

MEETING #426
OREGON STUDENT ACCESS COMMISSION
Friday, February 22, 2013
Oregon Student Access Commission
Columbia Room
Eugene, OR

COMMISSIONERS

Glenda Melton
Gary Weeks (Phone)
Nagini Reddy (Phone)
Shawn Fincher
Mike Holland
Bart Howard

STAFF

Cheryl Gallagher, Research Staff
Lora Carson, Budget & Finance Manager
Joyce Berman, Donor Development
Brandon Fox, IT Staff
Thomas Ridder, IT Staff
Vic Nunenkamp, Interim Chief Operating Officer
Lacie Morgan, Scholarship Technical Specialist
Bob Brew, Interim Executive Director

GUESTS

Brent Wilder, OAICU
Belle Cantor, OCF
Bill McGee, DAS Budget and Management Office

CALL TO ORDER

Commission Vice-Chair Glenda Melton called the meeting to order at 9:30 am. Having a quorum present, the meeting proceeded.

CHAIR'S/COMMISSIONER'S REPORT

Chair Weeks had nothing to report. Other commissioners did not have anything to report as well.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Chair Week moved to approve meeting minutes from November 30, 2012, Commission Meeting #424. Commissioner Howard seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. Commissioner Howard moved to approve meeting minutes from January 11, 2013, Commission Meeting #425. Commissioner Holland seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

SCHOLARSHIP APPLICATION DEMONSTRATION

Lacie Morgan, Scholarship Technical Specialist, presented a live demonstration of the new scholarship application. Commissioner Holland asked if there is a verification process for the high school GPA or test scores. Cheryl Gallagher reported that there is not a verification process in house; the burden is put on the selection committees to verify this information. Commissioner Howard asked if students are able to visit the application and determine their scholarship matches before writing their essays and other supplements. Ms. Morgan responded that the idea of the new application was to first determine if the student is eligible for any of the scholarships that OSAC offers. If not, they don't have to spend time writing essays or preparing activity charts that will not be utilized.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Bob Brew, Interim Executive Director, reported that it had been an extremely long, extremely trying effort to get from where the application was last year to the application just presented. Mr. Brew reported that in addition to the public-facing part of the application, there is SAM (Scholarship

Application Manager) and the on-line portal that high schools use to upload transcripts from students, and the donor portal that partners use to view the application status for students applying for their scholarships and see other specific information related to their applicants. Other than the application, there are two other large processes that occur behind the scenes. The first involves matching high school and college transcripts to the appropriate students, which is very labor-intensive process that involves many work study students from the U of O. The second big behind-the-scenes effort is known as the query process, where applicants are sorted into the scholarships for which they qualify, links are made to financial need data as appropriate, and the list of eligible applicants is winnowed down to a workable number based on qualifications.

Mr. Brew reported that this background is provided so the commissioners can understand the scope and level of effort that has gone into developing the application thus far, and the work that is still going on to identify qualified applicants and to deliver award money to them. Brandon Fox and Jordi Humphreys were the developers on the application, and not enough can be said about them. The number of hours they have worked on the application is mind-boggling; to use an old analogy, they have been building the airplane while they are flying it. Brandon provided some historical perspective and familiarity with the old system, while Jordi brought cutting-edge knowledge and experience that provides, between the two of them, the backbone to the new system.

Cheryl Gallagher was instrumental in developing the test schema for each scholarship that allows the program to qualify or disqualify each student for each scholarship fund. Once it came time to write tests for each scholarship, she was assisted by Lacie Morgan, Holly Willeford, and Tina Wilson. Once the application went live, Cheryl Connolly and Lacie Morgan handled the bulk of the higher-level customer support, backed up by Dale Ludwig and Bridgett Morris – our two JOBS Plus employees. The application had a late and rocky start, and those four suffered a variety of insults, complaints, and exasperation from students, parents, teachers, and counselors, with outstanding customer service. As we've moved into the transcript review process, Cheryl Connolly is managing our work study crew, and Tina Wilson has moved in behind her seamlessly to take on customer service duty.

