MINUTES OF THE JOINT MEETING OF THE
OREGON STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
and the
OREGON STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

October 24, 1991

MEMBERS PRESENT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oregon State Board of Education</th>
<th>Oregon State Board of Higher Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G. Dale Weight, Chair</td>
<td>George E. Richardson, Jr., President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeana Woolley, Vice Chair</td>
<td>Robert Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anita Decker</td>
<td>Bob Bailey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Hewett</td>
<td>Britteny Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Kruse</td>
<td>Mark Dodson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Massey</td>
<td>Christopher Halsey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felipe Veloz</td>
<td>Beverly Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rob Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leslie Swanson, Jr.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Others in attendance: Superintendent of Public Instruction Norma Paulus; Chancellor Thomas A. Bartlett; Dale Parnell, Community College Commissioner; Dana Anderson, Oregon Community College Association; Larry Austin, Oregon Department of Education; President Bob Barber, Central Oregon Community College; Jan Bargen, State Senate Office; Roger Bassett, Oregon State System of Higher Education; Joyce Holmes Benjamin, Oregon Department of Education; Marjorie Bevins, IFS; Francesca Clifford, Chancellor's Office; Sue Coward, Eastern Oregon State College; Pat Fitzwater, Oregon School Boards Association; LeRoy Gornick, Oregon Education Association; Sharon Gray, Office of Educational Policy and Planning; J.D. Hoye, Oregon Department of Education/Office of Community College Services; Dale Hess, Oregon State System of Higher Education; Donna Jensen, IFS; Kenneth Jones, Legislative Fiscal Office; President Paul Kreider, Mt. Hood Community College; Vera Katz, Oregon State Representative; Marilynn Keyser, Governor's Office; Marilyn Lane, Oregon Department of Education; Larry Large, Chancellor's Office; Deborah Lincoln, Office of Community College Services; Dixie Maurer-Clemens, Oregon Education Association; President Dan Moriarty, Portland Community College; Wayne Neuburger, Oregon Department of Education; Paul Plath, State Board of Education Advisor; Don Shore, Oregon Education Association; Joe Simon, Oregon Education Association; Viviane Simon-Brown, COCHE Director; David Small, Executive Department; Virginia L. Thompson, Oregon State System of Higher Education; Sharon Toland, Oregon Department of Education; John Westine, Office of Educational Policy and Planning; and Holly Zanville, Oregon State System of Higher Education.

CALL TO ORDER

The joint meeting of the Oregon State Board of Education and the Oregon State Board of Higher Education was called to order at 1:15 p.m. on Thursday, October 24, 1991, at Portland Community College, Sylvania Campus, Portland, by G. Dale Weight, Chair of the Oregon State Board of Education. Both Boards had quorums.

MINUTES APPROVED

Beverly Jackson moved, seconded by Don Kruse, that the minutes of the joint meeting held on January 18, 1991, be approved as previously distributed. The motion passed unanimously.
Chair Weight announced that the Oregon State Board of Higher Education and the Oregon State Board of Education have submitted a joint proposal to the National Science Foundation for funding of a statewide initiative for improving math, science, and technology. The proposal will involve the Oregon elementary and secondary schools and will have a strong staff development and teacher preparation component. Wayne Neuburger, Oregon Department of Education, and Holly Zanville, Chancellor's Office, are the co-directors of the project. The two Boards will be responsible for setting the policies related to the implementation of the proposal and coordinating the efforts at the two levels. The proposal also calls for an advisory council comprised of representatives of elementary and secondary education, higher education, business and industry. This multimillion dollar request could assist Oregon as the state aims to have the best educated workforce by the year 2000. Chair Weight complimented the two Boards and their staffs on this effort.

Chair Weight recognized Dan Moriarty, president of Portland Community College. He thanked President Moriarty and his staff for their hospitality and the help with the many arrangements.

Chair Weight called on Bob Bailey, Oregon State Board of Higher Education, and Jeana Woolley, Oregon State Board of Education, representing their respective Boards, to address how the agenda topics were developed for today's meeting.

Bob Bailey informed Board members that the Boards are required by ORS 348.090 to meet once a year. Governor Roberts issued an Executive Order on May 24, 1991, asking that the Boards meet together to address mutual concerns and issues. House Bill 3565, the Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century, sets out many issues that need to be addressed jointly. The Boards also are meeting because of the responsibility they bear to the citizens of Oregon as the custodians of the state's educational resources; there is a particular need to address Ballot Measure 5 issues and other problems. A committee, comprised of Board members and staff from both Boards, has met to develop the agenda: Access and Articulation, Assessment and Accountability, Teacher Preparation, and Governance.

Jeana Woolley said that the committee set these four topics as having priority for mutual discussion. She acknowledged the work of the committee and collaborative efforts with the staffs from Higher Education, Community Colleges, and the Department of Education in preparing the papers. She believes the agenda provides a good beginning for setting forth the kinds of issues that need to be considered jointly.

J.D. Hoye, associate superintendent, Division of Vocational Technical Education, Oregon Department of Education, reported on the major issues concerning Access and Articulation (Addendum A). She distributed copies of a three-dimensional schematic of the reforms that are recommended in House Bill 3565 in terms of the relationships that need to be developed between programs and educational delivery systems. It is hoped to move the schematic to a computerized system in order for each strand to be set out to show the relationships, K through adult, in terms of courses, curriculum development, and teacher preparation. A major theme is "seamless delivery," used to describe the concept of students being able to begin and follow through on a
program that is relevant to them throughout the educational process. Education should be seamless; at present, however, barriers may prevent transfer from one program to another. A seamless education would assure that the delivered services are related to one another to serve the student no matter what system is delivering those services.

