

OPAS Steering Committee Meeting #18
May 16, 2007 – Capital Center and Teleconference

Attendees: Bruce Schafer (OUS/ETIC), Dick Knight (Saturday Academy/PSU), Jay Bockelman (OIT), Jo Oshiro (OUS/OPAS), Eda Davis-Butts (OSU/SMILE), Roger Rennekamp (OSU/4H), Tom Thompson (ODE), Jeff Triplett (PCC)

Summary as emailed and posted May 18, 2007

The most recent (rescheduled) meeting was May 16, 2007.

On the legislative front, forecasted tax revenue projections are up \$152 million, much of which is slated for higher education but will at least several more weeks before we know the final allocation. The detailed disposition of the ETIC allocation will be no sooner than the July 20th meeting. Jeff Triplett reported that the community colleges' allocation appears to be slightly above the Governor's budget, but still significantly below their original ask.

The workgroups' feedback on the two funding exercises will be collated and distributed. In the meantime, some of the input could be summarized as follows:

Exercise 1, "What would we do with \$1 Million of External Funding" elicited a variety of suggestions for enhancing existing programs, using existing models, and leveraging additional funds. Many of these focused directly on teachers.

Exercise 2, Criteria for an OPAS RFP: Include the reach of the project, demonstrated impact or effectiveness, and a plan or model for financial sustainability, be focused, and project goals should mesh with the workgroups' strategies.

The group's discussion of other aspects of external funding touched on

- concerns about not thinking big enough, recognizing scalability;
- properly addressing NSF Broader Impact and Outreach (also known as EPO, Education and Public Outreach) requirements; and
- the OPAS Initiative's ability to offer things other than money, notably help developing business plans, asks, and strategic management to the appropriate scale. Possible sources of external funding, which will take different strategies to tap, include foundations such as Murdoch and Ford Family, Congressional ear-marks, Perkins funds, and NSF.

The next meeting will be Tuesday, June 12, 2007 3:30 – 5:00 at the Capital Center and by teleconference.

Action Items:

- Jo
 - Collate the funding exercises worksheets and distribute

- Send out the Perkins funding summary links
 - Schoelkopf's slides (ODE) - http://opas.ous.edu/Committees/Resources/NonOPAS_Working_Papers/perkinsreauthorizationblueprint.pdf
 - Issue brief – http://opas.ous.edu/Committees/Resources/NonOPAS_Working_Papers/perkinsreauthorization072606hilites.pdf
 - ODE's Perkins update webpage - <http://www.ode.state.or.us/search/page/?id=480>
- Bruce
 - Talk to OMSI about their experience with Congressional funding
 - Contact staff of Cong. David Wu, etc.
 - Check to see if copy of PSU's proposal to NGA is available
- Tom
 - Summarize the data provided to PSU for their NGA proposal
- All – who do you know who does NSF “Broader Impact and Outreach” really well? Who can come talk to the group? How can OPAS help expand state capacity to respond to NSF opportunities with solid Broader Impact and Outreach and collaboration. – what would an infrastructure look like?

Additional Points of Information, Discussion, and Resources

The collated funding document is available at:

http://opas.ous.edu/Workgroups2007/OPAS_Funding_Analysis_All_060607.pdf.

Some specifics of ideas discussed at this meeting:

- Don – Seed money to high schools to offer pre-engineering pilot classes. The hump is the first 2 years – need that time to generate enough buzz to get enrollment. Class cost is about \$7K per year, \$14K for a lab to run not counting facilities (so can run with less than 30 kids). We have curriculum we know works from SuperQuest. Really likes teacher investment concept. Pilot has worked really well at Hillsboro High School.
- Jay – industry mentorships not just for students but with teachers. Take your teacher to work day. Education is an enclave – we lose contact with industry excitement and requirements. Let teachers see how the knowledge is applied.
- Bruce: High merit. Worries about what BEC has discovered over the years – small number of teachers (~24 a year)
- Don: In the last 15 years we have lost all of our sabbatical programs. Temp out sabbatical teachers for a year. Get it as a self-sustaining self-funding program. \$100,000 would seed that.

How should we work on external funding? Steering Committee as a whole? Push it down to the workgroups? Create a taskforce?

