

OPAS Steering Committee Meeting #10
August 29, 2006

Attendees: Dick Knight (Saturday Academy), Bruce Schafer (OUS), Jo Oshiro (OUS), Larry Flick (OSU), Scott Huff (PCC), Don Kirkwood (N Salem HS), Michal Young (UO), Jay Bockelman (OIT), Di Saunders (OUS), Susan Boyanovsky (CCWD), Bill Becker (PSU)

Summary

High School Requirements:

- Bruce reported on his work on a document clarifying the issues surrounding increasing science requirements for graduation, which he used in recent discussions with OSBE. The groundwork for OPAS' role as a respected advisor to the board and its members is in place.
- The current drive is to increase requirements, academic rigor, and delivery of material in math and science such that more students do better and retain more. ODE in particular knows they need to improve standards and assessments and always offer students the option of proving mastery of the material via test. OSBE/ ODE are leery of setting students and school districts up for failure with unsupported requirements.
- (Bill Becker) Testing at the state level is good to the building level at best. Carrying the results down to course level or individual student level is not valid and adding a third requirement will not fix the test scores. Standardized test scores do not measure higher level cognitive function, which is what is necessary for success at the college level.

Teacher Preparation:

- Increasing the requirements increases the need for science teachers, who are already in short supply. Options and programs in Colorado, at PSU and OSU were discussed. While many science disciplines are amenable to a double degree in education, engineering is not – a liberal arts degree combines well with a professional degree, that is, education. Two professional degrees such as engineering and education, are much harder to combine in 4 years.
- (Scott Huff) OSU and I believe PSU are moving to 180 credit programs for Bachelor's Degrees. Historically, a Bachelor's was 204 credits and is now 192. The hours and content are being reduced, driven by budgetary considerations. Institutions want to get people through in closer to four years, because this is what the legislature and federal subsidies will pay for, and what the students can get financial aid for. (Bill) As well as reducing the number of credits, fewer are required by the major.

Fall Workshop:

- Convene a "pre-meeting" of the subcommittee chairs and develop a schedule for the workshop day that is a happy medium between issues and subcommittee time. (*Jo is currently polling for Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday October 3, 4, 5, and 10, 11, 12 and has asked Larry Flick to sit in representing the currently chairless Instructional Professional Development (IPD) subcommittee.*)
- Prioritize and commit to some strategies and possibly tactics, based on a comparative layout of

- alignment with with OPAS mission
- timelines
- resources needed
- resources available
- potential impact
- do people have passion and energy around this action?
- Do an “environmental scan” of national, other states, and especially regional programs with targets similar to OPAS before the workshop.
- (Dick) Do not take it for granted that we have stakeholder buy-in that injecting pre-engineering and especially engineering (especially using those terms) into K12 education is a good or desirable end.
- Resource development – how can we help stakeholders get funding? From whom?
- We currently see potential action in three domains:
 - Changes in policy – acting at a political level.
 - Changes in teaching practice – acting at the classroom and pre-service arenas.
 - Out of School Time programs – foundation funding.

Workforce 2005:

- (Susan) “PTE” Professional Technical Education will become “CTE” Career and Technical Education to better align with the national vocabulary and the renewed Perkins funding. The task force for Senate bill 364 has landed on three priorities to forward to the legislature:
 - better articulation of dual credit and tech prep;
 - funding models;
 - applied baccalaureate degree.

Next Meeting Tuesday September 12, 2006 3:30 – 5:00

Discussion Details

Bruce reports on his interactions with the Board of Education:

- input to annual retreat
- draft document on graduation requirements
- input from Ed Dennis, ODE
- panel of experts incl teachers and university faculty one on sci and another on math
- flipcharts never made it to the wall. 15-20 tables, go through find 5 key points of the day.
- Huge diversity of opinion. Recurring themes: active learning, applied sci, applied math, flex for school districts came up. Preaching to the choir
- Passed out copies of the white paper – one of the board liked the paper so much passed it out.
- We have friends on the board now.

Susan: What is the general opinion from Math and Sci panels?

Bruce: Difficult. Much from our playing cards – needs to be rigorous, needs to be engaging. All over the map. Setting kids/school districts up for failure with the lack of resources.

Susan: Are they talking about more credit or more mastery?

Bruce: One or two people arguing not to add more science until we do a better job at delivering what we've got. More general: add third year, but keep going to better deliver what we've got. ODE – we've got more to do on standards and assessments, always give students the option of testing out by establishing the proficiencies.

Dick: How much discussion of pedagogical style?

Bruce: Some. Not that controversial – but how we going to get there from here? Lack of science and math teachers, esp. from private colleges.

Dick: sent out an article on a program encouraging science track students to become teachers.

Bill: CSE will be getting a NSF grant to get 30 new teachers into the system in the next (n) years.

Bill: Testing at the state level is good to the building level at best. Carrying the results down to course level or individual student level is not valid and adding a third requirement will not fix the test scores.

Standardized test scores does not measure higher level cognitive function which is what is necessary for success at the college level.

Larry: 30 teachers a year out of their Master's program; our departments have become increasingly active over the years in counseling their students and setting up the education option. We do something similar to program described in article on Colorado.

Backs up Bill on test scores.

Just having a Bachelor's in Science does not guarantee the candidate knows sci well enough to teach it, and we've had some students of whom this is true.

