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A regular meeting of the State Board of Higher Education was held in Room 338, Smith Center, Portland State University, Portland, Oregon.

ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 3:50 p.m., January 20, 1989, by the President of the Board, Mr. Richard F. Hensley, and on roll call the following answered present:

Mr. Robert R. Adams  Mr. Mark S. Dodson
Mr. John W. Alltucker  Mr. Rob Miller
Mr. Bob Bailey  Ms. Janice J. Wilson
Mr. Tom Bruggere  Mr. Richard F. Hensley

Absent: Director Brooks was absent due to illness. Directors Johnston and Richardson were present for most of the committee discussion, but had to leave prior to the Board meeting.

OTHERS PRESENT

Centralized Activities—Chancellor W. T. Lemman; Secretary Wilma Foster; W. C. Neland, Executive Vice Chancellor; Larry Pierce, Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; John Owen, Vice Chancellor, OCATE; Kay Jurin, Acting Vice Chancellor, Public Affairs; James Mattis, Assistant Attorney General; Holly Zarville, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Davis Quenzer, Associate Vice Chancellor, Fiscal Policies; R. S. Perry, Associate Vice Chancellor, Administrative and Information Systems Services; George Feinstein, Associate Vice Chancellor, Facilities Division; Steve Katz, Controller; Joe Sicotte, Associate Vice Chancellor, Personnel Administration; Roger Olsen, Assistant Vice Chancellor, OCATE; Ron Anderson, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Personnel Administration; James Payne and Gary Christensen, Assistant Vice Chancellors, Academic Affairs; Gary Esqate, Assistant to Executive Vice Chancellor; Virginia Thompson, Special Assistant to the Chancellor; Jim Sellers, Director of Communications; Jeff Smith, Associate Director, School Relations.

Oregon State University—President John Byrne; Ed Coate, Vice President, Finance and Administration; Graham Spanier, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost; Robert Barr, Dean, OSU/WOSC School of Education; Kathleen Mulligan, Assistant Vice President, Finance and Administration; Beverly Herzog, Chair, Special Education; Gary Tiedeman, President, Faculty Senate.
University of Oregon—President Paul Olum; Norman Wessells, Vice President and Provost; Larry Large, Vice President, Development; Dan Williams, Vice President, Administration; Robert Gilberts, Dean, College of Education; Judith K. Groenick, Associate Dean, College of Education.

Oregon Health Sciences University—David Witter, Vice President for Administration; Ralph Tuomi, Assistant Vice President, Facilities Management; Mary McFarland, Associate Dean, Undergraduate Studies.

Portland State University—R. N. Edgington, Interim President; Frank Martino, Provost; Gary Powell, Acting Vice President, Finance and Administration; Robert Everhart, Dean, School of Education; David Krug, Department Chairman, Special Education; Nancy Tang, Ulrich Hardt, Linda Parshall, representatives of Interinstitutional Faculty Senate.

Eastern Oregon State College—President David Gilbert; James Lundy, Dean of Administration; James Hottois, Dean of Academic Affairs; Jack Schut, Director, College Relations.

Oregon Institute of Technology—John Smith, Dean of Administration; Chris Eismann, Dean of Academic Affairs.

Southern Oregon State College—President J. W. Cox; Ronald Bolstad, Dean of Administration; Stephen Reno, Dean of Academic Affairs; Gary Prickett, Dean, Development and College Relations; Jim McFarland, Associate Dean, Academic Affairs; Bob McCoy, President, Association of Oregon Faculties; Susan Roper, Director, School of Education.

Western Oregon State College—Bill Neifert, Dean of Administration; Bill Cowart, Provost.

Others—Thomas A. Bartlett, Chancellor-designate; Elizabeth Johnson, Commissioner, Teacher Standards and Practices Commission; Sister Kathryn Hallmann, President and CEO, St. Charles Medical Center, Bend; Susan Shepard, Research Assistant, Oregon Student Lobby; Frederick H. Boyle, President, Central Oregon Community College, Bend; Louis B. Queary, Vice President for Instruction, COCC, Bend; Philip D. Aines, Chairman, Central Oregon Council on Higher Education; Viviane Simon-Brown, Director, Four-Year Articulation, COCC, Bend; Gayle Gilbert, Assistant Administrator, Sacred Heart General Hospital, Eugene; Cretia Bolenken, Associate Executive Director, Valley Community Hospital, Dallas; Doris Bowman, Member, Board of Directors, Oregon Education Association; Roger Bassett, Director, Office of Educational Policy and Planning; Minet Nettleton, Vice President, The Common Fund.
MINUTES
APPROVED

The Board dispensed with the reading of the minutes of the last
regular meeting held on December 9, 1988, and approved them as
previously distributed. The following voted in favor: Direc-
tors Adams, Alltucker, Bailey, Bruggere, Dodson, Miller, Wilson,
and Hensley. Those voting no: None.

Welcome to
T. A. Bartlett,
Chancellor-
Designate

Mr. Hensley introduced Chancellor-Designate Thomas A. Bartlett
and welcomed him to his first Board meeting. He invited him to
address the Board.

Dr. Bartlett said it was very exciting to return to Oregon to
work because he had the strongest personal attachment to the
state in which he grew up. On the professional level, he said
Oregon appeared to be entering a period of remarkable oppor-
tunity in higher education, although it could also be a period of
considerable threat. Patterns seem to be changing and opening as
a result of several factors. There is a sense of urgency about
working together and changing some of the ways in which things
are done in Oregon. New opportunities are appearing from the
state's position in the Pacific Rim. All of these factors em-
phasize the importance of educational development, human de-
velopment, and the development of Oregon's citizens as its principal
resource. He said this would suggest the possibility this could
be a creative time in higher education if all parties work to-
gether and communicate with one another effectively.

CHANCELLOR'S
REPORT

Reaccredita-
tion, EOSC

The Chancellor announced that Eastern Oregon State College had
completed its reaccreditation study by the Northwest Association
of Schools and Colleges. The full commission gave Eastern Oregon
State College full accreditation on December 3, 1988. The school
received high accolades for its response to its regional educa-
tional mission and was described as a model regional college.

Naming of EOSC
Classroom/Lab-
oratory Build-
ing for M. J.
Loso

The Chancellor said President Gilbert had recommended that the
new Classroom/Laboratory Building at Eastern Oregon State College
be named for Dr. Mary Jane Loso. The Board's rules prohibit
naming a building after a living person unless the person has
donated a substantial share of the cost of construction or for
an unusually meritorious cause. He said he believed Eastern Ore-
gon State College had presented such a meritorious cause.

Dr. Loso was associated with the institution for a long period,
ending her career in 1982 as professor emeritus. She has been
Woman of the Year, has served on the EOSC Regional Arts Council,
was instrumental in establishing the foreign languages in their
elementary schools, and has been in the forefront for development
of the liberal arts.

The Chancellor said there was wide support for the proposal in
the community and recommended that the Board approve naming the
new Classroom/Laboratory Building in her honor.

The Board approved the recommendation, with the following voting
in favor: Directors Adams, Alltucker, Bailey, Bruggere, Dodson,
Miller, Wilson, and Hensley. Those voting no: None.
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Awarding of Honorary Doctorates, OSU

The Chancellor indicated that Oregon State University was proposing to award honorary doctorates to the following individuals:

Dr. Paul Berg, a pioneer in the field of gene research and a recipient of the Nobel Prize for chemistry in 1980.

Dr. W. Edwards Deming, who has been responsible for the phenomenal success that Japanese industry enjoys today in the world market.

Mr. John A. Young, President and Chief Executive Officer of Hewlett-Packard, one of the world’s largest and most progressive electronics firms with a major installation in Corvallis. Mr. Young graduated from Oregon State University in 1953 with a degree in electrical engineering.

A more detailed description of the accomplishments of these three individuals was provided to the Board. A copy is on file in the Board’s Office.

The Chancellor recommended that the Board approve the awarding of the honorary doctorates to these individuals as requested.

The Board approved the recommendation, with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Alltucker, Bailey, Bruggere, Dodson, Miller, Wilson, and Hensley. Those voting no: None.

Engineering Graduates, OSU and PSU

The Chancellor reported that engineering graduates from both Oregon State University and Portland State University had extraordinary success in passing the national standardized engineering examination at 96.9% and 94% respectively. The national average is 74%. The test scores place the State System’s graduates in the top 1% nationally as measured by those examinations. He commended the institutions for the achievements of their faculty and students.