Ms. Hoye identified two major issues: (1) the articulation of the relationship between the K-12 system, the community college system, and the system of higher education; and (2) the concept of access. With the reform effort, access must be available to all students no matter what system they are in and an integrated curriculum must be developed for the student’s benefit. Ms. Hoye encouraged the use of technology that would begin to allow the classroom to be seen not as a room in a school building (be that K-12, community college, or higher education) but as part of an educational delivery system; the system needs to be broadened to provide access to education no matter where people are located in the state. Methodology and curriculum are needed that encourage students from all backgrounds to believe they can access all parts of the educational system to achieve the occupational focus they need to reach the goal that they seek.

Shirley Clark, vice chancellor for Academic Affairs for OSSHE, complemented Ms. Hoye’s remarks by presenting additional background information. In Oregon, according to data developed by the Office of Educational Policy and Planning, gradually increasing proportions of high school graduating classes have chosen to attend colleges and universities in the fall following their graduation. At present, this is about 54 percent of students, including those who choose to go to postsecondary or higher education institutions out-of-state. She also noted that employment data developed by the Oregon Employment Division indicate that certain occupational sectors, such as the professional, managerial, and technical ones, have grown very rapidly in the last decade and are expected to continue to grow in this decade. Therefore, to meet the needs of Oregon’s economy and society for a well-educated work force, students need to have access to well-developed, well-supported, and well-articulated systems of education to move smoothly and logically from one level to another. As referenced by Ms. Hoye, it should be a system in which students of diverse backgrounds, ethnicity, abilities, and interests are all accommodated. Articulation from higher education extends through a school relations program particularly into the high schools; it includes visits and development of materials and intersector curricular committees, advisory groups of school administrators and counselors, as well as teachers of subject matter, to give advice about curricular matters. There are two committees through which much of the articulation with community colleges has been accomplished. One of these is the ten-year-old State System/Community College Coordinating Council or the SS/CCCC. A comparable committee is the House Bill 2913 Committee created legislatively in 1987 to: (1) assure that an academic block transfer degree program would be devised to improve the transfer relationship of Oregon Community College students into the four-year institutions; and (2) make progress on the common course numbering of general education courses. Reports given in recent months suggest that the block transfer program is being implemented by the community colleges; about 100 of those students who are graduates of the AA transfer program are already in the four-year institutions. The roles of these two committees overlap considerably; they have essentially the same membership and agenda. The
staff has suggested evaluating these mechanisms to determine how adequately they work with the high schools involved to establish an appropriate level and scope of preparation requirements for admission to college-level work in various disciplines. There are two things occurring simultaneously. First, Oregon has chosen a very innovative path of curricular restructuring that will have impact of unknown proportions on the college admissions and entry process; and second, at the same time around the country, many states have developed increased expectations for college preparation requirements to include more math, science, and two years of a foreign language. This is part of relating the performance of students to internationally referenced standards. There are a number of challenges to meet, and articulation is one of the areas in which it is imperative for the Boards and their staffs to work effectively together.

Commissioner Parnell commended the state of Oregon and the two Boards for the work that has been done in the area of articulation, particularly as it relates to transfer between community colleges and the universities or colleges. Oregon is now ready to take the next step in that area. He suggested three items for consideration:

- Establishment of one committee rather than two;
- Development of incentives and rewards to encourage faculty members at universities to meet with faculty members in community colleges or to meet with colleagues in the high schools to develop a seamless curriculum; and
- Development of the applied academics curriculum.

Commissioner Parnell said that he and Gary Christensen (OSSHE) recently met with their colleagues. On higher education's list of high school courses that are not acceptable for admittance into college were applied physics, applied biochemistry, applied math, and applied communication. They were listed apparently because they seemed unfamiliar. At that meeting, it was concluded that faculty members at all levels (high school, community college, and university) should meet to examine the content and quality of those courses—to see if they could be included among the courses that students may take in high school that would be acceptable for admittance into the university. Commissioner Parnell believes that the articulation effort has had success in the liberal arts and the associate arts degree areas. However, there has been no similar success in the professional/technical education areas.

Superintendent Paulus said that she had met with the head of the economics department at Portland State University who explained that the same problem occurred with the transfer of economic courses between community colleges and Portland State.

Ruth Hewett stated that she supports the recommendation that the Boards look at the incentives to encourage articulation; she believes that the work of the committees could be consolidated. She recommended that the Boards proceed in this endeavor. One of the most serious issues in the reform agenda is the educational reform at the end of the tenth grade. There need to be discussions between staff and Board members to guarantee that applied courses in certain areas are transferable.
Chancellor Bartlett remarked that the concern is to increase confidence in personnel in the sense of the content of the course. The most important part of articulation is likely to be curricular articulation. A common understanding needs to be established of what students should experience by the time they are through the fifth grade, the eighth grade, and the tenth grade. These stages relate to each other and follow a pattern. Getting faculty together at all levels is essential.

Rob Miller asked if there are models in the United States for the Joint Boards to review. He said it is important to confer with faculty, but it is important also to confer with the private sector.

Commissioner Parnell responded that Florida has a fairly good model of articulation, particularly between the public four-year colleges and universities and the community colleges; but, he added, Oregon is about as good as any state. He believes that Oregon needs to take the next step now in articulation.

Felipe Veloz said that the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC) has a significant impact on the evaluation of programs, what is taught, and how it should be taught. TSPC also needs to be a part of this effort.

