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STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING HELD IN THE
FIR ROOM, ERB MEMORIAL UNION, UNIVERSITY OF OREGON
EUGENE, OREGON

June 15, 1989

Meeting #577
A regular meeting of the State Board of Higher Education was held in the Fir Room, Erb Memorial Union, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.

ROLL CALL
The meeting was called to order at 11:00 a.m., June 15, 1989, by the President of the Board, Mr. Richard F. Hensley, and on roll call the following answered present:

Mr. Robert R. Adams
Mr. John W. Alltucker
Mr. Bob Bailey
Mr. Tom Bruggere
Mr. Mark S. Dodson
Mrs. Kasey B. Holwerda

Mr. Gary Johnston
Mr. Rob Miller
Mr. George E. Richardson, Jr.
Ms. Janice J. Wilson
Mr. Richard F. Hensley

Absent: None.

Mr. Les Swanson, Jr., newly-appointed Board member, was also in attendance.

OTHERS PRESENT
Centralized Activities—Chancellor Thomas Bartlett; Secretary Wilma Foster; W. T. Lemmon, Executive Vice Chancellor; John Owen, Vice Chancellor, CCATE; Holly Zanville, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Kay Juran, Acting Vice Chancellor, Public Affairs; George Perstein, Associate Vice Chancellor, Facilities Division; R. S. Perry, Associate Vice Chancellor, Administration and Information Systems Services; Davis Quenzer, Associate Vice Chancellor, Budget and Fiscal Policies; Joe Sicotte, Associate Vice Chancellor, Personnel Administration; Steve Katz, Controller; Jerry Casby, Assistant Attorney General; Melinda Grier, Director, Legal Services; Barbara Barrie, Personnel Officer; James Payne, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Curricular Affairs, and Gary Christensen, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Student Services, Academic Affairs; Ron Anderson, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Personnel Administration; Virginia Thompson, Executive Assistant to the Chancellor; Jim Sellers, Director of Communications; Kimberly Carnegie, Public Affairs Assistant.

Oregon State University—President John Byrne; Graham Spanier, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost; Ed Coate, vice President, Finance and Administration; Stefan Bloomfield, Assistant to the President; Pat Wells, IFS President; Michael Maksud, Dean, College of Health and P. E.
University of Oregon—President Paul Olum; Norman Wessells, Provost; Larry Large, Vice President, Public Affairs; Alison Baker, Executive Assistant to the President; John Moseley, Vice President, Research; Virginia Boushey, Acting Associate Dean, College of Arts and Sciences.

Oregon Health Sciences University—President Peter Kohler; Lesley Hallick, Vice President, Academic Affairs; Robert Koler, Interim Vice President, Academic Affairs.

Portland State University—Interim President R. N. Edgington; Gary Powell, Acting Vice President, Finance and Administration.

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

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

Southern Oregon State College—President Joseph Cox; Ronald Bolstad, Dean of Administration; Stephen Reno, Dean of Academic Affairs.

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

Others—T. K. Olson, Consultant, OEPP; Elizabeth Johnson, President, S. S. Johnson Foundation; Jetta Siegel, Executive Secretary, AAUP; Lynn Pinckney, Executive Director, Oregon Student Lobby; Michael Dawson, President, Graduate Teaching Fellows Federation; Scott Kerlin, Kristine Harper, Jeanette Bauer, Loretta Vitolo, Tylar Merrill, University of Oregon students.

L. M. Swanson, Jr., Welcomed

Mr. Hensley introduced Mr. Leslie M. Swanson, Jr., who recently was appointed to the Board and had completed his appearance before the Senate confirmation committee. He welcomed him to the Board.

MINUTES APPROVED

The Board dispensed with the reading of the minutes of the last regular meeting held on May 19, 1989, and approved them as previously distributed. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Alttucker, Bailey, Bruggere, Dodson, Holwerda, Johnston, Miller, Richardson, Wilson, and Hensley. Those voting no: None.

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

The Chancellor confirmed that Mr. Ron Herndon of Portland had accepted appointment to the Presidential Search Committee for Portland State University. This completes the membership of the committee. The first meeting of the committee will be held on June 22 and will be primarily for organizational purposes.
The Chancellor reported that Governor Goldschmidt, by Executive Order, had established an 11-member Governor's Commission on Higher Education in the Portland Metropolitan Area viewed against the background of state higher education. The chairman of the commission is Don Frisbee, outgoing chairman of PACIFICORP; and the executive director will be Bob Wise, the director of institutional planning at Portland State University, presently on leave. The Chancellor said the identification of outside experts to serve as professional consultants to the commission was nearly completed. The Chancellor indicated he would serve as the State System's liaison and Paul Bragdon would be the Governor's liaison to the commission.

The Chancellor announced that the Oregon Community College Council recently had passed a resolution welcoming the action of the Board in trying to make allowances for community college transfers as the State System enters its enrollment management and ceilings programs.

The Chancellor introduced Dr. Patricia Wells from Oregon State University, the newly-elected president of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate. He called attention to her written report which was distributed to Board members.

