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TO: Senators and Ex-officio Members to the Senate
FR: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on November 4, 1996, at 3:00 p.m. in room 53 Cramer Hall.

AGENDA

A. Roll
B. Approval of the Minutes of the October 7 and 14, 1996, Meeting
C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor
   1. President’s Report
   2. Provost’s Report
D. Question Period
   1. Questions for Administrators
   2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair
E. Reports from Administrative Officers and Committees
   *1. Report from the October 1996 Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting - B. Oshika
F. Unfinished Business
   *1. Constitutional Amendment - Art. IV, Sec. 4,k, General Student Affairs Committee
G. New Business
   *1. Approval of ESL/Bilingual Licensure Endorsement - Dean Everhart
   2. Status of Engineering Education at PSU - R. Schaumann & F. Rad
H. Adjournment

The following documents are included with this mailing:
   B. Minutes of the October 7, 1996, Senate Meeting
   D1. Questions to Administrators
   E1. Report from the October 1996 Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting
   F1. Constitutional Amendment, Art. IV, Sec. 4,k
   G1. Proposal for ESL/Bilingual Licensure Endorsement

Please submit your Alternate’s name to the Secretary at the 4 November Senate meeting or by telephone or e-mail(see below) by November 4, 1996.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, October 7, 1996, and October 14, 1996
Presiding Officer: Ulrich H. Hardt
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier

Members Present October 7, 1996:


Members Absent: Adams, Anderson L., Elteto, Friesen, Harrison, Steinberger, Taggart, Tierney.


Members Present October 14, 1996:


Alternates Present: Bauer for Goslin, Chapman for Howe, Pratt for Mercer, Holloway for Westbrook.

Ex-officio Members

A. ROLL CALL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

THE MEETING OF OCTOBER 7, 1996, WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 3:14 P.M. The Faculty Senate Minutes of June 3 and 12, 1996, minutes were approved as distributed, after C.1. Provost’s Report.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS

• HARDT previewed the agenda for 1996-97 Senate. Potential agenda items include restructuring Urban and Public Affairs, the OSSHE planning process for engineering programs, curriculum issues, development of degree programs, further conversions to four-credit courses, scheduling issues, Summer Session issues, and biennial budget issues. As you will hear from today’s reports, the future holds some good news and some challenging news.

• Please forward the names of your alternates to the Secretary.

• Senators and ex-officio members are reminded to speak loudly, and state name and division when recognized by the Chair. The microphones in the lower gallery are for recording the meeting and they do not pick up speakers from above the transverse aisle.

• As there has been very little turn-out at “K” House after Senate in recent years, the Steering Committee will discuss the value of continuing this event.

• HARDT briefly outlined the procedures for setting the agenda and conducting the meeting, particularly those related to the Question period. The Steering Committee will place questions on the agenda which have been presented to it’s regular meeting one week after Senate.

1. PROVOST’S REPORT

REARDON reported he has requested recommendations for the Search Committee for the Dean of SFPA from both the Advisory Council and the Interim Dean of SFPA. He hopes to have names by the middle of the month and establish the committee by the end of October.
REARDON then moved to his response to Question to Administrators D1.a) regarding the OSSHE engineering planning process(see “D1.”). REARDON first reviewed the history of activities to date. At the June board meeting in Ashland, the board approved a process of seventeen “solution teams” to report at varying times appropriate to their charges. The most important one to PSU will look at the enhancement of engineering education in the state, and was established with OSU President Risser and Provost Reardon as co-chairs. They immediately added Dean Dryden and his counterpart, John Owen, Dean of engineering at OSU(and Vice Chancellor of Engineering). That group met and decided to add three community/industry representatives to the team, who have been contacted. It is that final group who will make a recommendation to the board, and technically, that solution team has not yet officially met in its totality. Next, two major sub-committees were formed, one to look at academic programs and industry relations and be co-chaired by President Risser and Dean Dryden, and the other to look at policies and procedures and be co-chaired by Provost Reardon and Dean Owen. The former sub-committee has met the most frequently and extensively since the June date.

REARDON discussed the policies and procedures sub-committee. Made up of representation from the two universities, its charge is to look at implementation issues surrounding the idea of a consolidated school of engineering, such as the status of faculty, students in the program, fiscal issues related to such a consolidation, and other nut-and-bolts issues. The first issue that Reardon raised in committee is that the sub-committee cannot discuss the impact or status of faculty in a consolidated program, as PSU has a collective bargaining agreement that would have to be reopened and renegotiated. Therefore, PSU takes the position that the committee cannot address issues relating to faculty. A requirement was established on the basis of a court case arising out of the consolidation of nursing programs under OSU. It states that ninety days before recommendation for a consolidation is made to the board, negotiations must be reopened for a) a decision for consolidation, and b) what impact such consolidation would have on currently represented faculty. Therefore, the date must be absolutely determined for the OSSHE board to receive the recommendation in order for the contract to be reopened.