Although it wasn't always pleasant to listen to, the feedback we received from students, parents, teachers, and counselors was very valuable and provided excellent direction for improving the functionality and reliability of the application. We would be remiss in not thanking all those users in absentia. In addition, our partners at The Ford Family Foundation have provided ongoing feedback and input into the application's development, and we're extremely grateful for their assistance. Thomas Ridder had a full plate since the inception of the application's development. Our total IT section only has 3.5 FTE, and with two of them dedicated more than full-time to the scholarship application for the last seven months, Thomas had to step in to virtually every other IT-related task, whether that involved moving PCs, researching vendors, downloading Opportunity Grant information, coordinating our temporary IT staff, or working in our old database. In spite of that workload, he agreed to take on more work and become the scholarship application coordinator, to keep our large team in sync and to be the keeper of assignments and minutes. As strange as it may sound, he also played the role of translator between the technical and non-technical sides of our team. We would literally be lost without him. Aaron Meyers also has done great work, setting up the new dedicated server at the University of Oregon, and keeping our network connections up and humming.

Lastly, Mr. Brew acknowledged the rest of the OSAC staff, stating, "We are not a large organization, and taking on a project as large as the scholarship application with so many people involved has meant that others have had to step up and take on new assignments or exercise patience when waiting for IT

support or management attention to non-scholarship related activities. This project will truly be a combined effort, including the contributions from every single OSAC employee – either directly or indirectly. A year down the road we will look back on this endeavor and be very proud of the way we pulled together to build and support this application and our students. We all have much to be proud of.”

Mr. Brew noted that this is the good news, but it is far from the complete story. In the interest of full disclosure, the commissioners need to know the complete story. Across the state, we have donors, students, counselors, parents and teachers who are very angry and for good reason. We have consistently missed our target dates; we have only recently had a system that worked reliably; we are still fighting bugs and struggling to find a way to accommodate students during our peak periods of activity, and there are still components of the system that have yet to be created. These shortcomings are not for lack of trying, however. As managers, he and Vic have thrown every available resource possible at this application. We have purchased equipment, redeployed staff resources, authorized virtually unlimited overtime, and contracted with outside service providers. Essentially, any request made that could potentially help this project move forward was approved by management; we just came onto the problem too late to make up for the ground that was lost.

Mr. Brew stated that in order to understand fully where we are we have to understand how we got here. When he arrived at OSAC in June, OSAC management was fully committed to this project. For those that were around in 2011, they may remember that late in the year our internal auditors determined there were serious problems with our old scholarship application system. The conventional wisdom at that time was that the problems were so ingrained and so serious, that the current system had to be abandoned. In talking with staff at that time, a decision had been made by management to move forward on a new scholarship application, although there was serious disagreement among the IT staff as to whether such a system could be developed in-house. Staff explored some off-the-shelf financial aid management systems that had a scholarship component, but none were capable of doing what we needed. Bob stated that, to the best of his knowledge, we didn't explore the option of hiring an outside firm to develop the system for us or to evaluate our capabilities to develop a system. We had previously hired a firm called Incight to design the “look and feel” of the new application and rolled it out in the 2011 season. We announced that this would be the new “look and feel” of the new application for 2012. Given that we had to extend deadlines in the 2011 scholarship season, we used the opportunity of a captive audience to heavily market that a new web-based scholarship system would be available for 2012.