The report reviewed the subjects discussed at the meeting of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate in early June. The topics included: Suggestions for promoting higher education in Oregon through appearances before organized groups and clubs, speakers' bureaus, and the promotion of an Alumni Advocate program; a legislative report; suggestions concerning the timely notice proposal; library funding; and faculty involvement in program reduction.

Significant considerations in the appointment of IFS representatives to the two standing committees of the Board of Higher Education were developed and are presented below:

1. One person should be from a university and the other from a college.
2. Representatives should have served on the IFS within the last three years.
3. The appointments should be for two years.
4. Appointees should attend IFS meetings during their term.
5. Appointees should consult with other faculty groups, such as the AOF and AAUP.
6. A list of candidates with background information should be provided to the Chancellor in July to enable him to make the appointments this summer.
L. Pierce and P. Olum, Certificates of Recognition of Dr. Larry Pierce, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and Dr. Paul Olum, President of the University of Oregon:

CERTIFICATE OF RECOGNITION
HONORING
LAWRENCE C. PIERCE

Larry Pierce has invested two decades, 1969-1989, in furthering excellence in the Oregon State System of Higher Education. Beginning his Oregon career teaching political science at the University of Oregon, he became department head, assistant to the Chancellor and, in 1985, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

In the Chancellor’s Office, Larry Pierce became known as the Thomas Jefferson of the strategic plan, working with the Oregon State Board of Higher Education to write the State System’s first long-range planning document. He won the respect of the State System’s provosts and academic deans through his leadership of the Academic Council. He brought many innovative academic programs to the Board, including centers of excellence, higher admission and academic standards, and reform of teacher-education programs. He worked closely with the Governor’s Office and state agencies that sought to show business and industry how public higher education could benefit them if they decided to locate in Oregon. On his own time, he maintained his reputation as an authority on educational finance, including collaborating on a book on the subject.

The Chancellors with whom you have served and the members of the Board thank you for your dedication and loyal service to Oregon public higher education. They wish you satisfaction and success as you assume new endeavors and responsibilities.

CERTIFICATE OF RECOGNITION
HONORING
PAUL OLUM

During eight years as president of the University of Oregon, Paul Olum has earned a reputation as one of that institution’s most popular, respected, and beloved presidents.

Paul Olum led the institution during an era that often experienced too little money for people, salaries, facilities, and equipment. Yet he employed the magic of psychic rewards
to retain and recruit top faculty who in turn lent their talent, energy, and expertise to producing excellence in programs for students. He forged new ties with city officials on projects of academic and economic significance, such as the Riverfront Research Park. He supervised the University’s, and one of Oregon’s, most ambitious construction programs. He became known statewide as an academic leader outspoken in his pursuit of academic excellence and fierce in his defense of academic freedom. If he could be faulted, it would be that he sometimes couldn’t understand why others did not recognize the significance of building and maintaining first-rate universities, a fault that Paul would surely never understand.

Chancellor Thomas Bartlett and the Oregon State Board of Higher Education commend you upon a lifetime of energetic and meritorious service to higher education. In retirement, we wish you the happiness of knowing yours was a job well done combined with the knowledge that it was also a job too big ever to be completed.

Mr. Hensley invited President Olum to address the Board.

President Olum said his 13 years at the University of Oregon had been wonderful. He said he had never thought he wanted to be an administrator and had not done so until he was 56 years old. He said he was quite sure he did not want to be a university president because it was so far from the academic part of the institution. However, if he had followed that inclination, it would have been a terrible mistake because he would have missed the best and most exciting and rewarding thing he had ever done. He said he appreciated the opportunity, especially the opportunities to work with outstanding people.

The Chancellor presented a recommendation from Provost Wessells that Paul Olum be designated President Emeritus of the University of Oregon. The recommendation came with the unanimous and enthusiastic support of the university’s vice presidents and faculty advisory council. Procedures are also underway at the University to designate Dr. Olum as Professor of Mathematics Emeritus.

The Chancellor recommended that the Board approve the designation of Paul Olum as President Emeritus of the University of Oregon.
Mr. Hensley then requested Mrs. Holwerda and Mr. Johnston to read the Certificates of Recognition honoring John Alltucker and Kasey Brooks Holwerda respectively. The certificates appear below:

CERTIFICATE OF RECOGNITION
HONORING
JOHN W. ALLTUCKER

John Alltucker served as a member of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education for more than seven years, 1982-1989, earning a reputation as a Board member who always posed tough questions and never settled for anything less than a full answer in plain English.

As a team player in the best sense of the word, John Alltucker put a businessman-engineer's savvy to work investigating significant questions, seeking correct answers, and weighing implications. He was a leader in various aspects of State System planning and will especially be remembered for heading the Board's long-range planning committee. He was an outspoken advocate of the benefit of athletics to students, he continued to meet eager students in classrooms at Oregon State and Stanford, and he was gracious even on occasions when he was in the minority on Board decisions that ultimately prevailed. As needed, he cheerfully provided the fleet and piloting expertise of Alltucker Airlines to members of the Board and Chancellor's staff.

