



Higher Education Coordinating Commission
Student Success and Institutional Collaborations Subcommittee
September 10, 2014
2:30PM-4:30PM
Capitol Building, Hearing Room F
900 Court Street, NE, Salem, OR 97301

DRAFT MINUTES

Subcommittee members in attendance: Neil Bryant, co-chair, Carmen Rubio, co-chair (by phone), Kirby Dyess, Lee Ayers, Larry Roper

Other Commissioners in attendance: Rob Fullmer, Tim Nesbitt

Staff in attendance: Ben Cannon, Endi Hartigan, Donna Lewelling

[AGENDA](#)

1.0., 2.0, Roll Call and Introductory Comments, Approval of Minutes from August 13, 2014 meeting

Co-chair Bryant called the meeting to order, and took attendance. A motion was made to approve the [Draft Minutes from the August 13, 2014 SSIC meeting](#) and the motion passed unanimously.

3.0 Presentation and Discussion: Pay It Forward final report

Commissioner Rob Fullmer, Chair of the Pay It Forward Workgroup, and Donna Lewelling, work group administrator presented on the [Pay It Forward Final Report](#). There was no change to the actual report since the prior meeting, though the extensive public testimony received on the PIF is now referenced in a link. Director Cannon added that as part of the required process the HECC is required to submit an executive summary, and Commissioner Fullmer confirmed that this summary appears accurate in his review. Donna Lewelling reviewed the PIF documents which includes the final report, the executive summary, the [memo from the PIF work group](#), the [memo from the HECC regarding their recommendations for the pilot](#) under consideration as a draft, and the [ECONorthwest analysis](#). Commissioners expressed gratitude and commendation to Commissioner Fullmer and the workgroup for their excellent work.

The subcommittee reviewed the [draft HECC memo](#) summarized by Director Cannon, which described merits and considerations that the HECC may provide to the Legislature when they consider this pilot program. The draft memo noted a key consideration is to ensure that the cost of this program does not come at the expense of expanded funding for public higher education and the funding priorities the Commission has established. Tim Nesbitt recommended that this consideration be posed as condition, as well as a condition that the state should establish a feasible structure and timeframe for the program. Further, he suggested the consideration of a state loan program should not be a condition but an item for further exploration and research, and Commissioners discussed potential other changes. Commissioners discussed the pilot program proposal, reviewed the proposal in relation to federal income based repayment options, and considered whether the pilot program could be scaled down to a lower cost. Commissioner Fullmer explained that the pilot size as proposed was designed to ensure that it serves enough students to be statistically representative as a pilot program, but there are alternative ways to approach the ramp up of funding. Commissioner Fullmer presented [a memo from the workgroup](#) specifically addressing the risk factor ECONorthwest introduced in relation to the costs of higher education shifting to student more than it anticipates, and the issue of adverse selection.

5.0 Public Comment, Pay It Forward

Chair Bryant asked that anyone interested in providing public testimony specifically related to PIF do so at this point in the agenda. John Burbank of the Economic Opportunity Institute provided public testimony in strong support of

the PIF pilot, and with constructive suggestions for the proposed HECC letter to the Legislature. His testimony is summarized in a [memorandum to the subcommittee](#). John Gibson, who advised the PIF workgroup on economic and financial analysis and modeling of the PIF Pilot program, provided [public input including written comments](#) on the purpose and benefits of the pilot and the significance of uncertainty and sensitivity analysis results.

3.1 Action Item: Subcommittee recommendation to Commission on Pay It Forward report

Commissioners further discussed the proposed HECC cover memo, Commissioner Nesbitt's recommendations and other considerations, including an alternative concept for the model financing provided by Mr. Burbank. Ben Cannon asked that members look at the voluminous public comments which represent a wide range of opinions. Chair Bryant and the subcommittee delegated to HECC staff the responsibility to bring a revised version of the memo to the full commission meeting on September 11, 2014, presenting the edits and intentions discussed. No official motion was made or action taken on the draft memo, but there was consensus to move forward with a revised version, as well as to forward the full report to the commission for review and consideration.

4.0 Presentation and Discussion: Free Community College report

The HECC contracted with NCHEMS to provide an analysis of viability of tuition-free community colleges, and this report will need to be submitted to the Legislature in September. Patrick Kelly and Dennis Jones of NCHEMS presented their Initial Findings on [Assessing the Viability of Tuition-Free Community Colleges in Oregon](#), noting that work is still in progress. Their model provides estimates of the cost of free community college tuition under various assumptions about student eligibility, student rates of participation, and durations and conditions for eligibility, with costs ranging widely from approximately \$10M to \$250M depending on variables, including conservative and aggressive sets of assumptions for student behavior. Kelly and Jones reviewed the variables and noted that the model is heuristic for analysis, not a recommendation. Commissioners discussed how the funding scenarios would impact different income brackets, and how the program would function and compare to the Oregon Opportunity Grant. Commissioner Ayers discussed the importance of looking at their decision through the equity lens, and recognized the importance of serving multi-generational middle-40 students.

4.1 Possible Action item: Subcommittee recommendation to Commission on Free Community College report

Cannon reported that the original intent was for the subcommittee to provide commentary for recommendations which would accompany the model to the Legislature in September, however, a next version of the report is needed from NCHEMS, and the HECC needs to explore their position. Nesbitt suggested the group provide a policy statement on their intentions with their strategy which should include vision for student success, the equity lens, the 40-40-20, and establishing career pathways. Commissioners also discussed that they need to further explore any unintended consequences of the program. The subcommittee took no formal action on the model.

5.0 Public Comment (continued)

There was no further public comment.

6.0 Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned.

Meeting

AGENDA

3.0 [Pay It Forward Draft Cover Memo](#)

3.0 [Pay It Forward Workgroup Memo](#)

3.0 [Pay It Forward Final Report](#)

3.0 [ECONorthwest Review of Pay It Forward Model](#)

4.0 [Assessing the Viability of Tuition-Free Community Colleges in Oregon: Initial Findings, Dennis Jones, NCHEMS](#)

5.0 Public Comment: [Memorandum from John R. Burbank, Economic Opportunity Institute](#)

5.0 Public Comment: [John Gibson written remarks](#)