Mr. Brew reported that in reviewing the Commission meeting minutes for the end of 2011 and the months of 2012 before he arrived, OSAC was very optimistic about the new application. At several points, we indicated we were on schedule or ahead of schedule. Bob stated that in retrospect, staff was clearly overly optimistic, and several things happened in 2012 to push the project off the rails. Don Charlton, Bob's predecessor in the financial realm, left the agency in February. He supervised IT, and had a significant role in keeping the scholarship application moving forward. In May, Sue Strauslin, our lead IT developer and creator of the OSAC database left the agency. This left OSAC adrift without an IT staff supervisor or an IT team lead. OSAC had also prepared a contract with a computer systems architect to help us design the new layout, but it got hung up in the state procurement process and by the time the contract was approved some three months later, we had apparently already passed the stage of work where that assistance would have been useful. Brandon Fox had been the lead developer on the new application. With Sue's departure, he applied for her old Information Systems Specialist 5 position and was the successful candidate. Mr. Brew reiterated that he began at OSAC in the middle of June.

Brandon's hiring took place during his second week on the job and officially took his new role on July 1st; we interviewed for his replacement on July 31st.

Following the departure of Don and Sue from the agency, Brandon was pulled off the scholarship project to do many IT tasks unrelated to the new application. In early August, Vic and Bob met with Josette and prevailed on her to dedicate Brandon one hundred percent to the new application. We communicated this to staff and set Brandon in a secluded office. Jordi joined the organization in late August, and has been toiling with Brandon on the application ever since – sometimes 80 hours a week or more.

Mr. Brew stated that, in his unvarnished, professional opinion, we have been playing catch-up with this application from the very beginning. We didn't have a clear idea what we were getting into when we started down this path; we didn't have a clear project plan in mind; we didn't have a trained project manager on this project for far too long, and we got badly off course. In terms of development, he thinks we are now where we should have been six or eight months ago – maybe even a year ago. He stated we are all doing our very best with the hand we were dealt, but the reality is that, as an agency, we were overly optimistic and possibly overly trusting, and the more realistic voices in the agency were shut down early in the development process. Bob stated due diligence was not completed as an agency, but he does not believe this project suffered from bad management, as much as it suffered from lack of management.

Mr. Brew reported by the time he and Vic were fully able to oversee the project, the option to resurrect the old application had been shut, both in terms of timing and security. The agency could not delay the roll-out of the new application because donors and school partners were basing their calendars around the agency. They were adamant we stick to our original timeline – particularly given our performance the year before.

Mr. Brew stated that we really had no choice but to move the project forward regardless of how rocky the road had become. The quality of the product demonstrated earlier is testament to the good work staff have done with minimum resources, and he truly believes that the application our customers see next year will be quick, seamless, and robust. In the meantime, we have to get through this year. Without making excuses, we tried to communicate the actual state of the application at each stage in the process, as we understood it. Even given our best efforts at communication, we now have a lot of frustrated students, parents, teachers, counselors, and donors. He and Vic take responsibility for that, and it will be up to them to rebuild those relationships over the next year and to prove our value once again. He said the product we have to offer is good – the underlying product, which is our collection of 450 scholarships. What is not working well right now is the delivery mechanism for the product – the application itself. That will come together, in time. Mr. Brew reported that they are concerned that the number of applications is down, but the numbers are coming up: last week we were at about 10% of our 2011-12 numbers; yesterday we had pulled up to about 57% of last year's numbers. Mr. Brew stated that this is reason for optimism, but he honestly does not expect our numbers this year to equal last year's; we simply got too late a start, and we'll never get enough students through the pipeline by March 1 to equal last year's numbers. By next year, he is confident we'll be back up again to where we were last year and more.

Mr. Brew stated he has more to discuss in his presentation besides the scholarship application, but paused to answer any questions before moving on to other topics.

Commissioner Holland stated he appreciates Bob's candor in acknowledging that the scholarship application development process fell short, that we are disappointed and intend to do better, and that from at least one commissioner's perspective, he could not say enough good things about Bob's willingness to accept responsibility for it. Commissioner Holland asked if, with the numbers being lower than last year's, are there any alternatives to explore that might largely improve the numbers? Perhaps extending timelines, or allowing paper applications in this digital age? Are there things we can do at this late stage to rescue some parts of this process.