The Chancellors with whom you served and your colleagues on the Board wish you all the best in your well-deserved "retirement," encourage you to continue your active support of public higher education, and hope you will also now find more time to pursue your fishing, skiing, windsurfing, and other favorite activities.

CERTIFICATE OF RECOGNITION
HONORING
KASEY K. BROOKS


She participated fully, not only in the deliberations of the Board and its Committees, but she also served as vice chair of the Chancellor Search Committee that helped to bring Thomas A. Bartlett back to Oregon. In her Board service, she demonstrated the serious-minded thoughtfulness that surely contributed to her election to Phi Beta Kappa, a
graceful manner in managing the pressures of many responsibilities simultaneously, and a lawyer’s ability to get to the heart of complicated issues.

The Chancellors with whom you have served and your colleagues on the Board thank you for sharing your energies and your talents, and they extend best wishes to you on your marriage, your new law career, and your commitment to public service.

Mr. Alltucker said during the festivities the previous evening he had said farewell as a friend to many of those present and had indicated he would take the opportunity of his last appearance before the Board to offer some professional advice. He said he would like to remind Board members of some problems and suggest some solutions with respect to three general subjects. They are the governance of higher education, the responsibility of Board members, and the accountability that comes with that responsibility. He said during his first five years on the Board there was a sense of a common vision and sense of direction. The things accomplished in that period represented an almost revolutionary change in the State System. He stated that during the last two years, in his opinion, there had not been a serious decision made by the Board that was not first approved by the Governor’s Office. He commented that this was contrary to legislative intent, contrary to Oregon law, and not in the best interests of the future graduates of the state.

Mr. Alltucker indicated he was not totally critical of the Governor and never had been. He said he regarded his presence, his energy, his expressed interest in higher education, and his desire to do something about it as an opportunity that Board members must take advantage of and carry on. A Governor with these qualities offers a tremendous opportunity to Board members for providing him with the necessary direction and leadership to achieve his desire to do something constructive about higher education.

Mr. Alltucker noted all the Board members had now been appointed by Governor Goldschmidt. He said he believed some people on the Governor’s staff would like the Board of Higher Education to become just another department under the Governor’s Office. However, Oregon made a decision this was not the way to go when it established the Board of Higher Education. Board members have a responsibility to see that this does not happen. If they accept their statutory responsibility, Mr. Alltucker said he would envision governance returning to the statute which established a State System that is envied by most of the other states in the nation. If Board members abdicate their responsibility and allow higher education to become just another department in the executive branch of government, Oregon will be poorly served.
Mr. Alltucker then addressed the responsibilities of Board members as he viewed them. He said governors, legislators, Board members, and college presidents change but a college or university cannot be turned off in four or five years, nor can its basic direction or major departmental direction within the individual institution be changed quickly. He said he had hoped to see a long-range plan approved by everyone as the continuum that would allow sensible planning and sensible direction to keep higher education improving every year. He reminded the Board of the things that remain uncompleted in the long-range plan. The first and most important element is to define and clearly articulate the qualities and skills future graduates will need. Once that is accomplished, the curriculum can be revised with some degree of sensibility. He emphasized the necessity for students to learn to understand themselves and to relate to other people.

A second part of the long-range plan which has not been implemented relates to the Oregon Health Sciences University. The institution and its potential has not been clearly understood. As a result, the Board has been unable to give it the support that it needs.

Portland State University represents a third part of the plan that is incomplete. The institution has never been given a clear sense of direction or purpose. He stated the aspirations of some people to make the institution a full-scale, comprehensive research university was not possible in the future economic climate of Oregon. Mr. Alltucker said it was also impossible to close either of the other two major universities simply because they no longer perhaps belong in the locations selected 100 years ago. Portland is unique in that it has an adequate population to support what is needed in a particular discipline or program, but those needs must be identified and the appropriate clientele identified. He commented there has been a substantial change in the attitude of Portland State’s faculty in the last few months. They are eager to cooperate and make Portland State University the best possible institution, and the Board has a responsibility to help them do that.

Mr. Alltucker indicated he had almost completed the chapter on athletics for the Strategic Plan and would mail it to the Board.

Mr. Alltucker said the Board must have the understanding and support of the general public to accomplish its objectives. A top priority must be to gain the understanding and support of the media because they are the means by which the Board communicates with the general public.

In addressing accountability, Mr. Alltucker said he saw a moral crisis in continuing to avoid responding to the issues mentioned above. However, if the Board fulfilled its responsibilities, he could envision the Oregon State System of Higher Education as
being the envy of the entire country. In closing, Mr. Alltucker expressed his regret at leaving the Board when so many things remained unfinished but said he would always remember the many friends he had made. He then commended the presidents, Board members, and the Chancellor's staff for their leadership. In conclusion, he emphasized to the media that higher education needed their support and thanked them for their fair and accurate reporting during his years on the Board.