George Richardson commented that it is appropriate for the Boards to reflect on the importance of Head Start through higher education. For many, this is critical.

Beverly Jackson asked Ms. Hoye to explain why there was a difference between the liberal arts area, where articulation is successful, and the difficulties and barriers that exist within the technical/professional areas.

Ms. Hoye responded that over the years not as much value has been placed on skills developed in technical/professional training as on those developed in higher education training. Historically, there has been image difficulty as well. The professional/technical programs do not necessarily require a four-year degree but do require additional training beyond high school. The whole reform movement focuses and refocuses the study of math, science, and English as key issues within the professional/technical curriculum rather than separate and unrelated efforts.

Superintendent Paulus underscored Commissioner Parnell’s comments, emphasizing the need to have faculty-to-faculty discussions and discussions with Higher Education and Department of Education staff. There is an immediate need to infuse more science and math into the K-12 curriculum, and the system does not ensure that the K-12 direction is going to be accepted or supported by Higher Education. A system (to accomplish that task) should be readied as soon as possible, particularly in math and science.

Jeana Woolley said a system of coordinating these new projects needs to be developed. Also, in regard to the two committees that Dr. Clark mentioned, Ms. Woolley asked what authority the committees have and how they were created. She suggested that perhaps one committee could be the central coordinating body for these projects. Robert Adams concurred with the need to coordinate the work of committees.
Chair Weight opened a discussion of the paper and where the Boards' efforts might lead in this area and what the next steps might be. He asked for direction from the Joint Boards for the staff.

Ruth Hewett responded that she was interested in the second statement which encourages faculty-to-faculty communication. This area is important in order to move forward, and is crucial in order to have reform.

Jeana Woolley suggested merging the two committees into a coordinating committee and also looking at the constitution and membership of those committees. The membership might need to be changed in order to have appropriate representation in terms of the new agenda. Secondly, a report should be brought to the Joint Boards about the committee's progress. The incentives and rewards within each of the respective systems need to be reviewed and cross referenced.

George Richardson cautioned the Joint Boards not to take on more than could be handled. He supported focusing on items one and two and later perhaps adding additional items.

Rob Miller supported tracking the math and science subject. He concurred with what Mr. Richardson had said about working on items one and two.

Chair Weight suggested items one and two would be appropriate; particularly in light of the National Science grant proposal, if consolidation of the committees could be incorporated.

Ruth Hewett asked when the appropriate time would be to bring back reports on these issues.

Chair Weight suggested reporting on a quarterly basis and asked for a show of hands on how to proceed. Consensus was to focus on Steps 1 and 2.

ASSESSMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Wayne Neuburger, Shirley Clark, and Larry Large reported on the issues of Assessment and Accountability (Addendum B).

Dr. Clark said the Boards share a common interest in setting goals and standards for the effective teaching of diverse groups of students and of improved student performance relative to international benchmarks in various areas. Assessment is essential to improving performance and productivity and serves as a basis for making changes. The State System of Higher Education established a task force last summer that has surveyed the various assessments that have been done. Higher education engages in program reviews before programs are permitted to be started; and there is a new Board policy requiring a review of new programs that the Board has approved in the last decade. It is important to determine the configuration and whether that particular pattern makes sense or not. She identified several representative problems. The Department of Education, Office of Community College Services, and State System of Higher Education share the information that they are all producing for the benefit of the student. Another concern is developing and communicating evaluative information in formats and ways that are understandable to the public. The third area would be relating assessment activities to the state's goals. Is progress being made? One more major problem is that assessment programs are very expensive.
Dr. Neuburger further reported that the Oregon State Board of Education has been interested in looking at outcomes of the K-12 system for a number of years. To determine outcomes requires a focus on two areas: one is a clear definition of the expectations, the goals set for the students; and second, good measures must be developed to determine whether or not students have achieved those goals. In 1984, the State Board took action to begin to identify clear outcomes for students in the state with the development of the Essential Learning Skills and the Common Curriculum Goals. In the Oregon Educational Act, the state legislature directed the Department to look at those outcomes to make sure the standards are as high as any in the world. This year the Department of Education is reviewing everything that has been done in setting goals over the last six years. The Department has developed a testing program that is designed to provide information on the identified outcomes. The purpose of the assessment was to provide program information to the policymakers and to the public about the performance of the system. With the passage of House Bill 3565, a fourth purpose was added: to provide information to every student in the state on how well he or she is performing in relation to the standards. The challenge will be how to convey the information in a way that is meaningful to everybody.

Dr. Large’s report focused on accountability, indicating it is an artificial effort to try to separate assessment from accountability. The former is really the means of achieving the latter. The first and most significant is the category called "students and parents." In the higher education and community college settings, an increasing percentage of total money is being paid directly by the students and parents. Obviously, the state government, the governor, and the legislature have the ultimate responsibility to balance the state’s resources and investments in all public services. It is important for the Joint Boards to show the effectiveness of the state’s and the student’s investments of time, money, and facilities.

Chair Weight commented that, of all of the issues, he believes this is one that is on the minds of the public more than any other single issue. For discussion purposes, he suggested the Boards address this issue as though there were adequate resources.

Commissioner Parnell said in terms of the community colleges and the four-year colleges, and the universities, separate assessments need to be done with regard to quality of instruction and the teaching-learning process. Access to higher education is very important. It has to do with setting tuition policies and with quality. In terms of public policy, he urged the Joint Boards to look at the effectiveness indicators they are willing to accept as evidence of the progress being made toward missions and goals. He encouraged having only four or five effectiveness indicators.