Ways and Means Subcommittee for Education Subcommittee

The Chancellor announced that the Ways and Means Subcommittee members for the Education Subcommittee had been announced.

Senator Frank Roberts will chair the committee and Senators Lenn Hannon and Cliff Trow and Representatives Mike Burton, Nancy Peterson, and Tony Van Vliet are members of the subcommittee. The hearings for higher education will begin on March 6 and continue for approximately four weeks.

Introduction of G. Pernsteiner

The Chancellor introduced Mr. George Pernsteiner, who was employed recently to fill the position of Associate Vice Chancellor for Facilities Division. Mr. Pernsteiner has a bachelor’s degree from Seattle University and a Master of Public Administration degree from the University of Washington. He was the director of the department of administrative services for the City of Seattle before taking the position with Centralized Activities.
The Chancellor indicated Mr. Bill Neland, who had planned to retire and return to Portland, had been persuaded to join the administrative staff at the Oregon Health Sciences University, effective March 1. The Chancellor expressed his personal appreciation to Mr. Neland for his friendship and support and for his outstanding work for the Board.

Staff Report to the Committee

Background

The preparation of public school teachers is one of the most important responsibilities of Oregon's public four-year colleges and universities. In fact, several of Oregon's colleges were established as normal schools solely for the preparation of school teachers. While the State System has been involved in teacher education from its inception, never has there been more interest in the improvement of teacher preparation programs. Across the country and in Oregon, the public, community leaders, and politicians are demanding that public schools do a better job of preparing young people for participation in American society. A major burden falls on college programs that prepare teachers for those schools.

The seeds of reform were planted early in Oregon. The Board's first Strategic Plan, 1983-1987, called for higher admissions requirements for teacher education and the development of extended teacher education programs. The reform theme was expanded upon in the Board's second Strategic Plan, 1987-1993. Among the current plan's recommendations are a number of new initiatives in teacher education, specifically that the System's colleges and universities should:

* Develop cooperative programs to recruit highly qualified students to the teaching profession (Recommendation #15).

* Raise standards for admission to teacher preparation programs — raise grade point average to 2.75, require students to pass CBEST (Recommendation #16).

* Redesign their teacher preparation programs to a five-year program sequence that would emphasize improved recruitment, raised admission standards, extended field work, redesigned education courses, more subject matter preparation, improved accountability, and financial incentives to students (Recommendation #17).
While the Strategic Plan provided some guidelines for the development of new teacher education programs, campus efforts were greatly encouraged by the 1986-87 Interim Legislative Committee on Teacher Education and its citizens' advisory committee. Chaired by Speaker Vera Katz and President John Kitzhaber, the Interim Committee proposed major changes in the teaching profession, including the transition from undergraduate teacher education programs to a fifth-year graduate teacher preparation model.

In March 1987, the Board received its first progress report on the implementation of teacher education reforms outlined in the Strategic Plan, 1987-1993. At that meeting the Board reviewed and "conditionally adopted" a proposal calling for a five-year teacher preparation program for the public colleges and universities in Oregon. (A copy of that report appears as Appendix A of the full document entitled, "Review of Oregon's New Teacher Education Programs," which is on file in the Board's Office.) The proposal called for shifting the preparation of teachers from its current undergraduate program to a graduate program that placed more emphasis on subject matter preparation and closely supervised field experiences in school districts.

The Board also asked that the proposal receive a public review including hearings to be held across the state to give educators and interested citizens an opportunity to provide comments on the proposal.

Copies of the proposal and hearing schedule were sent to all school districts and ESD offices in the state, as well as to educational agencies and organizations, and colleges and universities. Hearing notices were provided to all area newspapers; press releases were provided to radio and television stations. In all, more than 800 copies of the proposal were sent to agencies and organizations throughout the state.

**Public Hearings**

Seven public hearings were held across the state between April 13 and April 23, 1987. Approximately 200 people attended the hearings, and over 100 testified. In addition, the Chancellor's Office received about 20 letters of comments and many more telephone calls.

Receiving testimony at the hearings were a member of the Board (serving as a hearings officer), a staff member, and a dean representing one of the colleges of education in the State System. The Board received a complete summary of the testimony. (See Appendix B in the full report.) The original proposal that had been conditionally approved by the Board was substantially revised to accommodate many of the concerns and suggestions received during the public review process. The revised proposal was reviewed by the Board at its May 15, 1987, meeting. (See
Appendix C of the full report.) The Board then approved a staff recommendation to wait an additional month for further discussion about the proposed revisions before taking final action on the guidelines for extended teacher education programs at its June 1987 meeting.

Guidelines for Extended Teacher Education Program

The Guidelines for an Extended Teacher Education Program were approved by the Board on June 19, 1987. (A copy of the complete staff report is contained in Appendix D of the full document.)

In the guidelines, the Board directed the State System's schools of education to take up to eighteen months to redesign their teacher education programs by adding a fifth year to the curriculum. Two tracks would be available to students wishing to prepare as teachers. For undergraduates interested in education, the schools were to offer extended five-year programs. For post-baccalaureate students who majored in other disciplines, the schools were to offer an accelerated graduate teacher education program.

Specifically, the proposal required the five schools of education to submit their plans for extended five-year programs to the Board by January 1, 1989. The plans were to be developed by the faculties of the institutions (both arts and sciences faculty and education faculty) with the participation of professional teachers and administrators in the state. Institutions were encouraged to be innovative and present plans that would meet the needs of their students and communities. The Board did not want five identical teacher education programs.

In order to assure that the programs would prepare students with strong general education, mastery of the subjects they would teach, high quality professional education in effective teaching, and experience in a variety of public school settings, the program proposals were directed to conform to the following guidelines:

- **Teacher Education Programs.** Teacher preparation programs in the State System should be extended to five years to ensure that future teachers are well educated, possess superior knowledge of the subject(s) they will teach, have strong professional educations, and have adequate practice teaching in school settings.

- **Academic Major.** All students should be required to complete a baccalaureate degree in a major outside of education. Institutions may offer interdisciplinary or liberal studies degrees especially designed for students working to become elementary school teachers. The undergraduate major in education should be eliminated.
Education Courses. Schools of education may offer education minors, concentrations, and courses for students desiring to begin their professional education courses before completing the baccalaureate degree as part of the extended five-year program.

Undergraduate Practicum. Schools of education should provide early exposure to classroom situations for undergraduates considering careers in teaching. These field experiences should be available to all undergraduates regardless of whether they intend to enter the extended five-year program or the post-baccalaureate program.

Extended Teacher Education Program. Students entering the extended program as undergraduates should receive a baccalaureate degree when they complete their undergraduate majors, typically after the fourth year. During the fifth year of the program, students should be considered graduate students, and a significant proportion of the course work (a minimum of 50 percent) should apply toward a Master's degree. Students should complete all the academic requirements for standard certification at the end of the fifth year.

Post-baccalaureate Programs. State System schools of education should establish distinctive post-baccalaureate programs that encourage graduates who may not have previously taken education courses to enter the teaching profession. These "accelerated" graduate teacher education programs should be high quality and rigorous programs. They should be designed to enable post-baccalaureate students to complete the academic requirements for Standard certification in one year. Schools may want to offer a new Master of Arts in Teaching degree, which could be completed at or about the same time as certification requirements, for students who meet the high standards set for these programs.

Fee Policy. The State Board should extend its post-baccalaureate fee policy for teachers, even though fifth-year students and post-baccalaureate students are fulfilling some or all of the requirements for a graduate degree. The State Board should also support other means, such as the Teacher Corps (forgivable loan program) and Mentor Teacher proposals, to assist students in meeting the financial burdens of the extended teacher and post-baccalaureate education programs.

Special Education. Special education courses and endorsement requirements should be integrated into the extended programs and the post-baccalaureate programs.
Meeting #572

January 20, 1989

- Multiethnic and Multicultural Education. Teacher education programs should include courses focusing on multiethnic and multicultural education.

- Recruitment. State System schools of education should recruit well-prepared students to teacher education programs, and special emphasis should be given to the recruitment of minority students.

- Admission. State System schools of education should implement high admission standards to teacher education programs. Students entering their fifth year of preparation should meet the graduate admission standards established by each campus.

The schools were given until January 1, 1989, to submit their conceptual plans for new extended education programs to the Board, with implementation of the new programs expected in the Fall of 1990.