Mrs. Holwerda said her tenure on the Board had been a wonderful experience. She especially thanked Mr. Richardson and the members of the Chancellor's Search Committee for the opportunities provided and for their faith in her abilities.

The Board then adopted the four resolutions as presented and approved the designation of Dr. Paul Olum as President Emeritus of the University of Oregon. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Alltucker, Bailey, Bruggere, Dodson, Holwerda, Johnston, Miller, Richardson, Wilson, and Hensley. Those voting no: None.

Mr. Hensley congratulated the four individuals and expressed the Board's deepest heartfelt thanks for their service.

Staff Report to the Committee

Background

The Board approved Guidelines for an Extended Teacher Education Program on June 19, 1987. In the guidelines the Board directed the State System's schools of education to redesign within an 18-month period 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 a one-year graduate teacher education program.

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

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

- Extend teacher education 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.

- Require all students to complete a baccalaureate degree in a major outside of education. The undergraduate major in education should be eliminated.

- 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.

- Provide early exposure to classroom situations for undergraduates considering careers in teaching. Make field experiences available to all undergraduates regardless of whether they intend to enter five-year programs or post-baccalaureate programs.

- During the fifth year, students should be considered graduate students and at least 50% of the coursework should apply toward a master's degree. Students should complete all the academic requirements for Standard certification at the end of the fifth year.

- Establish distinctive post-baccalaureate programs that encourage graduates who may not have taken education courses previously to enter the teaching profession. These accelerated graduate programs should be high quality and rigorous. They should be designed to enable students to complete the academic requirements for Standard certification in one year. Institutions 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.

- The post-baccalaureate fee policy should be extended to students in the fifth year, even though fifth-year students are graduate level students.

- The special education courses and endorsement requirements should be integrated into the extended programs and post-baccalaureate programs.
Courses should be included that focus on multi-ethnic and multi-cultural education.

Well-prepared students should be recruited to teacher education programs and special emphasis should be given to recruitment of minority students.

High admission standards should be implemented.

The extended teacher education proposals the Board reviewed from Eastern Oregon State College, Oregon State University/Western Oregon State College, University of Oregon, Portland State University, and Southern Oregon State College involved hundreds of faculty in the colleges of education and liberal arts and about a thousand public school administrators and teachers. As part of the development process at the institutions, the old undergraduate education curriculum has been eliminated, undergraduate academic majors for prospective students are in the process of being strengthened, and new graduate education courses are being developed. Thousands of hours have been spent working out the problems related to the design of new programs and obtaining curricular and faculty senate committee approvals for the proposed changes.

In preparing their programs, the schools of education have had to consider not only the Board’s Guidelines (above) but also the standards required by the national accrediting agency, National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), and the standards of the state certification agency, the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC).

Shortly after the Board approved its Guidelines in 1987, the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission adopted 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. The Teacher Standards and Practices Commission subsequently revised its standards by removing all reference to the master’s degree but the Commission still prohibits required undergraduate education courses.

HB 3038

Since the Board approved the fifth-year programs in January 1989, HB 3038 was introduced in the Legislature. HB 3038 as originally drafted called for all institutions that request approval of fifth-year programs by the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission also to have approved four-year programs. Since Eastern
Oregon State College is the only campus with its fifth-year program approved by the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission, the Bill would have affected all but one of the System's institutions offering teacher education.

HB 3038 received considerable debate in the Legislature. Higher education's process for consulting with teachers, administrators, students, and faculty was called into question. Also questioned were the decisions of all but one campus not to offer a new professional master's degree in education after the completion of one year of graduate level work, the lack of strong undergraduate components in education and related academic prerequisites for those students who know as undergraduates they want to be a teacher, and the costs of the fifth year to students and school districts who employ these graduates. HB 3038 was approved by the House despite concerns raised by the Board, the institutions of the State System, and others who testified against the Bill.

When HB 3038 was heard in Senate Education Committee, it was amended to permit institutions to offer programs that have required undergraduate teacher education components, opening the door for five-year programs that previously were not allowed by TSFC Standards. The Bill also requires that public higher education institutions provide a diversity of four- and five-year teacher preparation programs by 1991. (A copy of the amended Bill was provided to the Committee.)

Impact of HB 3038 on State System Teacher Education Programs

Since the Board's 1987 policy directed the institutions to eliminate their four-year programs with the expectation that fifth-year programs would be implemented no later than fall 1990, the Board's policy will now need to be reconsidered.

Eastern Oregon State College's program begins in summer 1989, and Portland State University begins a pilot fifth-year program in the fall of 1989. All institutions but Eastern Oregon State College are currently preparing their programs for review by the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission and subsequent review by NCATE. Students have been advised to prepare for admission to fifth-year programs.