- Foundation funding:
 - Dick: Don't think too small, that makes too many things to do at the end of the day and not enough to show for it. Thinking in terms of \$1 to \$5 million programs, not \$10 thousand programs. Very carefully and strategically use the funds we have under our control to prove concepts and then use that proof and

funds to leverage major funds. Programs that are extendible across the state – aim at 20%-50+% of the population. Force ourselves to think big enough so that a win is really really big. ORTOP is an example.

- From the discussion at the June 15 Prepare meeting with Tim Brower, Associate Director for PLTW in Oregon, we do have things we can offer other than money – we can help strategically manage things to the right scale.
- How do we recognize scalability when we see it? What do we consider a pilot, a prototype, a first scale-up?
- Don: It took those targeted small victories for ORTOP to get there.
- Federal funding:
 - Dick argues that we really need to start with a good idea.
 - Congressional earmarks:
 - Dick: The ask and program need to be fairly large to interest the congressional delegation.
 - David Wu was in Don Domes' classroom last spring, because of Perkins funds. SB 589 – find out more. Other states fund CTE classes at a higher rate than classroom classes.
 - OMSI has a connection to the Congressional budget, probably through Smith – they got NASA earmarks (for JASON). We can ask – how did that happen? How did you proceed?
 - Dick: No harm in a get acquainted session with Wyden, Wu, and maybe even Smith. There is some evidence Smith is interested some of these issues.
 - Perkins: Consider for future Agenda – What's the latest on the Perkins re-authorization. OPAS could issue a white paper on what we would like to see the Perkins money in Oregon spent on. Much of Perkins spending is under local control.
- Oregon Legislative Earmark: need to start working this summer on an Oregon legislative earmark for next January's budget negotiations.
 - Dick: Tom, is there something we can do collaboratively with ODE to prepare for the next legislative session to be more of a part of the solution.
 - Tom: ODE is severely limited in the agendas that they can push.
 - Don: Look to Ron Dexter at Sabin Center and Concordia University for advice. Don took his class on working with the legislature.
- Evidence and Evaluation
 - Roger: What is the role of OPAS in promoting programs and best practices that are evidenced based? Foundations and Congress don't always promote what is evidence-based. OPAS needs to endorse, push, put forward things and programs that we know work and can demonstrate with evidence.
 - Dick: We can target some things where there is evidence that it works. We have an opportunity here because of the environment of many programs that can't demonstrate that they make a measurable difference. We use our funds for proof of concept, then leverage into more sustainable things
 - Bruce: Evaluation is expensive.
 - Don: Expand existing programs.

- Leveraging Collaboration
 - Eda: it's important to have the collaboration for K-16 between with OPAS and ODE and university faculty around STEM in the state of Oregon.
 - Matching funds – Should OPAS leverage its funds by some matching formula that requires requestors to already have, or have solid plans to acquire additional funds from other sources?
 - Dick: The problem with that version of matching is that the timing doesn't work out very well. A different version is we look for the scale-up of a proven program but we give the money conditional on the grantee finding additional money – give your grantee a lever to pull money out of the foundations, school districts. Somebody has to ante up first.
 - Eda: Her concern is that to be highly competitive for NSF funding, we need to do a better job of looking at the Broader Impact and Outreach section of the grants, which may need as much effort as the research. She did some workshops on campus last year, but it doesn't seem to have gone anywhere. Need multi-institution collaborations in ongoing conversations to be ready to respond to these RFPs with quality proposals that are grounded in ongoing partnerships with a track record. “Communicating Research to Public Audiences” is over and above the Broader Impact and Outreach funding. We need to think about the role of OPAS in growing the state capacity to respond to these opportunities. No one place at OSU where researchers can go to get help on planning the Broader Impact and Outreach section of their grants. It went to the Research office and no outcome has yet been evident. We need an infrastructure to support faculty to in responding to the broader impact and outreach. She sees the need and is not sure how to address it. We need to brainstorm some ideas. NASA at one point had groups they called something like education and public outreach brokers. EPO broker/facilitators help minimize the time it takes for a researcher to identify appropriate partner organization.
 - Dick: Can somebody identify somebody who does this really well – can we fly in an expert? How do you affect change in a university?
 - Tom: I can see this as the first step for developing that infrastructure statewide – ODE, PSU, OSU, CCs.
 - Bruce: This is analogous to the grant-writing support group that OHSU set up several years back, except that we're talking about helping researchers with the community and K12 outreach part of their proposals.
 - Roger: Research departments do not often have the infrastructure to do Broader Impact and Outreach.

Next meeting Tuesday, June 12 3:30 – 5:00.