The Development and Review of Extended Teacher Education Programs

The extended teacher education proposals the Board has already reviewed (Eastern Oregon State College and Oregon State University/Western Oregon State College), and those that will be reviewed on January 20, 1989, have involved literally hundreds of faculty in the colleges of education and liberal arts and about a thousand public school administrators and teachers. As part of the developmental process at the institutions, the old undergraduate education curriculum has been eliminated, undergraduate academic majors for prospective students strengthened, and new graduate education courses developed. Thousands of hours have been spent working out all of the problems related to the design of the new programs and obtaining curricular and faculty senate committee approvals for the proposed changes.

Arrangements with participating school districts have also been renegotiated to lengthen and improve the field components of the teacher preparation programs. Many new ideas have emerged in the new programs, many of them reflective of the teacher education needs in each institution's respective communities.

In preparing their programs, the schools of education have had to consider not only the Board's guidelines, but also the standards required by the national accreditation agency (National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education—NCATE) and the standards of the state teacher certification agency (Teacher Standards and Practices Commission—TSPC).
Shortly after the Board approved its guidelines in 1987, TSPC adopted its own Division 16 Standards for Graduate Education Programs. The new TSPC standards were more restrictive than the Board’s guidelines. The original TSPC standards prohibited all undergraduate education courses (specifically contemplated in the Board’s five-year teacher education track) and also required the awarding of a master’s degree at the end of the fifth-year. TSPC recently revised its standards by removing all references to the Master’s degree, but the Commission still prohibits required undergraduate education courses.

Eastern Oregon State College was the first school to bring its new teacher preparation programs to the Board for approval. Approved by the Board at its June 17, 1988, meeting, EOSC’s programs would meet all of the academic requirements for the basic and standard certification for elementary and secondary school teachers in one academic year, with an option for a Master’s Degree in Teacher Education (MTE) within an additional term, typically a summer term. Eastern’s programs were subsequently approved by TSPC and will be implemented Fall Term 1989.

The merged schools of education at Oregon State University and Western Oregon State College presented their programs to the Board in October 1988. The programs were placed on the December consent agenda for final action. Because of some questions that had been raised about the OSU/WOSC programs, Mr. Dodson requested that these programs be removed from the consent agenda and be considered along with the other programs coming to the Board for review in January 1989.

On January 20, 1989, the Southern Oregon State College, Portland State University, and University of Oregon extended teacher education program proposals will be presented to the Board, along with OSU/WOSC’s programs rescheduled for that meeting.

If the Board approves these programs, there is still much to be accomplished before the programs can be implemented in Fall 1990. First, faculty must redesign the curriculum to conform to a quarter academic calendar. Second, the programs must be presented to the Office of Educational Policy and Planning (OEPP) for its review. The Office director, Roger Bassett, is preparing a memorandum outlining the process for review by his office. After the review by OEPP, the programs must be reviewed by TSPC. If the programs reach TSPC by September, the earliest TSPC could give final approval would be October or November of 1989. Because schools will be recruiting students for the new programs during fall of 1989 and winter 1990, it is extremely important that the Board, the Governor’s Office, and TSPC work together to assure successful completion of the review process.
Continuing Policy Issues Regarding the Extended Teacher Education Programs

1. Diversity. The Board's original guidelines encouraged the institutions to be 'innovative and to present plans that meet the needs of their students and communities. We do not want five teacher education programs that are identical.' Underlying this statement was the desire to expand access to the teaching profession by providing alternate paths for students to prepare to become teachers.

While each of the proposed programs focus on different groups of students and different pedagogical themes, they are more alike than the Board originally intended. This is due partly to resource constraints and partly to limitations imposed by TSPC. As each institution completes the details of its new programs, it should be encouraged to reconsider program options that reduce the time it takes students to complete certification and degree requirements. Options should be considered even if they require changes in either Board or TSPC guidelines, such as allowing some undergraduates to begin their teacher preparation courses in the senior year.

2. Program Quality. The extended teacher education programs that have and will be presented to the Board are conceptual proposals that lack details about specific courses and content. A number of interested parties are concerned that the new fifth-year curriculum is not much different from the old undergraduate curriculum. They want to make sure that the new courses are rigorous, graduate-level courses that draw from the latest research on effective schools and are carefully integrated with the extended field experiences. As the schools of education complete the curriculum for the new programs, they should provide the Board with an accounting of what was dropped from the old curriculum and what was added — indicating why the new curriculum is stronger. Higher education needs to make sure that the public is convinced that the extra year of study is justified by the content and quality of the new curriculum.

3. The Master's Degree. The Board’s original proposal called for a fifth-year program that would lead to completion of certification requirements and the awarding of a master’s degree. Testimony at the statewide public hearings generally opposed the one-year master’s degree on the grounds that it would be a "cheap degree" and would cost districts significantly more money to hire beginning teachers. Faculty in four of the five teacher-education programs were also opposed to creating a new professional master’s degree in education (essentially a "pedagogy" degree), preferring
instead to stay with the existing Master of Education degree. The Teacher Standards and Practices Commission and the Citizens Advisory Committee to the Interim Education Committee continue to support, however, the one-year Master of Arts in Teaching degree. Higher education needs to be sensitive to these concerns and work out options that both maintain academic standards and serve the public interest.

4. **Budget.** The financing of the extended teacher preparation programs has been a continuing concern of the campuses during the planning process. In some cases, the new programs will cost more money. In others, there will be a reallocation of costs within the institutions. Areas of financial concern include:

* additional student credit hours required for the fifth year;
* the extra load on Arts and Sciences courses as elementary students seek courses to meet regular academic majors;
* the need to continue the four-year programs for students already in the pipeline;
* the cost of providing required summer session courses under the fifth-year model;
* the need to reduce faculty teaching loads (from 12 to 9 hours) to meet the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) standards for graduate programs;
* the costs of the expanded field-based instruction, including the cost of training school district personnel as student teacher supervisors and the remuneration of public school teachers who are selected as supervising teachers;
* the costs of advising students during the transition from four-year to five-year teacher preparation programs;
* the extra costs to students of attending school for an additional year.

The Board has recognized the adverse consequences to students for the additional fifth year of study and adopted a policy of undergraduate fee rates for the fifth year. There is still an open question as to whether students should pay undergraduate or graduate fees when they return to complete the master's degree after completing certification requirements, however.
While it is difficult to develop budgets for the System's move to fifth year programs (in part because the added costs of the fifth year will be offset by lower enrollments in the teacher preparation courses), the Board and its staff will have to pay careful attention to these issues. The proposals before the Board assume that each campus will make the necessary adjustments internally during the conversion to fifth-year programs.

5. **Summer Session Policy.** As a part of its consideration of the OSU/WOSC proposal in October, the Board agreed that student credit hours generated in the required summer term for all fifth-year teacher education programs should be counted as regular academic year courses for state reimbursement purposes. This means that the student credit hours taken in summer term will be included in the official three-term FTE enrollment reports issued by the Chancellor's Office.

This policy change would not mean, however, that campuses would automatically receive state reimbursement for these students. The State System does not receive additional funding under the corridor of enrollment funding policy until enrollments are outside the funding corridor. Those institutions close to overrunning their corridor may eventually benefit by counting the student FTE generated from required summer sessions (summer sessions are currently operated on a self-support basis -- FTE are not counted in System enrollment figures for state reimbursement). Those institutions with enrollment ceilings would not receive additional funds, because they are already at their enrollment limits.

6. **Field Placements.** Perhaps the most important component of all of the new fifth-year programs is an expanded, redesigned student teaching experience. Student teaching will be increased from 10 weeks to a minimum of 15, and in several cases, 30 weeks. Besides being expanded, the supervision of student teachers will be improved through a new partnership between higher education faculty and public school teachers.

Currently, schools of education negotiate separately with districts and schools to find student teaching placements. Compensation to supervising teachers varies from school to school, as do the other perquisites that are used to entice cooperation. With the expanded student teaching programs, educators throughout the state agree that a new statewide policy is needed regarding the responsibility for student teaching. Two approaches have been suggested. One would create a state policy or law that requires school districts
to become full partners in the supervision of student teachers with reimbursement to those teachers coming from state support of public schools. This is the model followed in Texas and Connecticut. Another approach would be for higher education and the Department of Education to agree on a process for selecting supervising teachers and an amount they should be reimbursed. The Legislature would then be asked for a separate appropriation which would reimburse each school district an amount (for example, $1,000) for each teacher who is selected as a student teacher supervisor.