In order to secure approval of an amended HB 3038, one which would not require all institutions to have dual four- and five-year programs in place by 1991, the Chancellor and presidents of the institutions have agreed that four-year programs may be able to be offered at more than one, but not all institutions. Institutions will need time to plan new four-year programs since the old programs have been phased out. It is the hope of the Schools of Education that many of the reforms proposed for the fifth-year programs may be accommodated in the four-year program, particularly the emphasis on undergraduate academic majors.
Recent data from the institutions also indicate that 44% of students currently enrolled in teacher education programs systemwide are already post-baccalaureates, with some two thirds of these prospective secondary teachers and about one third prospective elementary teachers. Institutions must keep these demographic trends in mind when planning for four- and five-year programs. There will need to be systemwide enrollment management to keep an appropriate balance among post-baccalaureate and undergraduate program options.

The Issue of the Merged School of Education at Oregon State University/Western Oregon State College

At the point of the five-year anniversary of the OSU/WOSC School of Education, and in response to growing concerns about problems associated with the partially merged school, an external review team was formed to advise the Chancellor about the future of the arrangement. In November 1987, the team conducted a site visit of the School of Education for the purpose of reviewing how the merger could be strengthened.

After reviewing self-study documents, budget data, statements by accreditation review agencies, a three-day site visit providing input from students, faculty, administration, and personnel from cooperating agencies, the four-person review team was unanimous in its opinion that the "merger be discontinued." The team’s April 1988 report to the Board cited many reasons for its conclusion that the merger had become counter-productive, including the different missions of the two institutions, the difficulties encountered in managing the merger, and the few gains that had resulted for the amount of work required in the merger. The review team also recommended replacing the merger with cooperative agreements designed to maintain the gains achieved by the merger.

In its report to the Board on April 15, 1988, the Board’s staff agreed that the review team’s descriptions of the difficulties facing the OSU/WOSC School of Education were accurate. Nevertheless, after reviewing the team’s findings with the presidents of Oregon State University and Western Oregon State College, staff recommended the continuation of the merged School of Education. There were thought to be a number of academic, financial, and political reasons for the merger to continue.

The Board, therefore, asked that the Presidents of the two institutions continue to move forward with the merger and strengthen it by taking a number of steps related to merging specific programs, developing joint extended (fifth-year) programs, moving Teaching Research to become part of the merged school, and reporting to the Board on an annual basis what steps had been taken to make progress in implementing the various recommendations of the review team and staff.
During discussions of HB 3038 and with continued pressure for more diversity among State System teacher education programs, it became increasingly problematic to ask the faculty of Western Oregon State and Oregon State University — institutions with two different missions — to continue the type of hand-in-hand planning required as part of the merged approach. The presidents of Oregon State University and Western Oregon State College alerted Chancellor Bartlett to the special problems this new context was placing on their ability to respond to the Board's directive to "make the merger work."

In spring 1989, therefore, Chancellor Bartlett asked administrators at Oregon State University, Western Oregon State College, and the University of Oregon to look at the needs for building diversity and complementarity among their programs with the recognition that all contribute programs for the geographical region of the mid-Willamette Valley. The institutions were asked to examine the feasibility of coordinated, cooperatively planned programs as a better alternative to continuing the merger.

Several meetings among the three institutions resulted in the conclusion that HB 3038 would require the type of diversity among institutions that would be prohibitively awkward under the structure of the OSU/WOSC merged school. It was the recommendation of the presidents, as part of the goal of achieving diversity, that complementary and coordinated programs would be more efficient than maintaining the merger.

In May, therefore, the provosts and deans of the schools of education at Oregon State University, Western Oregon State College, and the University of Oregon reviewed their plans to build more complementarity among their programs with Chancellor Bartlett. The new plans — still preliminary — call for the following:

. The University of Oregon would further reduce its student enrollments in teacher education and emphasize five-year programs that would draw upon the major research mission of the University.

. Oregon State University would emphasize its land-grant mission, reducing enrollments in elementary education and specializing in early childhood education (drawing on resources of Human Development and Family Science in the College of Home Economics). The University would emphasize five-year programs in areas of greatest strength (for example, mathematics and sciences). It would retain those areas for which it has sole responsibility (home economics, agricultural education) and develop a cooperative industrial arts program with Oregon Institute of Technology.

. Western Oregon State College would emphasize four-year preparation programs for elementary and secondary students.
Staff Recommendation to the Committee

1. In order to comply with the expectation that HB 3038 would be passed by the Legislature, the staff recommended that the Board had no choice but to rescind its 1987 policy authorizing the institutions to eliminate four-year preparation programs and plan extended programs for implementation no later than fall 1990. The staff recommended that the Board replace the 1987 policy with one that directs the institutions to offer a diversity of four- and five-year teacher education programs in the State System no later than fall 1991.

2. State System institutions with a mission to provide teacher preparation programs should immediately begin to plan for this greater diversity. Planning for diversity should consider the demographic needs of students, the missions of the institutions, geographical needs of communities, supply and demand realities, and resource constraints of the institutions and System. Perhaps one institution should offer a five-year program only, another a four-year program only, and others a combination of four- and five-year programs. Where feasible, institutions should plan five-year integrated programs in line with guidelines provided by the Board in 1987 and now made possible by HB 3038. It should be understood that it will not be possible to provide all options at all institutions. In order to ensure diversity and appropriate enrollment management of teacher education programs, the final array and enrollment goals of programs should be viewed within a systemwide context.