Ruth Hewett commented that a discussion on accountability is difficult because the assumption has always been, in the K-12 system, that there is something wrong with the delivery system, meaning the teacher. And somehow when a student who might be an "A" student enters the university setting and doesn’t make it, then it becomes the fault of the K-12 system, and accountability switches. Teachers are held accountable if a student fails.
Tom Bartlett responded. He expects if Higher Education does the assessment on the basis of outcomes, the issue of accountability will find its way to solution.

Ruth Hewett said she believed there is still a public sense that schools fail. Chancellor Bartlett indicated he believes that students are not coming to college well-enough prepared, which is not a comment to judge schools, but rather a comment on societal expectations of students all the way through, about how hard students should be working, how fast they should be working, and where their values should be placed. The school often manifests problems that it has practically nothing to do with creating.

Jeana Woolley concurred with President Richardson that accountability is as important as assessment. The Joint Boards need to experiment with new ideas and look at how well the ideas are being implemented. Teachers need to be willing to be held accountable for the results they have in a diverse classroom. A better job needs to be done of preparing the students and more emphasis placed on having the student ready to learn. Society, the change in family structure, and other social problems impact the student’s ability to take advantage of the resources and the educational opportunities. Somehow the Joint Boards need to create a consistent measurement. She suggested creating a common set of standards and rewards and incentives throughout the system.

In response to Chancellor Bartlett’s question, Ms. Woolley said business cannot be done as usual. We have to start developing relationships and willingness to explore new territories in the system.

Rob Miller agreed with Ms. Woolley, stating education does a fairly decent job of setting goals and expectations, but does not have the power to do very much about effecting change.

Jeana Woolley recommended talking with organizations such as the National Education Association about how to work at the local level. Site-based management helps to begin to create an opportunity for change.

Chair Weight asked for a response to the suggested next steps, indicating that he believes requiring regular reports is important. The question is what should be done with the reports after they are received.

President Richardson suggested the Joint Boards receive a report that would outline in detail the accountability structures that are in place in each of the systems. He would like to see some information on what is being done to hold the systems accountable for the delivery of education.

Jeana Woolley said that no action steps were listed that would move the Boards toward doing things differently. She encouraged having an assessment system that is congruent and consistent. There needs to be clarity as to where each part of the system is in terms of how it really measures its own success.

Commissioner Parnell said each institution could not have the same effectiveness indicators because the institutions have different missions; nonetheless, each system ought to have indicators. The Joint Boards should ask for a report on the accountability systems that are in place now.
Bob Bailey asked how the assessment instruments in elementary and secondary education are used? Are they just being used for internal use only? Are they really valid indicators for the public? And, can they be justified? He also expressed concern about diversity. He does not want to use any type of measuring device which would put some students in a narrow slot.

Rob Miller asked if it is possible to narrow the accountability issue to the math and science subject as a product.

Commissioner Parnell said he did not think they need to be separate but that both can be done. The Joint Boards could direct the staff to come back with a report on accountability in the three systems.

Chair Weight concluded the discussion indicating that it was the consensus that the Joint Boards request a detailed accountability report that identifies those areas where there are accountability efforts underway. Second, that the Joint Boards want to continue to improve the coordination between the respective areas of education on assessment programs. And last, the Joint Boards will focus on Step 2 which deals with the continual need to have updated assessment programs.

Wayne Neuburger and Holly Zanville reported on the Preparation of Educational Professionals for 21st Century Schools (Addendum C). Dr. Neuburger said that to implement the new vision of what should happen in schools, it is essential to change the training programs needed for teachers. It is imperative that the Department of Education work closely with higher education; not only to determine what the preparation for teachers ought to look like, but also to make sure new teachers have initial teaching experiences that reinforce the things that need to be done.

Dr. Zanville reported that higher education is in the process of implementing reformed teacher education programs after a decade of intense study. A number of meetings have been held to determine the ways in which the programs should be changed. The math/science technology areas are the easiest to grasp because that is the particular area where the applied academics curriculum seems to impinge most clearly on the regular curriculum. What complicates teacher preservice preparation is that currently teachers are prepared in about 30 different endorsement areas not including the several in special education. Fifteen higher education institutions are now preparing teachers: six are public and the others are independent institutions. Some community colleges also are preparing teachers in the professional/technical area. In order to make change, all of the institutions will need to work together.

Superintendent Paulus said teacher education is a very critical area, and she hoped the two Boards and three departments can work on it in depth very quickly. Decisions need to be made as soon as possible as to which private/public institutions are to teach which kind of teachers. Also, it would be appropriate to discuss what the private institutions, such as Willamette and Lewis and Clark, intend to do about teacher education. It will be difficult to implement House Bill 3565 without a coordinated effort on teacher training. Business people are beginning to question the process of training and certifying teachers. She sees the possibility of a total reexamination of this in the next
legislative session and the educational community should control that agenda. It is imperative that higher education, community colleges, and the Department of Education jointly develop a strategy for this issue.

Superintendent Paulus also commented on the earlier issue of accountability; House Bill 3565 cannot be implemented without several changes. One is that the state must make education, as a whole, the number one priority. That is not now occurring. Second, the status of teaching in this state must be elevated because it is getting harder to entice really bright people into the teaching profession. Many of Oregon's best teachers are moving out of teaching altogether because they cannot cope with the stress now being placed on them.

Commissioner Parnell commended the Chancellor and OSSHE for developing the new Western Center for Community College Education at Oregon State University. There is a need not only in Oregon but in 10 or 11 other western states to prepare faculty members and administrators for community colleges. He urged continued support of that development. The greatest single need in the school reform effort is preservice and inservice teacher training. He saw an urgent need to work together and suggested that the Joint Boards ask their staffs to develop a task force on the subject of teacher training, preservice, and inservice, to figure out how these programs should be delivered in Oregon.

