring Up 2002* also evaluates each state's progress in relation to its own results from 2000.

***Technical Guide Documenting Methodology, Indicators, and Data Sources for Measuring Up 2002*** (October 2002, #02-8).

***State Policy and Community College–Baccalaureate Transfer***, by Jane V. Wellman (July 2002, #02-6). This report recommends state policies to energize and improve higher education performance regarding transfers from community colleges to four-year institutions.

***Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education: The Early Years*** (June 2002, #02-5). The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) attained remarkable success in funding innovative and enduring projects during its early years. This report, prepared by FIPSE's early program officers, describes how those results were achieved.

***Losing Ground: A National Status Report on the Affordability of American Higher Education*** (May 2002, #02-3). This national status report documents the declining affordability of higher education for American families, and highlights public policies that support affordable higher education. It provides state-by-state summaries as well as national findings.

***The Affordability of Higher Education: A Review of Recent Survey Research***, by John Immerwahr (May 2002, #02-4). This review of recent surveys by Public Agenda confirms that Americans feel that rising college costs threaten to make higher education inaccessible for many people.

***Coping with Recession: Public Policy, Economic Downturns, and Higher Education***, by Patrick M. Callan (February 2002, #02-2). This report outlines the major policy considerations that states and institutions of higher education face during economic downturns.

***Competition and Collaboration in California Higher Education***, by Kathy Reeves Bracco and Patrick M. Callan (January 2002, #02-1). This report argues that the structure of California’s state higher education system limits the system’s capacity for collaboration.

***Measuring Up 2000: The State-by-State Report Card for Higher Education*** (November 2000, #00-3). This first-of-its-kind report card grades each state on its performance in higher education. The report card also provides comprehensive profiles of each state and brief states-at-a-glance comparisons.

***Beneath the Surface: A Statistical Analysis of the Major Variables Associated with State Grades in Measuring Up 2000***, by Alisa F. Cunningham and Jane V. Wellman (November 2001, #01-4). Using statistical analysis, this report explores the “drivers” that predict overall performance in *Measuring Up 2000*.

***Supplementary Analysis for Measuring Up 2000: An Exploratory Report***, by Mario Martinez (November 2001, #01-3). This supplement explores the relationships within and among the performance categories in *Measuring Up 2000*.

***Some Next Steps for States: A Follow-up to Measuring Up 2000***, by Dennis Jones and Karen Paulson (June 2001, #01-2). This report suggests a range of actions that states can take to bridge the gap between state performance identified in *Measuring Up 2000* and the formulation of effective policy to improve performance in higher education.

***A Review of Tests Performed on the Data in Measuring Up 2000***, by Peter Ewell (June 2001, #01-1). This review describes the statistical testing performed on the data in *Measuring Up 2000* by the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems.

***Recent State Policy Initiatives in Education: A Supplement to Measuring Up 2000***, by Aims McGuinness, Jr. (December 2000, #00-6). This supplement highlights education initiatives that states have adopted since 1997–98.

***Assessing Student Learning Outcomes: A Supplement to Measuring Up 2000***, by Peter Ewell and Paula Ries (December 2000, #00-5). This report is a national survey of state efforts to assess student learning outcomes in higher education.

***Technical Guide Documenting Methodology, Indicators and Data Sources for Measuring Up 2000*** (November 2000, #00-4).

***A State-by-State Report Card on Higher Education: Prospectus*** (March 2000, #00-1). This document summarizes the goals of the National Center’s report-card project.

***Great Expectations: How the Public and Parents—White, African-American, and Hispanic—View Higher Education***, by John Immerwahr with Tony Foleno (May 2000, #00-2). This report by Public Agenda finds that Americans overwhelmingly see higher education as essential for success. Survey results are also available for the following states:

*Great Expectations: How Pennsylvanians View Higher Education* (May 2000, #00-2b).

*Great Expectations: How Floridians View Higher Education* (August 2000, #00-2c).

*Great Expectations: How Coloradans View Higher Education* (August 2000, #00-2d).

*Great Expectations: How Californians View Higher Education* (August 2000, #00-2e).

*Great Expectations: How New Yorkers View Higher Education* (October 2000, #00-2f).

*Great Expectations: How Illinois Residents View Higher Education* (October 2000, #00-2h).

***State Spending for Higher Education in the Next Decade: The Battle to Sustain Current Support***, by Harold A. Hovey (July 1999, #99-3). This fiscal forecast of state and local spending patterns finds that the vast majority of states will face significant fiscal deficits over the next eight years, which will in turn lead to increased scrutiny of higher education in almost all states, and to curtailed spending for public higher education in many states.

***South Dakota: Developing Policy-Driven Change in Higher Education***, by Mario Martinez (June 1999, #99-2). This report describes the processes for change in higher education that government, business, and higher education leaders are creating and implementing in South Dakota.

***Taking Responsibility: Leaders' Expectations of Higher Education***, by John Immerwahr (January 1999, #99-1). This paper reports the views of those most involved with decision-making about higher education, based on focus groups and a survey conducted by Public Agenda.

***The Challenges and Opportunities Facing Higher Education: An Agenda for Policy Research***, by Dennis Jones, Peter Ewell, and Aims McGuinness (December 1998, #98-8). This report argues that due to substantial changes in the landscape of postsecondary education, new state-level policy frameworks must be developed and implemented.

***Higher Education Governance: Balancing Institutional and Market Influences***, by Richard C. Richardson, Jr., Kathy Reeves Bracco, Patrick M. Callan, and Joni E. Finney (November 1998, #98-7). This publication describes the structural relationships that affect institutional effectiveness in higher education, and argues that state policy should strive for a balance between institutional and market forces.

***Federal Tuition Tax Credits and State Higher Education Policy: A Guide for State Policy Makers***, by Kristin D. Conklin (December 1998, #98-6). This report examines the implications of the federal income tax provisions for students and their families, and makes recommendations for state higher education policy.

***The Challenges Facing California Higher Education: A Memorandum to the Next Governor of California***, by David W. Breneman (September 1998, #98-5). This memorandum argues that California should develop a new Master Plan for Higher Education.

***Tidal Wave II Revisited: A Review of Earlier Enrollment Projections for California Higher Education***, by Gerald C. Hayward, David W. Breneman, and Leobardo F. Estrada (September 1998, #98-4). This review finds that earlier forecasts of a surge in higher education enrollments were accurate.

***Organizing for Learning: The View from the Governor's Office***, by James B. Hunt Jr., chair of the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, and former governor of North Carolina (June 1998, #98-3). This publication is an address to the American Association for Higher Education concerning opportunity in higher education.

***The Price of Admission: The Growing Importance of Higher Education***, by John Immerwahr (Spring 1998, #98-2). This report is a national survey of Americans' views on higher education, conducted and reported by Public Agenda.

***Concept Paper: A National Center to Address Higher Education Policy***, by Patrick M. Callan (March 1998, #98-1). This concept paper describes the purposes of the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education.

[www.highereducation.org](http://www.highereducation.org)