Mr. Brew described options that had been explored, such as extending the deadline. However, input from donor partners is that they have extensive processes that depend on our deadlines and they are hesitant to extend deadlines even if it means lower application numbers. The early bird deadline was extended by three days, due to the system capacity issues. However, there is a concern in our ability to communicate deadline extensions early enough so that students can actually take advantage of them, as many rely on school equipment to complete the application process. There have been some changes made on some servers to move portals to another server to free up the application server and allow more users to complete the process.

Commissioner Melton asked if the additional server will be enough. Mr. Brew stated he thinks there will still be students who will procrastinate. We will get a flood of students on that last day, and some will get the message that maximum occupancy has been reached; they won't be able to get in by the deadline because they waited until the last minute. He thinks the system is running well and when students are getting on they are having a great experience, but we will lose those students who are in a hurry and waited until the last minute.

Commissioner Holland commented about the responsibility to our donors. In terms of who he would rather inconvenience, he would rather work with and inconvenience donors on the back end of the process for this one year. Our primary responsibility is to provide access to students and not provide a convenience to donors. Can we ask them to extend their process by two weeks to make this happen?

Mr. Brew stated he is not sure what it will buy us to do that; there are times right now when there is nobody using it. But if you wait until the last minute, it will be crowded. If you push the deadline out two weeks, the last minute activity happens two weeks later. Applicants will wait, and he is not sure extending the deadline would buy us a significant number of additional applicants.

Commissioner Howard stated he shares his concern the about inconvenience to the donors; he knows they have literally more than 100 reviewers lined up who all have schedules themselves. He believes it would be hard to get in touch with all of them to change the schedule and have the same quality in their selection process. It still might be worth asking the question, however. Mr. Brew stated that he will ask the question again, and we could use the extra time to build the query process.

Commissioner Howard suggested that we send texts rather than emails; perhaps we will get more responses. Mr. Brew described robust communications tools used and is confident we can get the message out and he will be glad to talk to the donors.

Commissioner Melton expressed concern about the early bird deadline extension. Mr. Brew replied that the final deadline is March 1 at 5:00 p.m. We could extend with no harm to Sunday March 3 at 5:00pm; the downside is that we would have to pay folks overtime to be here and watch the system, but it would

not impact donor processes at all. This wouldn't necessarily buy time for students who rely on their school's equipment to complete the process; if we extend a full week that would make a difference.

Commissioner Howard stated that it sounds like there were two main reasons why we wanted to upgrade the application: it's a much more friendly system and we had external auditors say there are some security risks with the old system. In addition, along with the fact that the person who built and could deal with the existing database left the agency.

Mr. Brew confirmed that it was critical. He has discussed this with Vic that if he knew then what he knows now, he would have done things differently. But, given what he knew at the time, he would make the same decisions again. Only caveat he would add is that he would make a plan B. They were without a net and didn't have a contingency plan. He didn't think realistically there was any way to resurrect the old application, make it safe and roll it out. He didn't have the technical expertise to tell him one way or the other. If he had to do it again, the lesson learned is have a backup plan, a contingency plan.

Commissioner Howard commented in saying that the best policy is to acknowledge it. He recounted times past when changing data systems and assured Bob and staff there will be other years and life will go on. Please let the commission know when you need help. He commented that after looking at today's demonstration, this could turn out to be quite nice in another year.

Lacie Morgan commented that being immersed in customer service, she had heard a lot of complimentary comments and feedback from those who were able to get into the system. . Lacie has suggested development of training videos this summer and podcasts that can be used to walk students and teachers through the application in a matter of 10 minutes.

Commissioner Holland asked if it's easy to send emails and tweets to applicants, have we specifically suggested times that they could go into the system to better their chances or alerted them to more challenging times of use? Mr. Brew confirmed this has been done, and students have been warned not to wait until the last minute.

There was discussion about application numbers and concerns for the agency and our partners. Mr. Brew commented that anytime there is change to a stable process, there's a dip in productivity and then it comes back up. That's what we will see here.