Chair Weight welcomed Representative Vera Katz and asked for her comments. Representative Katz thanked Superintendent Paulus, the Department of Education, and others who worked so hard to make the school reform effort, House Bill 3565, a reality. She recently attended the National Board of Professional Teachers Standards meeting in San Antonio. The group is developing a national examination system for teachers; hopefully, teachers in Oregon will take that examination. The National Board will also drive the teacher education programs in our system, especially when we see how many teachers pass and fail across the country by state.

Ruth Hewett said she is interested in looking at the issue of the preparation of counselors. She believes it is a crucial issue. Chris Halsey concurred with Mrs. Hewett and supported the effort to examine diligently the role of counseling in every aspect of the changing education system in Oregon.

Bob Bailey suggested that the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC) be included in the process.

Chair Weight reviewed the statements on where the Joint Boards efforts might lead and asked if anyone saw any problems with the statements. None were expressed. He then moved the discussion to the statements on the "next steps." He remarked that it appears there is consensus to have a joint approach by higher education and the Department of Education staffs, with the inclusion of TSPC, to conduct a study of preparation programs for teachers, counselors, and administrators in the public schools and in community colleges. He opened the floor to discussion.
Ms. Woolley asked that the report also include a set of issues for consideration on how to modify the existing system effectively. She believes there are valuable uses for the statewide assessment data that will help with the reform efforts and she suggested that this be added to Step 1 also.

Dr. Veloz said that teacher preparation of those who will work with the limited English proficient population needs to be considered also. Teachers have a difficult time working with this population.

Chair Weight then directed the discussion to Step 2.

Chancellor Bartlett responded that one of the most preoccupying activities in the Office of Academic Affairs is how teacher education is to evolve. How are we to relate those programs to other things going on in this state? It is unclear how to finance individual research projects. He further responded to Step 1. One of the things we have to do is invent a new kind of teacher and, therefore, invent a new kind of teacher education program. We need in particular the teachers who are to be the leaders in our new technical/professional programs in the secondary schools. When higher education was going through the downsizing process a few months ago, people asked why a very small vocational teacher program was closed. There were two reasons: (1) most people going into vocational education were not coming through that program; and (2) that was not the program that is needed. What is needed is a teacher who can lead technical education and also serve as liaison between the school and the business community where a lot of students are going to serve as interns to gain experience. Currently, we do not have that kind of teacher, and we do not now have a training program for them. This is one of the very first points on higher education's agenda, looking at this development in the evolution of teacher training.

President Richardson also suggested, following up Superintendent Paulus' comments, one of the next steps should be expanding collaboration with other institutions and other systems with respect to the delivery of teacher training.

Bob Bailey asked, referring to Commissioner Parnell's comments about preservice and inservice, for comments from the Superintendent on how to get the present teacher force to be players in this situation. The key to the reform effort is the teacher in the classroom, but they are not on board.

Superintendent Paulus responded that, generally speaking, most teachers have been very supportive. The union continues to be concerned about the funding—the ultimate problem.

Chair Weight concluded the discussion and said that there were a number of recommendations relative to the request of a joint staff:

- To include the TSPC in the study;
- To study the preparation programs for teachers, counselors, administrators;
- To look at the resource requirements;
- To be concerned with pretraining and inservice training; and
- To look at what is going on with other institutions, other states, and private schools as they relate to this whole issue of yield and supply and demand for quality teachers.
Chair Weight asked for a show of hands if this is the direction to proceed. It was the consensus to proceed as indicated.

Superintendent Paulus, Commissioner Parnell, and Chancellor Bartlett reported on the Governance of Education (Addendum D). Commissioner Parnell called attention to No. 1 of the Next Steps. He believes a master plan for education in this state needs to be developed that would include all of education. In terms of breadth, the study should look at the whole range of education in the state and particularly higher education, the role and function of different institutions. In terms of governance, a legislative task force is working on this area. Also within the community college ranks, a joint commission was established by the Oregon State Board of Education to look at governance of community colleges. He believes he, the Superintendent, and the Chancellor have concluded that it would not be wise to spend a lot time in the present meeting talking about whether it should be a single board or three boards; what needs to be discussed is how to make the Joint Board situation work better. He recommended that the Joint Boards consider the development of a master plan and refer the issue to the staff to bring back to the Joint Boards some way to get at the process.

Superintendent Paulus responded that, given the fact that she has dealt with this issue (the Super Board issue) with Representative Katz, Commissioner Parnell, and Stanford Hansell for 18-20 years, she has some strong feelings about it. She reported that she, the Chancellor, and the Commissioner have met several times and have tried to set the stage for the three of them to lead this effort to devise a master plan.

Superintendent Paulus also said that in the ensuing months and biennium she certainly hopes that the state will find another method for funding schools and education in general. Therefore, it is critical that education stay together; it would be unseemly for the three different branches to compete or seem to be competing for funding. That cannot be allowed to happen. The quicker we get about arranging our own priorities with the two Boards working together on the major issues, the better off education will be. Then we can go about, not only coming up with a master plan for education, a seamless system which we do not have now, but we can also put ourselves in the proper position to say to the public that Oregon's future is at stake if it does not make education its No. 1 priority. She said that she, the Chancellor, and the Commissioner, are working very closely together and that the two Boards are working closer together--more now than they ever have in the history of this state. She is encouraged by today's meeting, and urged identifying the immediate problems and start working on those.