7. **Enrollments.** Unlike many other parts of the country, Oregon does not have a teacher shortage. In fact, Oregon schools have been graduating many more certified teachers than can be absorbed in the state's public schools. With the introduction of the fifth-year programs, enrollments in State System teacher preparation programs are expected to decline by about one-third. Each institution has agreed to an enrollment goal which together should eliminate much of the oversupply. During the next two years, it will be important, however, to make sure that these goals are honored. It may be necessary in the future to establish enrollment lids on campus programs so that state resources are not wasted preparing teachers for jobs that do not exist.

**General Recommendations for the Implementation of Extended Teacher Preparation Programs**

1. The staff recommends that the Board authorize the State System's colleges of education to implement their extended teacher preparation programs, effective Summer Term 1990, except for Eastern Oregon State College which will begin its program in Fall 1989.

2. The staff further recommends that the schools phase out their current undergraduate teacher preparation programs as soon as they can honor commitments made to students enrolled in those programs.

3. The Board should require that the schools send the Chancellor by June 1989 a detailed report on the curricular changes that have been made in the fifth-year programs. These reports should: (a) convert the approved programs from semester to quarter calendars, (b) include course details that will be needed to complete the TSPC reviews, and (c) show what has been eliminated from the current programs and what has been added to the new graduate curricula which will strengthen teacher preparation in Oregon.
4. In order to provide program alternatives that shorten the time required for some students to enter the teaching profession, the Board invites institutions to submit additional proposals including the Master's of Arts in Teaching programs. Particular attention should be given to a five-year option which would permit students to begin teacher preparation courses as undergraduates and complete a master's degree at the end of the fifth year.

5. The Board should direct the Chancellor to seek the cooperation of the Department of Education and other educational groups in the state in developing a statewide approach to the placement, supervision, and financing of student teachers.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

The Committee discussion with respect to each of the proposed teacher education programs appears following the staff report and recommendation for each program. The overall discussion of the new teacher education program in general, the staff recommendations covering the extended teacher preparation program and institutional programs, and the Board discussion and action are included with the "Review of Oregon's New Teacher Education Programs."

Dr. Pierce reviewed the development and objectives of the teacher education reform movement leading to the proposals for extended five-year teacher education programs.

He said the institutions originally had been instructed to prepare proposals using a two-track model. One would be for those students in college who had made the decision to be a teacher. They would begin teacher preparation in the senior year and continue to complete that degree during the fifth year. A second program would be for students who had completed a baccalaureate degree and wished to prepare for teaching as a professional option. Shortly thereafter, the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission established standards for teacher education programs which prohibited any undergraduate professional teacher education courses. This, in a sense, precluded one of the options the Board had directed the institutions to develop and placed them in a very difficult position.

Dr. Pierce commended the institutions for doing the best possible job in developing programs that met both the Board's standards and those of the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission. The programs also provided some diversity and maintained the quality essential in those programs. Dr. Pierce said the programs had been criticized for lacking vision but the vision was highly constrained by the actions of the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission.
In preparing the programs, there was broad-based participation involving many groups within the institutions and in the communities. The programs will continue to evolve and improve. There is still interest among outside groups in having some option for those students who want to begin their teacher preparation before the graduate year. Any such plan would be contingent upon persuading the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission to liberalize the standards it is now applying to fifth-year programs.

In response to a later question from Mr. Adams concerning this prohibition with respect to special education and elementary education, Dr. Pierce said the current standards of the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission prohibit any required undergraduate education courses as a part of any of the fifth-year program. Efforts to have that standard relaxed, particularly to permit a small number of required courses in elementary and special education programs, have been unsuccessful. Some optional or recommended courses are allowed, but they are very limited and cannot be required as part of a program to be forwarded to the Teacher Standard and Practices Commission. Dr. Pierce said there should be continued efforts to work with the Commission and some interested legislators to modify what is viewed by many as an unreasonable standard.

Dr. Pierce said he was convinced the pedagogical courses offered as part of the graduate programs were substantially different and substantially better than those offered in the undergraduate program. The institutions have been asked to provide the Chancellor with a very detailed report on the curriculum development indicating what has been eliminated and what has been added to that curriculum that is substantially stronger than in the past.

Dr. Pierce indicated he had distributed a letter from Mr. Roger Bassett, Director of the Office of Educational Policy and Planning, which indicated the nature of the review of the programs by that office.

Dr. Pierce urged the Board to take final action on the programs.

**Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee**

Following the presentation and discussion of the individual institutional programs, Mr. Hensley requested Mr. Roger Bassett, Director of the Office of Educational Policy and Planning, to address the Board concerning the proposal for review of these programs which was contained in his letter of January 17 to Chancellor Lemman. Copies of the letter were distributed to the Board.
Mr. Bassett said the opportunity to look at something as important as teacher education and to redirect resources for the future is a rare opportunity. The promise of the teacher education reform activity had several concepts—rigor, to organize the curriculum around courses that had a proven relationship to effective teaching, practica to provide an emphasis on classroom experience as part of teacher education programs, the shifting of teacher education to the post-baccalaureate to open the teaching profession to individuals with undergraduate degrees in fields other than education, and differentiation to provide distinctive individual programs with specific parts to play in a renewed approach to teacher education. The result was to be an entirely new state policy with regard to teacher education. In terms of the broad policy setting, including the political aspects of it, Mr. Bassett said there was a perception that generally all of the programs before the Committee and the Board proposed to do most of the things represented in that promise, with the real risk that no part of it would be fully realized.

Mr. Bassett said he had a strong respect for the difference between academic decision-making and the political setting and said he intended to use his office to separate the two. He indicated he planned to focus on the broader policy context and bring any remaining concerns directly to the Board to be part of its decision process, rather than to allow those concerns to become political issues.

Mr. Bassett stated the statutory responsibilities of his office for program review had traditionally occurred after a program was approved by the Board and consisted of commenting on the Board’s decision. He said he preferred a process in which the Board’s staff and his office participated in a collaborative way much earlier in the process. He suggested a review of the programs as a total education policy decision rather than an individual review of each proposal. Since the 1990 implementation date makes immediate Board approval of the programs almost essential, he indicated a willingness to scan the policy setting for any loose ends, focus those in the form of recommendations from the Office of Educational Policy and Planning on the subject of teacher education generally, with specific recommendations on carrying out the Board’s decision on these programs, if appropriate. These recommendations to the Chancellor would serve as suggestions for further guidance in implementing the programs in the time that remains before the fall of 1990.

Mr. Dodson said Mr. Bassett’s proposal was commendable and would be very helpful to the Board. The process should be a fluid one, not a static process with comments after the fact. He asked who had the ongoing responsibility to monitor how the programs function, particularly if they should have a more serious negative impact than is anticipated on either supply or on the critical minority recruitment issue.
Mr. Bassett responded that he considered it the Board's responsibility to monitor how the programs function but the Board should hold his office accountable for accurate information concerning the situation in the state with respect to data relating to any kind of educational program. He stated he was hesitant to get into the business of evaluating the decisions of other boards, but his office had a responsibility for being knowledgeable about demographics and policy trends generally.

Mr. Adams asked that the program previously approved for Eastern Oregon State College be included with the comments pertaining to the programs currently before the Committee and the Board, and Mr. Bassett indicated he would do so.

Mr. Bailey inquired what impact these proposed programs would have on the education programs of the private colleges and universities.

Mr. Bassett indicated the intersegmental impact was a specific responsibility of the Office of Educational Policy and Planning. He suggested in this instance the intersegmental analysis be done as part of his comments on these programs. He indicated he would prefer that analysis to be done early in the process for future programs.

Mr. Alltucker requested Mr. Bassett to elaborate further on the basis of the review of the elements of the teacher education policy as expressed in the letter to Chancellor Lemman.

Mr. Bassett said the first element was intended to acknowledge the teacher reform efforts throughout the country and analyze whether the program review process has anticipated those changes in education. In the fourth element, the intent would be to look at what is needed in Oregon from the teacher education programs, how that need can be addressed, what are its components, and consider whether individual programs should have a primary focus.

Mr. Hensley said he understood Mr. Bassett was proposing to review the programs in concert with the Board's staff and try to reach some formal conclusions or recommendations within a period of four to six weeks. He asked whether Mr. Bassett agreed that extended teacher education was a viable philosophy or concept and that only the other details mentioned needed to be resolved.
Mr. Bassett said he had not had an opportunity to reach a conclusion with respect to extended teacher education. He indicated he had been thinking in terms of a focus on the remaining broader policy setting of issues. Those issues would be identified and presented to the Board in a constructive way in order to remove them from the political setting and to relate them to the changed method of doing program review. He stated it was unlikely the review would question the fundamental decision on the extended teacher education programs.