3. Oregon State University and Western Oregon State College should discontinue the merged School of Education and plan complementary programs among their two institutions and with nearby institutions, specifically the University of Oregon and Portland State University. Within six months, the presidents of Oregon State University and Western Oregon State College should report to the Board about progress made in terminating the merger and moving to more specialized programs at each of the institutions.

4. Pursuant to the requirements of HB 3038, institutions should return to the Board no later than September 1989 with preliminary proposals for a more diverse framework of teacher preparation programs. Institutions planning four-year programs should adopt as many of the Board's standards outlined in the 1987 Guidelines as is feasible within the four-year undergraduate sequence.
5. Institutions should continue to place the highest priority on accommodating those students caught within the transition to expanded options in teacher education, with an emphasis on effective advising during this disruptive period of program redesign.

6. The Board should request that the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission consider expanding its requirement of the Standard Certificate for all teachers. This would ensure that elementary teachers completing four-year preparation programs would also complete a fifth year of training for permanent certification as is now required of secondary teachers in Oregon.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

In presenting the staff report, Dr. Holly Zarville emphasized the necessity for developing enrollment caps in order to use care in the number of students able to enter a four-year option in line with the increasing post-baccalaureate population interested in entering teacher education.

The Chancellor said the new law, as developed out of the HB 3038 initiative represented a challenge for the State System to relate its six programs of teacher preparation more closely than ever before. Each one will now have to be seen as part of a total state system because the law requires certain characteristics of teacher preparation be provided for the state as a whole. Different campus programs will be selecting different parts of that whole to emphasize. Since the law requires that a number of things be done without additional resources, it will be important to increase the degree of specialization at each institution. The Chancellor said this inevitably would necessitate enrollment ceilings to achieve a sense of the size and characteristics of the programs on each of the campuses.

Mr. Adams inquired about the statement in the Bill with respect to the number of four-year programs which must be offered. The Chancellor said there were various interpretations of the language but it was his impression there was a pretty wide latitude in the number provided.

The Chancellor said he had discovered the student population for the four-year program was not as large as might be expected since almost half of the students already have baccalaureate degrees. A large proportion of the remainder decide to become teachers late enough in their undergraduate academic careers so that they could not complete a four-year program in any event. It would
appear that, on the basis of the student population, about 28% would be potential candidates for a four-year program. He indicated it would be impossible financially to have both programs on all campuses so there would be substantial specialization. It is expected that three, or perhaps four, of the institutions will have some element of four-year preparation in their programs.

Dr. Zanville pointed out that many students, both undergraduate and fifth-year or older students, are not very free to move. An effort will be made to provide four-year options at diverse campuses, but a four-year option will not be available everywhere and there will be some unhappy students.

The Chancellor stated the Legislature understood this would be an impossibility because of the problem of resources.

Mrs. Holwerda inquired how the decisions would be coordinated and who would determine the plan for each institution. Dr. Zanville replied that she had been meeting on a regular basis with the deans of the schools of education. The provosts, presidents, and the Chancellor also have been involved in these discussions. The available faculty will be assembled during the summer for discussions of what can be done best at their campuses in line with their missions and the demographic profile of their students. The information will then be considered from a systemwide perspective to be certain there is adequate diversity throughout the State System. It will also be essential to have an early session with the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission because the Commission approves the teacher education programs. It will not be possible to implement any of the fifth-year programs until the Commission is satisfied the four-year programs are on line or near completion.

Mr. Bailey said his biggest concern was to be certain everyone involved was in agreement with the proposals so that the Board would not face the issue again in the next Legislative Session.

Dr. Zanville said her office would be working with the interim committee of legislators. The Oregon Education Association, and the Oregon Federation of Teachers, and other groups will be involved in the design of these programs. Every effort will be made also to gain the support of the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission. This process should help everyone to understand the problems encountered during the next two years.

Mr. Bruggere inquired whether passage of the Bill and the subsequent development of four- and five-year programs would result in adequate preparation of teachers for the next century or be a mini-disaster for the State System.

Dr. Zanville said the proposal would create a difficult situation to resolve. She said faculty and staff were not convinced the graduates of the four-year programs would be comparable with
the graduates of the fifth-year program, although every effort would be made to have that happen. If efforts were successful to encourage the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission to establish the standard, or fifth-year, requirement for elementary teachers, it would be very beneficial. Without that, graduates of the four-year programs probably would not have enough time to complete the kind of preparation they should have and could complete during a five-year program.

The Chancellor said the legislation provided some flexibility which was not available earlier. It also had the imperative for providing a four-year stream. The challenge is to make the best of the situation even though it is an unnecessary and probably inappropriate piece of legislation. If the key notion can be salvaged that teacher preparation should have a significant component of fundamental disciplines in addition to methods and education courses, it will be possible to convert the decision to something that has benefits as well as difficulties. The fifth-year direction is also in line with the national trend, and Oregon probably will be caught up in that movement.