Chancellor Bartlett responded that he believes Oregon may have a unique opportunity to do something that no state has ever done--to bring education together into a coherent process. This prospect is very exciting and one that can produce something of which Oregon can be proud. Two areas need attention. One is budgeting and finance. In the aftermath of Ballot Measure 5, the whole educational process needs to be reviewed; it should be viewed as a single allocation of state resources. Second, in the articulation area, curriculum needs to be reviewed and the points that overlap and interact need to be examined. In the resource allocation and curriculum areas, a process needs to be developed. There are cultural factors and traditions, value systems, in each of our three sectors that are important. Some of those differences
need to be protected, not be eliminated, because they are indeed important. The other related factor is the national processes to which we must fit ourselves because we can not deal with our state activities in isolation. We are going to have to see ourselves, to some extent, in ways that are national and, to some extent, as different.

Bob Bailey noted that Marilynne Keyser, Administrator, Office of Educational Policy and Planning, was in the audience, and he asked her to comment about the governance issues.

Marilynne Keyser responded that she appreciated the process that took place in the meeting. She attended the entire time, watching the joint work of the group, and sensed very positive dialogue. She remarked that, as everyone is aware, the Governor has appointed a Task Force on State Government to look at ways to organize and make state government more efficient and effective. In the process, the Task Force is looking at six program areas. One of those program areas is education. She has been meeting with an education subcommittee to the Task Force made up of Dick Hensley, a former member of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education, and Matt Hennessy. On January 7, the Task Force will entertain a discussion about how education is organized in the state.

Mrs. Keyser remarked that a part of her responsibility in assisting the Governor is to meet and discuss these issues with the Task Force. She will also share the process created by the Governor’s Executive Order. At the same time she thinks it would be inappropriate not to surface the fact that the discussion of governance is going to be on the table at different places. The issue that Superintendent Paulus mentioned, of creating one board of education, might be on the table for a discussion by the Governor’s Task Force. The staff of the Office of Educational Policy and Planning is researching what other states are doing. The Task Force will complete its work by June 1992. It would be helpful for the Joint Boards to have demonstrated substantial progress prior to that time because final reports will be made regarding various issues around how government is structured in Oregon. She will keep the Superintendent, Chancellor, and Commissioner informed of the progress.

With both these two Boards and the Task Force being directed by the Governor to address the issue of governance, Superintendent Paulus asked what happens if they come to opposite conclusions?

Mrs. Keyser responded that she will go before the Task Force with the message that this process is going forward. The timetable is slightly different: the Joint Boards is September 1992 and the Task Force’s is June 1992. It is possible the recommendations may differ. However, both the recommendations from the Governor’s Task Force and the recommendations from the Joint Boards will go to the Governor for her consideration.

Chair Weight called on Bob Barber, President of Central Oregon Community College, who spoke from the audience about the special commission that was formed by the Oregon State Board of Education to look at the issue of community college governance.

Mr. Dodson raised a concern about brokering the governance structure among Boards. He supports the development of a master plan and thinks it would be a good starting point for the Joint Boards.
Mr. Kruse cautioned that the Governor's Executive Order did not direct the Department of Education, the Office of Community Colleges, or Higher Education to do anything; it was directed to the two Boards. He said we have to be careful that we do not shirk our duty.

Chair Weight called attention to the Executive Order which identifies specific joint policies that define the relationship between the two Boards. He then directed the Boards to look at the next steps. Mr. Adams reinforced the need to promote the teaching profession and the importance of education to the state of Oregon.

Chair Weight asked if there was consensus to have the staffs begin the process of developing a master plan.

Mr. Bailey expressed concern about what the master plan would entail. He does not believe the Boards and staffs can afford to go through a time-consuming process. Superintendent Paulus concurred. The Department of Education does not have the staff because of the work created by House Bill 3565. Mr. Kruse remarked that the Executive Order asked for examination, not development.

President Richardson recommended that the Superintendent, Chancellor, and Commissioner present to the Joint Boards some type of a vision for education as to what it ought to look like in the state of Oregon and to report to the Joint Boards about the governance structures and an analysis.

Superintendent Paulus remarked that the master plan is the best way for the educational communities at all levels to stand together reinforcing that education has become the number one priority and that the Boards should have the Chancellor, the Commissioner, and herself join in that statement.

Mrs. Hewett said it is important to look at how the information is gathered. President Richardson asked that the Joint Boards' working group keep the Governor's Task Force on State Government informed about the governance issue.

Chair Weight concluded the discussion and asked for a show of hands to proceed as indicated; consensus was reached.

FUTURE ACTIVITIES

Chair Weight addressed the issue of the desire of the Joint Boards to receive regular reports from the working committee and to determine when to meet again.

The Joint Boards agreed that the staff should meet, develop a review of the Joint Boards meeting, develop a list of joint activities, prepare a timeline and suggested dates for future meetings, and begin developing the desired reports. It also was agreed to bring this information to the two respective Boards at the December 1991 meetings.

OTHER ISSUES

Chair Weight thanked the staffs for organizing an excellent meeting, expressed appreciation to the Board members, Superintendent, Chancellor, and Commissioner for their attendance.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting of the Joint Boards was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.; it was immediately followed by a reception and dinner.
TOPIC: ACCESS AND ARTICULATION

Nature of Topic

A long-standing goal for Oregon has been the creation of an accessible system where each student is able to obtain an education that meets the student's needs. The funding difficulties caused by Measure 5 will impose added barriers that will direct enrollment of students from one institution to another. This change will require cooperation and coordination among institutions or the promise inherent in the Oregon Education Act for the 21st Century will go unfulfilled.