Mr. Bruggere said he sensed there was not uniform agreement that the extended program would solve the problems that the Board and others were trying to solve.

Mr. Hensley concurred that the programs represented a major departure from the normal practice of teacher education. However, no one had presented the proposals as a final package. Comments indicated there were many details yet to be resolved.

Dr. Pierce stated the proposed programs had been under consideration for a long time and reflected a national movement toward the strengthening of teacher education. Much of the political support in Oregon has been toward moving to fifth-year programs. Most of the controversy as it continues to exist is in the fine-tuning of the fifth-year programs and whether there are enough options available within them.

Dr. Pierce said Mr. Bassett and others have referred to a gap between the promise and the performance as reflected in these proposals. However, the staff has not received any statement of what is substantively missing from these proposals. Much of the discussion has been on the process of looking at procedural issues. Faculty will begin to design the detailed curriculum for the fall of 1990, and the provosts have asked for some statement of the substantive problems that still need to be addressed by the faculty as they design curriculum.

Dr. Pierce stated the staff recommended moving ahead with the proposed programs. At the same time, Dr. Pierce said he would work closely with Mr. Bassett and his staff on the review and try to get the necessary information to the institutions as quickly as possible so that the good suggestions coming out of that review could be incorporated into the detailed curriculum proposals that would be reported to the chancellor later in the year.

Mr. Bassett said the time pressures was one of the reasons for proposing a more limited review by his office. The review would accept the fundamental assumptions the Board introduced into the process and would concentrate on the remaining loose ends the Board had not considered.
Mr. Hensley said he understood that if the Board approved the proposals and resolved the details with Mr. Bassett's office, the programs still must be approved by the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission. Mr. Bassett indicated this was correct. Mr. Hensley said he was unaware of the time schedule for review and approval by the Commission and suggested it would behoove the Board to work with Mr. Bassett as rapidly as possible so that final approval can be obtained and the institutions can proceed with implementation.

Dr. Pierce said he anticipated the curricular part of the proposals would receive final approval from the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission by October or November. The programs must be approved because there would be an entire class lost if the institutions returned to the four-year programs. There will be a process of discussion to resolve any problems and gain the approval of the Commission.

The Committee discussed when a report of the review by the Office of Educational Policy and Planning could be made to the Board and the extent of concerns from the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission. Mr. Bassett agreed to try to present a report to the Board at its February meeting. Dr. Pierce indicated the programs had been designed to meet all of the requirements of the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission. Dr. Pierce said if the Board approved the programs and the Office of Educational Policy and Planning had specific suggestions after its review of the programs, the Chancellor could direct that those recommendations to the deans and schools to be implemented as far as possible.

The Chancellor suggested the staff report to the Board at regular intervals on the progress being made by the institutions in developing the precise curriculum and in responding to suggestions made from any party.

Mr. Alltucker said he understood Mr. Bassett to be seeking the opportunity to make some suggestions at this late date in the process and that Mr. Bassett was counting on staff and others to follow recommendations by the Board to make future changes to adjust anything that was out of line. Mr. Bassett concurred.

Mr. Bruggere asked if Mr. Bassett would anticipate recommending significant changes to the point that the Board would have to rescind its decision. Mr. Bassett responded this was not the assumption he would start with because he accepted it as fundamentally good work.

Mr. Bruggere then asked what implications there would be if the programs were approved in March rather than in January.
Dr. Spanier said there was no absolute date by which a decision must be reached. However, the time element is critical considering the work yet to be done and the additional burden of converting programs from semesters to quarters when those programs had not existed under the quarter system. The faculty needs to understand very quickly what the gap is between the promise of the programs and what apparently has not met that promise in the proposed programs. That gap has not been described as yet.

Mr. Alltucker said Mr. Bassett's letter made the assumption that Board action could not be delayed until March. That was a good assumption and the review in the Office of Educational Policy and Planning would follow Board approval and would only be meaningful if judged relevant by the Board's staff and approved later by the Board. He stated that was also a good assumption and he saw no conflict.

Mr. Bruggere said he supported a fifth-year for teacher certification but it appeared the programs as designed were not meeting the expectations or potential. He said he did not think the Board should approve the programs when that issue could be resolved in two months.

Mr. Richardson indicated he would tend to agree because of the Board's recent experience with the semester conversion. He said he would feel more comfortable having as much information as possible before making a decision so it would not be necessary to revisit that decision when other information became available.

Dean Everhart said he hoped the Board would have faith that those charged with implementing the programs could deal not only with the intent of the reform but to create a program that would do what the reform was intended to accomplish. He urged the Board to provide a sign to the faculty to move ahead with the understanding corrections could be made during the process as a result of interactions with Mr. Bassett's office and directions from the Board.

Mr. Alltucker expressed confidence the programs would not have any major changes or objections. He also said he had full confidence in the ability of the deans and faculty members to make any minor adjustments as they become necessary.

Mr. Bruggere indicated he did not disagree with the confidence issue but was concerned the proposed programs would not fulfill the dreams and expectations.

Dean Barr urged the Board to continue the commitment and approve the program. He said the faculty would work with Mr. Bassett, legislators, and others to refine the program.
Mr. Hensley commented that he had not heard Mr. Bassett express any argument against the concept and that there would be benefits to the Board and the programs to have the support and cooperation of the Office of Educational Policy and Planning. If the details could be resolved in this manner, it would be possible to present the programs to the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission in concert rather than separately. Dean Barr and Mr. Bassett indicated their support for this approach.

Dr. Pierce explained that the gap between the programs and the promise apparently came as a result of a meeting attended with a citizens group at which about a third of the members had been on the original advisory committee. It became apparent the promise of new, more rigorous focused teacher education programs had not been met in the four programs now before the Board, although no one in the group had actually seen or read any of the program proposals. The issue before that group was whether a master’s degree would be awarded at the end of nine months. Dr. Pierce said he had explained that the large field component of the program proposals required an additional summer or term’s work in order to complete the master’s degree. The gap that these persons saw was more a disagreement with the design of the program. He added that the programs met very clearly the guidelines put forth by the Board and he believed on review by OEPP and TSPC it would be found the programs were extraordinarily interesting and thorough graduate programs for teacher education which followed the best examples from around the country and suggestions from people in Oregon.

Dr. Pierce said he saw no benefit in delaying a decision, only problems which would be created by further delay in starting the process of curriculum conversion and advising students who will be entering the programs.

Mr. Hensley said he was suggesting that the Board approve the proposals in concept and receive the report from Mr. Bassett at the February meeting. If serious differences were to develop, the Board could reverse its decision, but the institutions could move ahead with planning.

Ms. Wilson said she could support the procedure if the recommendations would involve minor issues. However, the Board would be faced with a different issue if the recommendation would be suggesting a major redirection.

Mr. Bassett said he planned to work with anyone who remained unsatisfied with the decision and express their concerns in the form of recommendations that could be handled in what remains of the implementation steps. He indicated he was not interested in calling into question the fundamental effort that has been made.
Mr. Hensley referred to a letter from Representative Phil Kiesling, who was a member of the citizen's advisory committee and the joint interim committee on education. He was complimentary of the Board in developing the fifth-year program, wants it to move ahead, but has some concerns about specifics. He indicated he supported the proposal by Mr. Bassett as a part of the review process.

Dr. Pierce then presented the staff recommendations.

Mr. Bruggere said he did not view Board approval with the potential for reversing that decision as being a sound management. It would also seem to have the same potential for consternation at the institutions as would a delay of approval.

Mr. Alltucker said the motion did not carry the implication of a subsequent disapproval, but Mr. Bruggere said the discussion had carried that intention.

Mr. Adams stated he had no feeling the decision could be reversed because the fifth-year program was such a strong program backed by the kinds of ideas proposed by the legislative task force. He said obviously there were some details to be resolved but he did not think they were major concepts.

Mr. Bailey said the issues of diversity, access of special students for special needs, and the problems relating to the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission and the Office of Educational Policy and Planning need to be addressed. He said he would assume those issues would be addressed during the review process. On that basis, he indicated he would support the motion for the Committee to recommend Board approval of the staff recommendation.

Mr. Richardson expressed support of the programs in concept but was reluctant to approve it since he saw no real difficulty with delaying the decision for four to eight weeks.