Dr. Zanville said the Oregon Education Association had made a commitment that, if an evaluation in about two years revealed a significant difference between four-year graduates and the fifth-year graduates, the organization would work to repeal this part of the legislation.

Mr. Bruggere commented that, if various groups supported actions which appeared to be drastic mistakes, he did not think the Board should simply accept those decisions.

Mr. Hensley said he had participated in the statewide hearings and believed that the Board had been headed in the proper direction when it approved the policy now being amended. The problem which surfaced during the legislative process will not disappear. However, the leaders of the Education Committee were responsive and sensitive to the issue. The proposed amendment represents a compromise. Mr. Hensley said he would not consider the compromise to be the best plan for teacher education but it gives the Board some flexibility to prove what can be done with a fifth year program. He complimented the deans of education for their responsiveness to this particular issue and emphasized the work which was required on each campus to develop the proposal. The situation had been very difficult throughout the negotiations. He said he viewed the recommendations before the Board as an opportunity to demonstrate that it was possible to continue with the four-year program and expand it to develop the quality through an eventual fifth year. Mr. Hensley said he did not enjoy going backward but felt it was necessary in this case.
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Mr. Dodson requested comments from the presidents of Oregon State University and Western Oregon State College as to the benefits of terminating the merger of the OSU/WOSC School of Education.

President Byrne reviewed briefly the efforts made by the two institutions toward achieving a successful merger. If the four plus one program were allowed to go forward, he indicated Oregon State University would choose that five-year program.

President Byrne said the difficulties he perceived with the merger were due to having a major university and an excellent four-year college attempting to merge in a situation where there were a number of fundamental differences. He said there were fundamental philosophical differences with regard to management of a large university and a four-year college. There are differences in salary structure and in the character of the standards used to measure competence of faculty which also have been impediments to the merger. Some of the programs have worked very well and those cooperative ventures could continue without forcing an administrative merger which has been the area of greatest difficulty. The goal should be the preparation of the best possible elementary and secondary teachers.

Dr. Bill Cowart, Provost at Western Oregon State College, said President Byrne had described the problem very well. Both institutions made every effort to have a successful merger. He concurred that the major beneficial aspects could be maintained through cooperative agreements. The most graphic element has surfaced in the differing missions of the institutions. The institutions have made the merger work for seven years in spite of fundamental differences. He noted that Oregon State had experienced need for a greater degree of administrative reorganization than had Western. The merger seriously restricts its ability to address issues of that kind.

The Chancellor said in a sense the programs never were merged. The merger had to be a real merger with one program, one faculty, one identity, and one administration. That never occurred. The merger consisted of an administrative merger without merging the faculties and removing them from their separate institutional settings into a separate entity. When the issues involved with the HB 3038 surfaced, the burden seemed excessive to try to maintain a single administration for two separate, identifiable kinds of style, mission, and program. It seemed wiser to implement an arrangement which had close coordination of complementary but different programs.

President Byrne and Dr. Cowart emphasized that teacher education programs in the State System should avoid duplication and complement offerings at other institutions. In this way, programs at
each of the institutions will be enhanced and teachers prepared who will have completed very rigorous programs and be very attractive to the educational community throughout the country, not just in Oregon. There is a great opportunity to look at the State System and see where the specializations should occur.

Mr. Richardson requested further information about the recommendation to add Portland State University to the coordinating group of three institutions addressing the needs pertaining to teacher education for the Willamette Valley.

Dr. Zanville explained that, as Oregon State University, the University of Oregon, and Western Oregon State College considered how to build more coordinated and complementary programs, it had become obvious Portland State University should be added to the group because it serves a somewhat similar geographic region in terms of the movement of students. As the next level of discussions begins, Portland State will be included.

Mr. Dodson said the Board should give a lot of deference to the people who are in the position of having to merge programs. A merger may look politically astute from the Board's standpoint, but it may look entirely different to those having to accomplish the merger. He said he was assuming many of the obstacles encountered in the education merger might apply to any other kind of program which might be proposed for merger.

President Byrne said that would be true to the extent one really attempted to merge something. As the Chancellor indicated, the OSU/WOSC education merger was a very special kind of merger in that there was still a degree of separation which existed. It was a noble experiment which gained national attention, and it had the appearance of having worked well. However, it was done at considerable cost. He said if the same sorts of cooperation and coordination could be achieved without trying the administrative merger, everyone would benefit.

Mr. Hensley commented that his only concern was the fact there were still people in the Legislature who were critical of the Board from the standpoint of duplication. The merger was a move in at least the one field of professional education to be sensitive to the duplication issue. He said there would be further criticism when people did not understand what the Board was doing. He asked how the institutions planned to communicate their message to the public.

President Byrne indicated it would be important to be very visible and to demonstrate all of these things were not being done at each of the institutions. The programs will have special emphasis in selected areas, and they must mesh. Institutions must
avoid unnecessary duplication. The teacher education plan represents an outstanding opportunity to avoid duplication and begin to enhance the quality of the people graduating from the teacher education programs.