Effective response to the educational challenges facing Oregon and the nation in this decade and beyond also requires improved articulation among the various levels of the educational system from kindergarten through higher education. Interdependence is characteristic of education: curricula are sequenced, student mastery of learning at one level is prerequisite to success at the next, movement through the system is eased or impeded by transition policies and procedures and is dependent as well upon student achievement. Although the education system should be well-articulated, in the United States it is typically segmented by levels that differ in organization, funding, governance, constituencies, cultures, and goals. In Oregon, a variety of voluntary, gubernatorial, or legislatively-established intersegmental committees, agencies, and boards work on issues of articulation of curriculum, college admissions standards, transfer policies, and other areas. (Examples of these articulation groups include: the State System/Community College Coordinating Committee, the HB 2913 Committee, the Oregon Mathematics Education Council, the Confederation of Oregon School Administrators, and the High School/College Relations Committee.)

Major Issues

- How can we identify the barriers to educational opportunity? Are there those who are being squeezed out? If so, who? Where?

- How effective are current articulation mechanisms and processes? How can we improve continuity in the teacher-learning process? What areas need strengthening? What articulation will be needed to move the education reform agenda of the 21st Century Schools forward? Are there models of articulation that should be changed, affirmed, or expanded?

- How can we better articulate elementary and high school curricula and student course choices with rising expectations of academic preparation for college to reduce the proportion of entering students who are underprepared for college-level study in areas that include mathematics, science, writing, and foreign languages?

- How can we design an articulated data-collection system to improve evaluation of effectiveness of student performance at every level? How can we track students, particularly under-represented minorities, throughout their educational careers to increase attainment and retention?

- What is the balance of uniqueness, complementarity, and duplication of programs among levels as this relates to mission responsibilities, funding, personnel, and other resources? Is this balance problematic?
• Are policies and processes for regulating transition and transfer of students among institutions appropriate, workable, and well-reasoned? Is the quality and availability of information needed by students to transfer from one education segment to another acceptable? Can the State System of Higher Education expand the current office of high school/college-relations to include community colleges?

• What articulation issues should be identified that may arise as part of educational restructuring with the increased opportunity for students to pursue professional-technical education after the Certificate of Initial Mastery is achieved? How should we prepare to address these issues of cross-overs between professional-technical and college preparatory curricula?

• How can we promote communication among and between school, community college, and university faculty? How can we improve the transfer function at the department and professional levels?

Where Our Efforts Might Lead

• A system of articulation for schools, community colleges, and higher education more oriented to the individual student moving through the education system toward a specified goal.

• Effective articulation policies, practices, and mechanisms including a new or recharged intersystem focus on access and articulation issues that need resolution.

• A seamless integration of math and science education from earliest exposure (curiosity) through school, community college, and higher education learning to the production of new knowledge through research.

Resources

Attention to issues of access and articulation will require the investment of considerable time and commitment of representatives from various educational segments. Some strategies to improve access and articulation will have real dollar costs associated with their implementation. The Boards also should anticipate substantial resistance from some quarters to serious attempts to increase articulation, because this may represent diminution of control and autonomy over separate spheres of activity.

Next Steps

1. The Joint Boards might request a staff review of the status of articulation; effective articulation policies, practices, and mechanisms, including the possible formation of a new or recharged intersystem group to focus on a broad set of issues that need study and resolution might be developed.

2. The Joint Boards could review the incentive system and structural barriers to encourage faculty to faculty communication and review of the scope and sequence of the curriculum. Better communication will increase the wise investment of resources, improve the preparation of students (and the professionals who educate them) for higher levels of attainment, and reduce the wastage and discontinuities sometimes associated with movement from one educational segment to another.
Next Steps (cont.)

3. The Joint Boards might request a staff study of the barriers to transfer among colleges and universities. If barriers are identified, the study should address methods for removal.

4. The Joint Boards might request a report on how the State System/Community College Coordinating Committee is working.

5. The Joint Boards might search for cooperative ventures in creating a coordinated curriculum such as the systemic math/science initiative.

6. 

7. 

8. 

Attachments
- "Proposed State System Subject Requirement Policy for Admission to 1994-95 Academic Year" (June 1990)
- "Recommendations of Task Force #5: Articulation Paper" (March 1990)
- News Release "Community College Enrollment up 8 Percent"
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Nature of Topic

Assessment activities relevant both to the Board of Education and the Board of Higher Education are those that will reflect the degree to which the goals and standards common to both Boards are being met. Assessment should provide information that is useful in improving effective teaching and student performance and in providing accountability to the people of Oregon.

Major Issues

- How can the knowledge and skills of Oregonians be improved in the areas of reading comprehension, critical thinking and reasoning, mathematical computation, computer competency, interpersonal skills including multicultural understanding, and problem solving. (See the Oregon Benchmarks 1991 and the State Board of Education Essential Learning Skills and Common Curriculum Goals.)

- How can the contributions of schools, community colleges, and higher education best be measured and related to the needs and public expectations of Oregonians?

- What high school preparation standards are appropriate for college entrance and how should entrance examinations, achievement tests, performance based assessment, and other indicators be used as parts of (not determinants of) admissions to two- and four-year institutions?

- Should entrance or placement measures for adult returning students be different from requirements for traditional students?

- Is more attention needed to track demographics of Oregonians to determine the composition of the population to be served?

- Is more attention needed to track demographics of high school graduates and students attending two- and four-year institutions of higher education to determine the degree to which we are serving all Oregonians?