Commissioner Holland stated that even with the lower number of applicants, he assumes there will not be dollars unspent. Mr. Brew confirmed that there are a handful of scholarships that don't have applicants, but these are the same scholarships that have not had qualified applicants in past years due to restrictive eligibility requirements .

Commissioner Howard asked if the work study students are required to sign confidentiality statements. Mr. Brew replied yes; this is not a new process, and they have been doing this for years.

Chair Weeks stated he appreciates the fact that OSAC has stepped up and admitted serious problems and we own them. That's really important for us to do and keeps people with us who would not if we did otherwise. He stated we are not the first agency to be overly optimistic about the implementation of an IT project. He said he hopes that OSAC has really learned here and when we have a huge system to install down the road, such as the grants management system. That will be a huge process and this was a painful lesson in optimism; we don't want to repeat this mistake when we build the new grants system.

Let's make sure we give ourselves enough time and have planned well. The last thing is we have a long history of running private scholarship programs. It's a history of confidence and good management; we have a stand on that of 40 years of history to get us through this time with our scholarship donors. We've taken responsibility for our mistakes and will move forward and learn from it. We have a good strong history, and we've delivered year after year and need our donors to look back on that and stick with us. The agency has done a good job of building this program from nothing. He is hopeful they will remember that and we will just move forward. He thanked Bob and staff for all the effort put into it. He believes once it's up and running it will be a good example across the country of how to run a privately funded scholarship program. He thanked all for their work.

Mr. Brew thanked the commission and reported on a recent conference call regarding college access, where we were asked to present on our scholarship application because it's unique that we were able to offer 450 funds in a single application. Mr. Brew also stated we have in the budget, a request to contract for professional help to define our needs for the grants system before embarking on upgrading and/or replacing the current grants system.

Belle Cantor, Program Staff at Oregon Community Foundation, reported that OSAC staff has been very open and honest about what's going on; she appreciates that they have not been sugar coating.

Mr. Brew stated the last time they came together as a group, the Legislature was just about ready to go into session. Reforming the educational system and structure in Oregon has been one of the governor's top priorities, and those efforts are going forward in earnest. Mr. Brew made one brief presentation before the House Committee on Higher Education and Workforce Development. Thanks to the staff at OSAC, he was well prepared and OSAC came off well.

Last week Representative Dembrow and Senator Hass released the skeleton of a bill, also known as a "legislative concept," that deals with the creation of the Department of Post-Secondary Education and Workforce Development. Mr. Brew provided the first couple of pages, noting that the bill is several hundred pages long and directs the makeup of the new agency. From OSAC's perspective, there really weren't many surprises in this bill – it was pretty much exactly what we'd been told to expect. One item of interest to the Commission is that the new agency (including current OSAC staff) is under the direction of the 15-member Higher Education Coordinating Commission (or HECC), but the OSAC commission still exists in the bill as an advisory committee to the HECC on higher education financial aid issues. OSAC staff is currently working through the bill to identify outdated statutes or other mistakes that could be corrected. Nothing of significance has been found so far, and he would be glad to email the entire document for those that have not seen it already.

Commissioner Holland asked about the proposed advisory board for the new agency. Mr. Brew answered he will review the exact language as it pertains to the Opportunity Grant and get back to them. Mr. Brew commented that Bill McGee may have insight on this. Mr. McGee reported that this is a bill to create the DPSEWD agency; there will be separate legislation to address the boards and commissions associated with these agencies.

In the new agency, OSAC staff will merge with staff from the Department of Community Colleges and Workforce Development, the Office of Degree Authorization, the Office of Private Career Schools, and portions of the Oregon University System's Chancellor's Office. All told, the proposed entity will have slightly less than 100 FTE, with OSAC making up about a quarter of the total. OSAC has met with CCWD staff and management to begin planning what a new agency would look like. Staff has been kept

informed as we move forward. Krissa Caldwell, the Deputy Director of CCWD, and some of CCWD IT staff, have met with OSAC staff. Lora Carson has also worked closely with CCWD staff on a combined budget document. We know that the new agency is just a proposal at this time, but if it does go forward, it is critical that both agencies are well prepared for the change and are controlling their shared destiny.