Mr. Dodson said he had a concern about faculty morale and also about putting pressure on Mr. Bassett or his staff to do a quick review of the proposals. He indicated he would vote in favor of the motion.

Mr. Alltucker said it was time to get the programs under way. He indicated there were unanswered questions and societal issues that may require attention as time evolves and the programs are operating.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendations as presented. Mr. Bruggere and Mr. Richardson were opposed.
Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Adams presented the report and recommendation from the Committee of the Whole. He said the only change in the staff recommendation was the addition to Item 3 that the institutions would also provide answers to the concerns addressed to the Board by the Office of Educational Policy and Planning review.

The Board approved the five staff recommendations presented above and incorporating the addition reported by Mr. Adams from the Committee of the Whole. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Alltucker, Bailey, Dodson, Miller, Wilson, and Hensley. Those voting no: Director Bruggere.

Extended Staff Report to the Committee

Teacher Education Program, SOSC

Introduction

Southern Oregon State College seeks authorization to offer fifth year graduate-level teacher preparation programs leading to basic and standard certification for elementary, secondary, and special education teachers after one calendar year. The programs would provide an option for a Master’s degree within an additional 15 semester hours.

With the initiation of the new teacher preparation programs, Southern Oregon State College also seeks authorization to eliminate its undergraduate-level teacher education programs leading to basic certification for elementary, secondary, and special education teachers; this would occur on a phase-out basis to enable students to complete their currently offered undergraduate programs no later than the end of Spring Term, 1991.

The purpose of the extended teacher education programs is to strengthen teacher preparation at Southern Oregon State College through the requirement of a regular academic major for all prospective teachers, the redesign of undergraduate professional educational courses to a more rigorous graduate-level professional curriculum, the testing of students on academic subject matter and pedagogy skills in nationally used tests, and increased field-based experiences in addition to strengthened student teaching experiences with highly qualified supervising teachers in local school districts.

Southern Oregon State College’s proposal is responsive to the Board’s Strategic Plan 1987-1993 and its subsequent policies regarding the redesign of teacher preparation programs to a five-year sequence of academic preparation, professional education courses, and practicum opportunities. A detailed review of the Board’s guidelines for extended teacher education programs is provided in the attached staff report, "Review of Oregon’s New Teacher Education Programs."
Staff Analysis of Southern Oregon State College's Teacher Education Proposal

1. Relationship to Assigned Mission

The proposed program is clearly within the mission of Southern Oregon State College. The Board’s Strategic Plan 1987-1993 states that Southern’s mission is to provide "high quality education in the liberal arts and selected professional programs at the baccalaureate and master's levels." The plan notes that Southern already has strength in its various professional fields of study, including teacher education.

2. Evidence of Need

The Board conducted a lengthy review of teacher education programs over virtually the last decade. Working with the campuses, the Board’s Office examined teacher supply and demand data on an annual basis, surveyed graduates to ascertain areas needed for program improvements, and conducted meetings with practitioners throughout the state to examine needed reform in the teacher preparation programs of the State System. This examination closely paralleled reviews throughout the nation, using many of the findings of the Carnegie Commission and the Holmes Group (representing the nation’s major research universities), as well as the work of Oregon’s Interim Legislative Committee on Education, which addressed needs for reform of teacher education in Oregon.

Southern Oregon State College worked with a number of groups in planning and documenting the needs for an extended teacher education program. Over 100 educators including teachers, school administrators, and faculty and students from the college, participated in the development of the proposed program. Southern also involved Dr. Lee Shulman, a principal consultant to the Carnegie Foundation Project on the National Board for Teaching, in the development of the program.

3. Quality of Proposed Program

The elementary program is designed as a 42 semester hour, 12-month sequence (two academic semesters plus one summer term) that culminates in a Basic and Standard Certificate (the "academic" requirements for a Standard -- teaching experience is also required by the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission). Students will have the option of completing a Master of Arts or Master of Science Degree in Elementary Education with an additional 15 semester hours.
The secondary program is designed as a 36 semester hour, 12-month sequence that culminates in a Basic and Standard Certificate. The secondary program has been designed to be shorter than the elementary program to allow students to take courses in their academic subject area. Students will have the option of completing a Master of Arts or Master of Science Degree in Secondary Education with an additional 15 semester hours.

The special education program (Handicapped Learner) has two options: a 44 semester hour "stand alone" program or a program that provides dual certification in special education with elementary or secondary education with an additional 24 semester hours. Students in special education will have the option of completing a Master’s of Arts or Master’s of Science Degree in Elementary or Secondary Education with an additional 15 semester hours.

Southern Oregon State College will enroll some 100 students in the elementary and secondary programs, with roughly 50 in each area. Approximately 20 students are expected to enroll in special education. Enrollment levels at Southern will be reduced by about one-fourth from the current undergraduate program (enrollments will be reduced from 158 in the current undergraduate program to around 120). This will represent a planned effort to limit enrollments in response to recent surpluses of beginning teachers in Oregon.

Admission standards will be rigorous. Students must have a 3.0 grade point average, complete an essay, have public speaking competency, pass the CBEST basic skills test, have completed a regular academic major and received the baccalaureate degree, have passed the appropriate National Teacher Examination Test (General Knowledge for the Elementary Program and Specialty Test for the Secondary Program), and provide verification of positive experiences in working with children.

There are a number of highlights of the proposed program:

- An education minor will be optional to students. This will provide an opportunity for students to determine early if they are really interested in a career as a teacher and begin to take coursework beneficial to the development of a teacher.

- A cohort system will stress building collegiality among students in order to prepare them for this important skill needed as a teacher.
- Advisors will be selected from public schools and higher education to work closely with each cohort group.

- A new integrated curriculum will be central to the program. Curriculum will be presented concomitantly with field experience and taught by faculty drawn from a variety of disciplines.

4. Adequacy of Resources to Offer Program

Southern Oregon State College currently offers a teacher preparation program for some 158 students a year with adequate numbers of faculty, library resources, and facilities. This is not expected to change under the extended program, although faculty will have altered loads to accommodate the transition from undergraduate education courses to newly-designed and more rigorous graduate level courses (the national accrediting body for teacher education requires a graduate load of 9 semester hours for faculty in contrast to 12 for undergraduate load).

Since the Southern proposal essentially doubles the amount of field placement in comparison to the existing four-year program, additional resources will need to be placed in the field placement component. This includes compensation to local school districts for increased supervision, training of local district supervisors, and increased delivery of concomitant coursework to outlying sites for preservice students.

5. Program Duplication

At present, five publicly-supported schools of education serve prospective teachers at six campuses throughout the state. Students are placed in practicum opportunities with districts throughout the state, and the "decentralized" model of the training of teachers has generally been regarded as a strength of Oregon's preparation programs.

6. Review by Other Groups

Southern Oregon State College's proposal has been reviewed and approved by the faculty at Southern Oregon State College. The proposal has also been reviewed by more than 100 teachers, administrators, and organizational representatives during the past several months.

The Academic Council reviewed and endorsed the proposal at its December 8, 1988, meeting.
Staff Recommendation to the Committee

1. The staff recommended that the Board approve Southern Oregon State College's request to implement extended elementary, secondary, and special education teacher preparation programs leading to a Basic and Standard Certificate, effective Summer Term 1990.

2. The staff further recommended that the Board authorize Southern Oregon State College to phase out its current undergraduate teacher preparation programs as soon as it honors its agreement to students already admitted to the undergraduate programs.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Dr. Stephen Reno, Dean of Academic Affairs, called attention to the timeline for program planning incorporated in the proposal from Southern Oregon State College. He said the timeline not only identified what would happen and when, but it indicated the principal players in the development of the program. He then reviewed the process followed in the development of the program. The proposal results from involvement of a very large constituency including over 100 public school personnel and more than half of the faculty at Southern Oregon. He said he viewed it as a model of cooperation between the two communities. He then requested Dr. Susan Roper, Director of Teacher Education, to present the highlights of the program.

Dr. Roper said the proposed program has been organized around the theme of a community of learners through organizing the students into cohort groups. She said the program had attempted to avoid duplication, had built in sequential learning, and represented a tighter and better organized learning experience than the current teacher education programs. A second difference concerns the students. Admission requirements have been raised dramatically, and there is a stipulation that enrollments in the program will be limited. This is expected to lead to fewer students of better quality.