- How effective are various early intervention strategies (e.g., SMILE\(^1\), MESA\(^2\), MAJIC\(^3\), etc.) in improving student performance and in increasing representation of underserved populations?

- How can both Boards synchronize their assessment policies/programs to provide useful data to improve teaching and learning outcomes and account to the public for those outcomes?

- What are the effectiveness indicators showing progress toward meeting the goal of insuring that Oregonians are the best educated and trained people by the year 2000?

---

1 Science and Mathematics Investigative Learning Experiences (SMILE)
2 Mathematics, Engineering, and Science Achievement for Minority and Female High School Students (MESA)
3 Mathematics Assessment for Juniors Interested in College (MAJIC)
Where Our Efforts Might Lead

- Articulation of education assessment programs among schools, community colleges, and higher education.

- Progress towards ensuring that Oregonians are the best educated and trained people by the year 2000 and equal to any in the world by 2010.

- An Oregon public satisfied with its excellent education system.

Resources

Gathering data and preparing data analyses, purchasing, administering, and sorting nationally normed tests, developing alternative indicators (such as portfolios), and conducting early intervention strategies have substantial associated costs that must be weighed against potential benefits.

Next Steps

1. The Joint Boards may want to direct that there be improved coordination among K-higher education assessment programs.

2. The Joint Boards may request regular reports on how the schools, community colleges, and universities are meeting the established Benchmark of ensuring that Oregonians are the best educated and trained people in America by the year 2000, and equal to any workforce in the world by the year 2010.

3. The Joint Boards may want to facilitate or sponsor expanded efforts at model demonstration programs (e.g., SMILE, MESA, MAJIC) in other parts of the state.

4.

5.

Attachments
- "Assessment and Accountability" prepared for the Board of Higher Education Renewal Meeting (July 1991)
- Excerpt from Progress Board Benchmarks, 1991
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TOPIC: PREPARATION OF EDUCATION PROFESSIONALS IN THE CONTEXT OF 21st CENTURY SCHOOL REFORM

Nature of Topic

In collaboration with schools and community colleges, higher education institutions prepare education professionals (teachers, administrators, counselors) for employment in schools and community colleges. Higher education institutions, community colleges, and local school districts also provide continuing education and inservice programs to upgrade education professionals. The Teacher Standards and Practices Commission licenses teachers and sets standards for K-12 teacher, administrator, and counselor education programs both public and private. How to prepare educators with the skills needed in the new context of 21st Century reform initiatives is of common concern to the Board of Education, the Board of Higher Education, and the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission, as well as numerous other educational agencies. Other reform initiatives such as those related to curriculum design, applied academics, restructured school calendars and schedules, the involvement of business/industry, and research to develop new knowledge needed as underpinnings to reforms, are also at issue and will require greatly increased higher education, community college, and school collaboration.

Major Issues

• How should teacher, counselor, and administrator preparation programs be altered to support 21st Century School Reform initiatives?

• How can we build greater multicultural diversity into our training of educators and attract a more diverse student body into our teacher, counselor, and administrator preparation programs?

• Should continued professional development be a requirement for educators? What are the best ways to provide these programs to support 21st Century reform initiatives?

• Should the present professional educational licensure system be changed?

• How can relevant, action-oriented research on 21st Century reform initiatives be developed? What should be the involvement of higher education, community colleges, and school researchers?

Where Our Efforts Might Lead

• Improved student achievement at each level (schools, community colleges, higher education) through new emphases on development of curriculum and preparation of teachers, counselors, and administrators.

• Readily available base of knowledge identifying effective reform strategies for Oregon, plus an action-oriented research commitment to fill in the gaps.

• Teachers just entering the profession as well as those currently teaching are well prepared and motivated to help students learn and their work places support the implementation of innovative practices.
Resources

• Significant resources will need to be designated to foster new collaborations among higher education, community colleges, and schools. For example, student teachers will need to be placed in 21st Century school classrooms and higher education faculty will need retraining with regard to reform initiatives, particularly to undertake relevant, action-oriented research programs.

• Further resources will need to be designated to recruit and support minority teachers, counselors, and administrators.

Next Steps

1. The Joint Boards might request a staff review of the preparation programs for teachers, counselors, and administrators in the public schools and in community colleges.

2. The Board of Higher Education may want to support efforts to focus some faculty research on improving the knowledge base for effective school reform efforts.

3.

4.

5.

Attachments

- "OSSHE's Inventory in HB 3565, The Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century" (September 17, 1991)
- Sandia Report, Perspectives on Education in America, Excerpts, May 1991
- "Policy Agreements, Staffing Our Schools for the 21st Century (SOS-21) Steering Committee," June 1, 1990
- Dale Parnell, "The Role of the Tech Prep/Associate Degree Program in Oregon School Reform," September 1991
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Next Steps

1. The Joint Boards may want to direct the staff to begin the process of developing a Master Plan for Education and report back at the next Joint Boards meeting.

2. The Joint Boards may want to direct the staff to obtain information about educational governance structures in other states, including analysis of strengths and weaknesses.

3. The Joint Boards may want to request a feasibility study on bringing the state-level governing bodies and their staffs into convenient proximity.

4. The Joint Boards might develop a work plan and set a schedule of meetings for the next two years.

5.

6.

7.

Attachments
- Office of Community College Services/Oregon Community College Association Joint Commission on Governance, Mission Statement (September 1991 draft)
- Charge to Governor's Task Force, June 25, 1991
- Governor's Executive Order, Board of Education and Board of Higher Education Joint Agenda, May 1991
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