Dr. Cowart emphasized that after this experience, the coordination could be achieved without the added administrative costs and restrictions.

The Chancellor stated the programs at each of the institutions will have quite different characters. There will be some overlaps at the margins, but basically the programs will be very distinguishable programs in teacher education. The problem will be to communicate that fact to the public. The challenge now is to develop complementary programs, implement them, and communicate that adequately to the Legislature and the public.

Mr. Hensley inquired whether the September 1989 date was realistic for a preliminary report to the Board. The Chancellor indicated it was an ambitious target but it was essential to expedite the process because of the short time frame for the transition.

Mr. Hensley asked whether the Eastern Oregon State College proposal would be changed as a result of the recommendations before the Board. Dr. Zanville said Eastern would implement its fifth-year program with the summer term and would have the option of returning to the Board along with the other institutions, if it reached a decision to request adding a small four-year program primarily to serve elementary students.

Mr. Richardson said legislative discussions the previous day regarding HB 3038 had raised the issue of what assurances were built into the system so that individuals already enrolled in the four-year programs would not be impacted adversely by those institutions that go to a fifth-year program in 1991.

Dr. Zanville said it was understood at all the institutions that students who were far enough along in their training that they could finish under their current four-year program would be able to do so. Those students who are now freshmen and sophomores, however, who were advised that they should prepare for a fifth-year program already essentially have been stopped. They probably will not be able to finish under a four-year program at most campuses. This is causing a lot of discomfort. She said it has been difficult for faculty to advise them because the staff has not known which options would be available at which institutions. Efforts are being made to accommodate those students. She commented the situation is further complicated by the need to reduce the overall numbers. Some students who believe they should be able to finish under a four-year program may not be able to be
admitted now into a fifth-year or a four-year program because of the competition for the overall slots. Several problems must be addressed at the same time dealing with enrollment management and the transition to fifth-year now back to some four-year options.

The Chancellor said it was anticipated the net result of all of this would be fewer people in teacher preparation.

Mr. Richardson commented that the legislator who had raised the question of the impact on students was supportive of the proposal but the Board should be sensitive to those concerns.

Dr. Zanville stated HB 3038 gives the State System until 1991 to have all of the programs in place. However, because of the problem with students, every effort is being made to develop enough options available very quickly in order to accommodate them.

Mr. Richardson reported that Representative Kiesling, who had carried the Bill on the floor, had stated it was his understanding the State System was taking all necessary precautions to make certain students would not be impacted adversely.

Dr. Zanville said some students would be hurt and the staff was doing all it could to alleviate the situation. Any transition is awkward, and this one is especially awkward because of the need to reduce numbers. She indicated it would be possible to give the Board some idea of the headcount that might be affected at the time the September report was presented.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendations as presented.

Board Discussion and Action

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

Program Reductions/Reorganizations

Staff Report to the Committee

Background

Governor Goldschmidt’s budget for state agencies requires that they fund internally, through reallocation, one-half of their proposed salary increases (4%) during each of the two years of the 1989-1991 biennium (also called the 2+2 percent budget cut). For the universities the reductions were to be 2+2 percent, for the regional colleges the reductions were to be 1+1 percent.
For months, the State System institutions have been planning for leaner academic, service, and research programs consistent with the need to reallocation funds for faculty salaries. With the hope that higher education’s required cutbacks will amount to one-half of the original target, the Chancellor instructed the institutions to prepare cutbacks consistent with that hope. The amount identified for systemwide reallocation for the 1989-1991 biennium thus becomes $7,997,227 (this includes General Fund and other funds). Amounts by institution/division are as follows:

University of Oregon $2,188,000  
Oregon State University $2,260,000  
Portland State University $1,265,000  
Oregon Health Sciences University $1,244,000  
Eastern Oregon State College $ 116,000  
Southern Oregon State College $ 229,000  
Western Oregon State College $ 191,000  
Oregon Institute of Technology $ 174,000  
Other (Includes Centralized Activities, OCATE, Teaching Research Division, & Child Development & Rehabilitation Center.) $ 330,227

Program Changes Needing Board Approval

On April 21, 1989, the Board delegated to the Chancellor the authority to approve unit name changes, departmental reorganizations, and deletion of options from approved programs. These types of requests are currently under review by the Chancellor as institutions submit their plans of program reductions/reorganizations. The Board continues to exercise the responsibility for approving the following types of reductions and reorganizations that are being proposed by some institutions:

. elimination of academic degree programs
. elimination of centers/institutes
. timely notices to tenured faculty.

During June and July, institutions will submit their final proposed program reductions/reorganizations to the Chancellor and Board. Following are the program changes that require Board review and approval in June:

Elimination of Degree Programs

OSU B.S. Agricultural Engineering  
OSU B.S. Agricultural Engineering Technology  
OSU B.S. Soil Science  
OSU B.S. Speech Impaired Education  
OSU B.S. Program in Speech Pathology and Audiology  
OSU Craft Design Program in Department of Art