The content of the proposed program differs from the current program in that it increases the academic content of teacher education. She said she believed the proposed program integrated theory and practice better than in previous programs. Methods courses are scheduled along with the field experiences so that students can apply their knowledge in the public schools immediately. Most of the secondary methods instructors are academic professors who will also be supervising student teaching. The student teachers will spend more time in this activity and will assume greater responsibility for the class for a longer period.
of time. The additional involvement in the classroom is believed to be critical in terms of inducing them into the teaching profession. The supervision student teachers receive is expected to be better because the program makes a commitment to prepare the cooperating teachers and college supervisors in supervision skills. She emphasized the strong commitment to special education in the proposed program and the effort to focus on future concerns and issues in education. There is a commitment to integrate the educational applications of technology throughout the proposed program.

Dr. Roper said Southern Oregon's program responded to the Board mandate to have early field experiences by creating an optional minor. This will allow undergraduates who know they are interested in teaching to have early field experiences and decide if teaching really is the right choice for them before committing too much time and money to that decision.

Mr. Adams inquired whether the expanded placement of students in the field was a major problem in terms of the need for more locations to serve more students in the field for a longer period of time.

Dr. Roper said having students at teaching sites beyond the geographic area of Southern Oregon State College should have an impact on the employability of its graduates.

Mr. Richardson mentioned the reference to controlling enrollments and a reduction from 158 to 120 students in the program. He asked what criteria would be used to evaluate the individuals who applied.

Dr. Roper said there would be three admissions committees, one each for elementary, secondary, and handicapped learner. Each will have a maximum number, presently estimated at 15 each for elementary and secondary with 20 for special education. The committees will be directed to take the top applicants out of the pool of people who apply.

Mr. Hensley mentioned a rather large group of citizens with Hispanic background in southern Oregon and said he was concerned about the 3.0 gpa in reference to this group. He asked whether the program included any consideration for retaining minority groups within the area.

Dr. Roper said the proposal made a commitment to recruit and select minority teachers. The decrease in the number of minority teachers nationally is a very serious problem. The admissions policy in the proposed program contains a composite score which was designed to provide some flexibility to make decisions that will give the program a better balance. Test scores, given the kind of test used, probably are a bigger problem than the grade
point average. In response to a question from Mr. Alltucker later in the meeting, Dr. Roper indicated there should be a commitment to provide any necessary extra attention needed for students who are accepted into the program and are borderline on any of the criteria.

Dr. Roper also commented briefly on plans for a general outreach program to advise high school counselors and potential students about the new program. She indicated about 50% of the graduates from the present program remain in southern Oregon.

Dr. Roper explained admission requirements for the current program specify a 2.75 grade point average and the California Basic Educational Skills Test. The new program will also require the National Teachers Examination both for elementary and secondary in the subject area, plus a 3.0 grade point average. Evidence will be required from supervisors attesting to ability to work with children. An autobiography is presently required, but students will now submit an essay stating their suitability for the teaching profession.

The Committee discussed briefly the impact of the revised programs on financial aid for students and cited some potential changes envisioned in teacher education and the teaching profession over the next ten years.

**Board Discussion and Action**

The Board action appears above at the conclusion of the item entitled, "Review of Oregon's New Teacher Education Programs."

---

**Extended Teacher Education Program, PSU**

**Staff Report to the Committee**

**Introduction**

Portland State University seeks authorization to offer fifth-year, graduate-level teacher preparation programs leading to basic and standard certification for elementary, secondary, and special education teachers after one calendar year. The elementary and secondary programs would provide an option for a master's degree within an additional 15 semester hours; because of differences within the special education programs, the specific number of hours required for the master's degree is still to be determined.

With the initiation of the new teacher preparation program, Portland State University also seeks authorization to eliminate its undergraduate-level teacher certification programs leading to basic certification for elementary, secondary, and special education teachers; this would occur on a phase-out basis to enable students to complete their currently offered undergraduate programs no later than the end of Spring Term, 1991.
The purpose of the extended teacher education programs is to strengthen teacher preparation at Portland State University through the requirement of a regular academic major for all prospective teachers, the redesign of undergraduate professional educational courses to a more rigorous graduate level professional curriculum, the testing of students on academic subject matter and pedagogy skills in nationally used tests, and increased field-based experiences in addition to strengthened student teaching experiences with highly qualified supervising teachers in local school districts.

Portland State University's proposal is responsive to the Board's Strategic Plan 1987-1993 and its subsequent policies regarding the redesign of teacher preparation programs to a five-year sequence of academic preparation, professional education courses, and practicum opportunities. A detailed review of the Board's guidelines for extended teacher education programs is provided in the attached staff report, "Review of Oregon's New Teacher Education Programs."

Staff Analysis of Portland State University's Teacher Education Proposal

1. Relationship to Assigned Mission

The proposed program is clearly within the mission of Portland State University. The Board's Strategic Plan 1987-1993 states that Portland State University's mission is to provide "excellent programs of teaching, research, and public service." Portland State already provides diverse undergraduate programs in the liberal arts and sciences and professional studies, with strong programs in teacher education. Portland State University has a special mission to address the needs of its multi-cultural, minority, and non-traditional students, and has been directed by the Board to "augment rigorous classroom and laboratory instruction with clinical instruction widely available in the metropolitan area." Portland State also has a mission to take advantage of the professional and research expertise of the metropolitan area for studying effective teaching.

2. Evidence of Need

The Board conducted a lengthy review of teacher education programs over virtually the last decade. Working with the campuses, the Board's Office examined teacher supply and demand data on an annual basis, surveyed graduates to ascertain areas needed for program improvements, and conducted meetings with practitioners throughout the state to examine needed reform in the teacher preparation programs of the State System. This examination closely paralleled reviews
throughout the nation, using many of the findings of the Carnegie Commission and the Holmes Group (representing the nation's major research universities), as well as the work of Oregon's Interim Legislative Committee on Education, which addressed needs for reform of teacher education in Oregon.

Portland State University worked with a number of groups in planning and documenting the needs for an extended teacher education program. Over 400 educators including teachers, school administrators, and faculty and students from the college, participated in the development of the proposed program.

3. Quality of Proposed Program

The elementary program is designed as a 43 semester hour, 12-month sequence (two academic semesters plus one summer term) that culminates in a Basic and Standard Certificate (the "academic" requirements for a Standard — teaching experience is also required by the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission). Students will have the option of completing a Master in Education with an additional 15 semester hours.

The secondary program is designed as a 37 semester hour, 12-month sequence that culminates in a Basic and Standard Certificate. Students will have the option of completing a Master in Education with an additional 15 semester hours.

The special education program (which includes Library Media, Handicapped Learner, Severely Handicapped Learner, Visually Impaired Learner, and Speech Impaired Learner) has two options: a 39-45 semester hour "stand alone" program or a program that provides "dual" certification with a total of 55-58 semester hours for special education and 59-62 semester hours for library media. Students in special education will have the option of completing a Master in Education, with an additional number of semester hours yet to be determined.

Portland State University will enroll some 250 students in the elementary and secondary programs, with roughly 125 in each area. Approximately 75 students are expected to enroll in special education programs. Enrollment levels at Portland State will be reduced by nearly one-half from the current undergraduate program (enrollments will be reduced from some 600-650 in the current undergraduate program to around 300). This will represent a planned effort to limit enrollments in response to recent surpluses of beginning teachers in Oregon.
Admission standards will be rigorous. Students must have a 3.0 grade point average, complete an interview, pass the CREST basic skills test, have completed a regular academic major and received the baccalaureate degree, have passed the appropriate National Teacher Examination Test (General Knowledge for the Elementary Program and Subject Area Test for the Secondary Program), and provide verification of positive experiences in working with children.

There are a number of highlights of the proposed program:

- The new theme of the program will be "reflective practice." Teachers will be trained through this program to make reflective decisions about the act of teaching.

- A cohort system will build collegiality, preparing teachers to work effectively together.

- Each cohort will focus on specific issues, for example, inner city teaching or middle school education (early adolescents).

- Some six to eight schools in a defined geographical area will be selected to serve as "cluster schools," providing a strengthened field experience for student teachers. Students within a particular cohort will focus on the cluster schools, enabling supervising teachers within these schools to work effectively with student teachers to meet the needs of the various "themes" of the cohorts.

4. Adequacy of Resources to Offer Program

Portland State University currently offers a teacher preparation program with adequate numbers of faculty, library resources, and facilities. This is not expected to change under the extended program, although faculty will have altered loads to accommodate the transition from undergraduate education courses to newly designed and more rigorous graduate level courses (the national accrediting body for teacher education requires a graduate load of 9 semester hours for faculty in contrast to 12 for undergraduate load).