Advisors in Sci Dept has their eye on two tracks, depending on when student self-identifies as interested in becoming a teacher. Can do a double-degree if early enough, take some of the courses with the Master's cohort. It does appear in most cases that this is a five year process. Practicums and student teaching very unforgiving schedule-wise.

Bruce: double degree in eng?

LF: Double degree is from Dept of Ed, can combine with many other disciplines across the board. Finishing an engineering program in 4 years very difficult. Can be difficult to see how

the NSTA requirements align with engineering courses – not always straightforward. Complicated to see what applies, different decisions based on different majors.

Scott Huff: OSU and I believe PSU are moving to 180 credit programs. Historically 204 and 192 in the past. The hours, the content is going to be reduced. Driver of this is budgetary – get people through in closer to four years, what they will pay for. Ties to financial aid.

Bill: As well as reducing the number of credits, fewer are required by the major.

Scott: trying to get any credit for work done in HS is increasingly difficult. No room per universities. Very limited transfer/articulation for PLTW and similar.

Bill: Grow your own technique – give students exposure through nonformal . ABET has a stranglehold on university curricula.

LF: Some of the double degree programs involve the department forgiving some senior level courses in the non-education . Not much room for that in engineering.

Bruce: Engineering is a professional degree. Education is a professional degree. Fairly easy to combine liberal arts degree with a professional degree and finish in 4-5 years. Much more difficult to combine two professional degrees.

Fall workshop:

Bruce: Happy middle ground between issues and committee members. Time for ZBB (Zero Based Budgeting) and picking amongst our well-loved children.

Do we want one of the workshop issues to be prioritization of possible strategies?

Resources.

Di: Re: prioritization - comparative chart. How long does it take to get to deliverable? Likelihood of impact? Resources needed? What are foundations actually funding? Programmatic things are more likely to be funded by most foundations. Only huge foundations fund systemic change across states? Do homework in advance – make our own environmental scan.

Bruce reads that as 1) decide criteria 2) bring the table with the criteria filled in to the workshop.

Jo: needs a national survey. “Environmental scan” – Jeremy and I tripped over things.

Susan: endorses scan. Look at Oregon. Look at regional. Leverage others’ work.

Dick: a number of these things (B possible strategies) imply a shared belief that injecting more pre-engineering is a plus. He doesn’t believe that consensus exists outside of our group. PTE programs treated in a completely different way. ODE moving toward better standards around a very traditional model.

DonD: PTE/Perkins separate from PLTW. Need multiple, well-established models. 2007 grad requirement for capstone project will drive district back into looking at hands-on stuff again.

SusanB: reauthorization of Perkins funds, seeing greater emphasis on accountability, program improvement, technical and academic skills without remediation. Perkins in the future will only be used for ODE approved programs, not for stray courses. Perkins funds can cover PLTW.

Bill: looking for change in policy, operate at political level. Change in teaching practice, act as the classroom level, preservice. Fundamentally dealing in two different domains.

Bruce: overlap in some areas.

Di: Third domain (environmental education model) become an OST advocate and go direct to kids through OST programs.

Bruce: choosing strategies is an important next step. Workshop is one place to do that. Got some priorities/ criteria?

Di: Test Bruce's list for alignment with OPAS mission. Get as much winnowed before the workshop. Use workshop time to get from point A to point B.

JO: Make Bruce follow up with committee chairs not here today.

DK: Do people have energy around the strategy/tactic?

Di: Do you change your tactics or your committee members?

Susanb: Don't derail any work really ongoing well?

JO: Sequencing for resource development – take it offline.

Susanb: Are there any RFPs out there with time lines that we need to pay attention to?

Bill Becker: for the most part external funding gets you short lived programs, planning funds. External funding won't change systemic priorities. Do have to read the tea leaves – mold your ideas into what the organization wants to have happen, not entirely under your own control. Can choose to sink efforts into doing something or hitting highest priorities? Might be two different strategies.

JO: Resource development, convening role.

Di: Wants better understanding of what subcommittees are doing. Merge, submerge, align and meet with each other.

Subcommittee chair meeting.

**Get one pagers from each of the ETIC grantees for inclusion at the workshop.
Send Di link to table of funded grants. (done 9/5/06)**

Subcommittee report:

Di – list of priorities. Do we need to wait until after retreat. This is committee's first take. Her handout – p2 & 3.

Susanb: At one point we'd (Di and Sue) discussed some graphics supporting a CC/ OIT program in mfg. engineering. Courses are well-aligned. They want a graphic to show parents and students. Susan wants to start with students, marketing effort starts this fall. They will take this offline to keep it moving.

Scott: Regarding the OIT program – 2 caveats. Not completely done yet. One very small piece of the statewide picture.

Susanb: Senate bill 364 – landed on three priorities: better articulation of dual credit and tech prep; funding models; applied baccalaureate degree – one way to improve articulation. Sometimes called inverse degree or upside-down degree. Forwarding recommendations to the legislature.

DonD: if the ideal happened, what would it look like?

Susanb: fund all three. To move PTE forward, need funding. Name change to CTE (Career and Technical Education) Long lit review. Council of Instructional Administrators of Community Colleges. Other states who have done this have extensive feasibility studies.

Next Meeting Tuesday September 12, 2006 3:30 – 5:00