Speaking of the Legislature, Dr. Rudy Crew will present his educational overview to the Ways and Means Committee beginning on Monday February 25. He anticipates about four days of testimony. Mr. Brew reported that he will be in the hearing room for Dr. Crew's testimony, as will all the other heads of education agencies. Once Dr. Crew is done, each agency will present their budget. OSAC is scheduled to appear either on March 18th and 19th or March 19th and 20th. Our March Commission meeting is scheduled for March 20th, so there might be a little juggling of the agenda involved.

Mr. Brew commented that, as commissioners probably remember from the last time they met, OSAC had been getting direction to re-think the way we award the Oregon Opportunity Grant funds. Dr. Crew, asked him to take a critical look at the way we award the Opportunity Grant and to develop some alternate proposals. After his last presentation to the Commission, he shared the current status of our work with Ben Cannon, Dr. Crew and others. Now the Governor's budget document indicates that the new post-secondary department and its board will be charged with designing outcome-based funding formulas for the colleges and universities that incorporate the Opportunity Grant and institutional aid. Mr. Brew said he knows that the community colleges and universities are working on their funding formulas based on outcomes, but thus far, OSAC and the Opportunity Grant haven't been part of that discussion. Those of who have been around awhile may remember the Access & Affordability Working Group that met from roughly 2004 through 2007. It was made up of professional educators, representatives from community foundations and industry, and other stakeholders in the success of Oregon's students. The primary output of this group was the Shared Responsibility Model that restructured the way the Oregon Opportunity Grant had been awarded. Dr. Crew has asked the Chancellors Office of the Oregon University System to reconstitute the Access and Affordability Working Group. It is not yet known what role OSAC will play in this work, but certainly nothing will happen before the end of the Legislative session – particularly given the change at the top in the Chancellor's Office. Bob stated he does not anticipate any change to the current methodology for at least a couple years and will keep the Commission informed as we learn more. Mr. Brew has been given direction to just keep doing what we're doing.

Chair Weeks asked if we had received direction not to move forward to fast with the redesign of the Oregon Opportunity Grant because the proposed legislature changes the authority to a different advisory board. Mr. McGee reported that due to the Governor's Budget looks at outcome based budgeting for the OOG and therefore we need to see how the legislative session turns out. Chair Weeks would like the record to reflect that OSAC does not have any responsibility and will not act on any recommendations for the restructuring of the Oregon Opportunity Grant.

Mr. Brew provided a summary of the bills currently being tracked by OSAC. These bills were included as a handout in the meeting packet. Mr. Brew expressed a big thanks to Susan Degen for tracking these bills and putting together the summary. Mr. Brew briefly described the Priority 1 bills.

Mr. Brew asked Lora Carson to provide the current financial status update that was provided as a handout in the meeting packet. Ms. Carson described the current financial status of the agency and stated that OSAC is right where it should be with disbursements and administration fees. OSAC is well set for waiting out the next four months. We are on course; it will be tight, but we will make it through. Mr.

Brew pointed out special payments/General Fund at 82.73% and explained that includes the fall disbursement of OOG; this is where we expect to be.

Chair Weeks asked about the status of the recommendation to award additional Oregon Opportunity Grants due having additional money; has that been done? Mr. Brew stated those additional awards have happened or are happening. He expects to end the biennium with \$500,000 - \$1 million left over; this is a comfortable margin but not such that we are underserving our students.

Chair Weeks asked if a cost estimate to draft the opinion from the AG's office had been completed on drafting a decision about race and ethnicity– based awards had been received? Mr. Brew answered that it had fallen off his radar; he asked for it but never received it. He will follow up on this.