Since the Portland State University proposal essentially doubles the amount of field placement in comparison to the existing four-year program, additional resources will need to be placed in the field placement component. This includes compensation to local school districts for increased supervision, training of local district supervisors, and increased delivery of concomitant coursework to outlying sites for preservice students.
5. **Program Duplication**

At present, five publicly supported schools of education serve prospective teachers at six campuses throughout the state. Students are placed in practicum opportunities with districts throughout the state, and the "decentralized" model of the training of teachers has generally been regarded as a strength of Oregon's preparation programs.

6. **Review by Other Groups**

Portland State University's School of Education proposal has been reviewed by the faculty at Portland State University, as well as more than 400 teachers, administrators, and organizational representatives during the past several months.

The Academic Council reviewed and endorsed the proposal at its December 8, 1988, meeting.

**Staff Recommendation to the Committee**

1. The staff recommended that the Board approve Portland State University's request to implement extended elementary, secondary, and special education teacher preparation programs leading to a Basic and Standard Certificate, effective Summer Term 1990.

2. The staff further recommended that the Board authorize Portland State University to phase out its current undergraduate teacher preparation programs as soon it honors its agreement to students already admitted to the undergraduate programs.

**Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee**

Provost Frank Martino reported similar broad-based participation in the development of Portland State University's program from numerous groups. He called attention to the timeline in the proposal which described the participants and process in developing the proposal. In response to a question, Dean Everhart explained the extensive involvement of personnel from the Portland School District in the planning.

Dean Everhart said the proposed program was organized so that prospective teachers would become better diagnosticians of what does or does not work and would be able to make better assessments of why something works in a particular way. Teachers must be able to ask difficult questions about the learning process. Teaching and the art of education involves values and choices and the need to assess effectiveness. A second important part of the Portland State program is dealing with education in an urban
environment. Most of the students graduating from the Portland State program will be working in urban school settings that have problems that are particularly unique. They must be prepared for cultural and learning diversity and for the various aspects that race, ethnicity, and cultural class bring into the classroom.

Dean Everhart indicated Portland State had organized its program around cohorts and clusters in order to develop a sense of community similar to that proposed by Southern Oregon. The cluster concept will involve working intimately with clusters of schools, elementary and secondary in six to eight districts at a time, and then cycling into a different set of clusters after one or two years. In this way, it will be possible for Portland State to know the goals and objectives of a district and create a better cooperative arrangement.

An integrated curriculum has been proposed for methods courses to reduce some of the duplication that teachers typically get in terms of pedagogy. Staff teams will work with student teams in a collegial, cooperative arrangement.

The admission criteria include a variety of indicators for admission resulting in a composite score permitting some sensitivity to differences in students’ backgrounds. A program to recruit more minorities into the teaching profession has been started recently. Admissions will be reduced considerably by limiting the intake in any given year by 50% under the new program. This represents a dramatic decrease but is essential in order to do the proposed program well and create a situation where the faculty have time to focus on the students and the programs being proposed.

Dean Everhart emphasized the proposed program proposal itself would not create better teachers or professionalize teaching. The change occurs as a result of the people who implement the program.

Mr. Bailey expressed concern about the opportunity for potential enrollees in the program to have some exposure to the real classroom or teaching environment before embarking on the actual program.

Dr. Everhart said the program included a requirement for the evaluation of a supervisor of the candidate’s ability to work with students. It also is expected students would be placed in a placement setting prior to admission to the program. In summary, a practicum would be a requirement for admission to the program to provide an opportunity for students to test their decision.
Mr. Adams commented that Portland State University had a greater opportunity to admit groups who are under-represented in current educational circles. He asked whether extra emphasis would be placed on making sure these individuals had extra opportunity because of the location of Portland State.

Dr. Everhart responded that the Portland Public Schools, Portland Community College, and Portland State University recently had received a grant to create a program to recruit more minorities into the teaching profession. The goal is to have no fewer than 30 minority students in the program in any given year. This would be a very significant increase over the present number. It is not anticipated that flexibility in the criteria will be necessary in such a long-term project because the plan is to start with students in the middle schools and high schools in preparing them for the possibility of a teaching career.

Mr. Dodson said he assumed some thought had been given to retaining minority students once they were admitted and to making certain they became quality teachers.

Dr. Everhart indicated it was recognized nationally that it was relatively easy to bring people into a program but was much more difficult to retain them. Retention is improved by having much more frequent and higher quality counseling, advising, and tutorial work throughout the undergraduate and graduate work. The cooperative plan incorporates a number of these opportunities.

Mr. Alltucker and Mr. Everhart reiterated the importance of having some actual classroom exposure before students make a commitment to preparing for the teaching profession.

Ms. Wilson referred to the reductions in admissions to teacher education programs at both Southern Oregon State College and Portland State University. She asked how the teacher supply would correlate with the labor market demand in the future.

Dr. Pierce said Oregon has been producing more teachers than were needed for a number of years and it is essential to restrain the number of students graduating from teacher education programs. The projections of student enrollments in Oregon are declining and are not expected to increase dramatically over the next ten years. The age structure of the teaching force is not particularly old so that no large retirement bulge is anticipated in the next few years. Dr. Pierce commented there was a much shorter turn-around time with the proposed fifth-year programs. If unanticipated shortages were to develop, it would be possible to begin to meet the demand within a one-year period.
Mr. Richardson said he was concerned that limiting enrollments based on a surplus of teachers would decrease the number of slots available and would lead to more intense competition for those available slots. At the same time, there is an increased demand for minority teachers in Oregon. Unless some specific language is included relating to minority enrollments in the programs, there may be a problem in maintaining or increasing those enrollments.

Mr. Hensley said Dr. Matthew Prophet, Superintendent of the Portland Public Schools, also had expressed some concern about the grade point requirement as a method of controlling enrollment in terms of its possible impact on the minority community and the potential for developing minority teachers. At the same time, Dr. Prophet has been complimentary as to the willingness of Portland State University to work with the Portland school district. Mr. Hensley agreed the issue should be addressed in some fashion as Mr. Richardson indicated.

Dr. Everhart commented that minority enrollment, especially black minority enrollment, in colleges in general has been decreasing. The issue is more complex than teacher education. He assured the Committee that Portland State University was very sensitive to the needs in this area and it would be a top priority under his administration.

Mr. Miller raised a similar point with respect to out-of-state applicants and limited enrollment slots. However, the number of out-of-state applicants is not large at the present time.

Mr. Richardson asked whether any program dollar reductions would result from the decrease in enrollment or would the improvements offset the savings from the reduction in students.

Dean Everhart said no reductions were anticipated, primarily because half of the present courses are taught by part-time faculty. This is cost effective but does not provide the best educational program. He said his goal was to improve the quality of the program by involving regular faculty more intricately into its operation.

There was a brief discussion of the importance of including foreign language instruction at the various levels of education. It was pointed out that there were a whole series of issues related to foreign language instruction and they should be resolved in a coordinated and cooperative effort after thorough study and analysis.
Board Discussion and Action

The Board action appears above at the conclusion of the item entitled, "Review of Oregon's New Teacher Education Programs."

Staff Report to the Committee

Introduction

The University of Oregon seeks authorization to offer fifth year graduate-level teacher preparation programs leading to basic and standard certification for elementary, secondary, and special education teachers after one calendar year. The programs would provide an option for a master's degree within an additional 12-15 semester hours.

With the initiation of the new teacher preparation program, the University of Oregon also seeks authorization to eliminate its undergraduate-level teacher education programs leading to basic certification for elementary, secondary, and special education teachers; this would occur on a phase-out basis to enable students to complete their currently offered undergraduate programs no later than the end of Spring Term 1991.

The purpose of the extended teacher education programs is to strengthen teacher preparation at the University of Oregon through the requirement of a regular academic major for all prospective teachers, the redesign of undergraduate professional educational courses to a more rigorous graduate level professional curriculum, the testing of students on academic subject matter and pedagogy skills in nationally used tests, and increased field-based experiences in addition to strengthened student teaching experiences with highly qualified supervising teachers in local school districts.

The University of Oregon’s proposal is responsive to the Board’s Strategic Plan 1987-1993 and its subsequent policies regarding the redesign of teacher preparation programs to a five-year sequence of academic preparation, professional education courses, and practicum opportunities. A detailed review of the Board’s guidelines for extended teacher education programs is provided in the attached staff report, "Review of Oregon's New Teacher Education Programs."