SCHOLARSHIP AND ACCESS PROGRAMS

Vic Nunenkamp, Interim Chief Operating Officer, reported that last week she participated on a conference call with George Erickcek, the researcher hired to lay out the costs for the **Oregon Promise** – a proposed statewide scholarship program specific for Oregon that has a similar program structure as the existing Kalamazoo Promise. This program would be available to all Oregon K-12 students who have lived in the state continuously during the final four years of their secondary education, regardless of whether they attended public or private schools or were home schooled. The scholarship could be used at any accredited public or private postsecondary college or university in the state with a tuition cap equal to the highest public university tuition, which is currently the University of Oregon. Mr. Erickcek will present his final report next week. Once received, the next steps will be discussed with our partners, Oregon Community Foundation and Oregon University System, who funded this research.

Ms. Nunenkamp reported that the Scholarship team participated in a nation-wide conference call with the **College Access Affinity Group**, which is led by Greg Darnieder, Senior Advisor to the Secretary of the US Department of Education. We were invited to share the OSAC Scholarship Application in a special presentation. Lacie Morgan created the PowerPoint and made the presentation. Mr. Darnieder complimented OSAC on doing something he could never do in his educational career and, to his knowledge, no other state is doing, which is to have one application for 450 scholarship funds.

Ms. Nunenkamp reported that donors are beginning to provide OSAC with their stories and logos, which will be used in the application and the website. Also Sherrill Kirchchoff, Bart Howard, Dave Mesirov, and Joyce Berman are working to more clearly define the Oregon Spirit Scholarship eligibility criteria and the options for garnering funds to support the scholarship. Ms. Nunenkamp reported that, as of this meeting, five new scholarship funds are pending.

Ms. Nunenkamp reported that ASPIRE is meeting with Doris Mcewen of the OEIB and Krissa Caldwell, our new partners at CCWD, to share about ASPIRE, its current status, and the anticipated expansion for the 2013–2015 biennium and all that such an expansion will require. ASPIRE staff continues to work on supporting the existing 145 sites, while at the same time planning for the 2013–15 biennium, which, according to the Governor's budget, expands ASPIRE to 295 sites throughout Oregon. Needless to say, we have to rethink how we do the business of ASPIRE to meet these goals knowing that we have only two additional staff in the budget to accomplish the task.

Ms. Nunenkamp reported that OSAC continues to work with **Lane County's Path to 40-40-20**. OSAC been asked to summarize the efforts to date and share with Hilda Rosselli of the OEIB as they are looking to spotlight projects and are considering our efforts for that spotlight. OSAC continues to

partner with **Oregon's 529 College Savings Plan** to do financial aid seminars throughout the State. Lori Ellis is in Portland today to film marketing pieces that celebrate ASPIRE and the 529 Plan. Yesterday, Lori attended the Youth Transition Conference in Hood River as a keynote speaker. OSAC and specifically Lori are making connections that are exciting and offer great potential.

OREGON OPPORTUNITY GRANT UPDATE

Bob Brew provided the OOG update on behalf of Susan Degen, Oregon Opportunity Grant Administrator, and provided her report entitled OOG Update for February 2013. Mr. Brew provided an overview of highlights of the report regarding overrides and/or additional awards previously approved. Mr. Brew reported that the total numbers are final, but the amount processed for all the groups as directed is around \$4 million.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Brent Wilder, OAICU reported that they have preliminary research on return on investment with regard to Oregon Opportunity Grant and he would love to share this information once it is complete. Discussion followed and it was agreed this could be shared in future meetings.

Bob expressed appreciation of the alliance on getting these numbers together. He shared recent data from Oregon State on graduation rates for OOG students.

OTHER BUSINESS AND ADJOURNMENT

Vice Chair Melton called for other business to come before the commission at this time. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:35am

Respectfully submitted,

Approved by Commission at Meeting 429 - April 26, 2013

Gary Weeks, Chair