REARDON stated the solution team and the two sub-committees have the charge of evaluating and examining a consolidated model for engineering education in the state. There has been much discussion back and forth in the committee as well as at the institutions and in the press as to the nature of this charge. The most current information is contained in a memorandum from Chancellor Cox dated 2 October:
"Although the Board may wish to consider further modifications and options after the discussion in November, I would ask that you continue to pursue the charge to you from the June meeting in Ashland. This charge is to plan for a single, consolidated school of engineering, which I continue to believe is the vehicle that will most advance our goal."

Cox lists a number of "points to consider, including:

• Our goal remains to provide improved engineering services statewide with particular emphasis on meeting the needs of Metro high technology industries.

• We continue to pursue the single statewide school of engineering concept.

• That the broadest possible approach be taken to meet industry needs, including contracting with other educational service providers, e.g., the Oregon Graduate Institute, Washington State University-Vancouver, and others."

Discussing the process, Cox has added some steps not listed in the original process:

"I. At its November meeting, the Board will hear the report from the Engineering Solution Team, which has been asked to develop the concept for a statewide college of engineering. The team is building and evaluating the case for a single school and should stay focused on this task--leaving aside, for the moment, the question of lead institution.

II. Also at the November meeting, the Board will receive any other formal proposals regarding the goal of building greater engineering capacity, quality, and production. If there are such proposals, the president of the Board will appoint a special Board committee, chaired by Vice President Tom Imeson (who is serving as Board liaison to the engineering Solution Team), to review and evaluate them and, after taking public testimony, will report back to the Board with the results and their recommendations.

III. After the above work has been completed, if the Board wishes to pursue the single statewide college of engineering concept, it will make the determination about the lead institution and the organizational structure, and it will instruct the Chancellor to take
the steps necessary over the next three months to bring the proposal to finality. Only after this has been completed, fully discussed, and reviewed by the Board, will a final decision be made regarding the statewide college of engineering."

REARDON stated he received the most recent communication on 3 October titled

"Rationale for the Process for Receiving and Evaluating Alternative Proposals Which Might Be Formally Developed and Submitted." It states:

"○ If formal alternative proposals are received, the president of the Board will ask Vice President Tim Imeson, together with several members of the Board, to receive, review, evaluate, and bring recommendations back to the Board.

• In so doing, Mr. Imeson’s sub-committee is fully at liberty to involve input from others: the high technology community, the AEA, and, of course, members of the original Solution Team, and both public and private sector individuals, etc.

○ In this way, two benefits accrue:

• The Solution Team can stay focused on its original task

• The Solution Team can bring its task rapidly to full development without distraction.

○ At the same time, alternative proposals, should there be any, will have an impartial and objective review and evaluation by a group that has not been fundamentally invested in the work of the original Solution Team. It is probably the fairest way to see that fresh proposals receive due and appropriate consideration, rather than being considered in competition by the group charged with developing the original idea.

○ This would seem to be the most objective and efficient way of proceeding. Thus, the arrangement that the Chancellor has recommended."

That’s where the process is at this point.

REARDON discussed enrollment. We have met our enrollment target and the carrying load for students is up and remaining up as compared to the past four
years. One reason for this is the amount of credit that has been moved to the four-credit module. Students are taking classes not credit hours. This is having a significant impact on our FTE.

REARDON commented on the Question to Administrators D1.b) addressed to Vice Provost Roy Koch regarding graduate education ("see D1"). This has been and will continue to be a critical issue at PSU due to increasing graduate enrollment. However, Masters-level programs are expanding faster than Ph.D. programs. Based on enrollment increases, there may be additional funding for graduate education. The task force on graduate education has a preliminary report prepared and will be making recommendations. Vice Provost Koch is working on a program that would provide for some start up funds for research groups at the institution that would be most likely interdisciplinary. REARDON has also asked the deans to develop fairly specific short range plans for investment and enhancement in graduate education in their areas.

REARDON also discussed two other issues. The first is the issue of access. Access is our traditional mission and is a goal we should continue to embrace and be public about. However, we are experiencing an enrollment increase of both younger and older students that puts stress on access. Furthermore, resources will not match access, although they will increase. The media has recently discussed viewpoints, of board members among others, which question the goal of access. This goes against the mission of our institution as well as one of the central roles historically played by American public higher education. Unlike some, let us not move to the elitist response of closing out underprepared students as the solution to rising enrollments.

REARDON discussed the parallel issue of access to graduate education, especially as it relates to quantity and duplication. We are the largest graduate institution in the state and there is great pressure to expand our offerings. REARDON expects our efforts in the near future will result in some conflict at the board level. He requested the faculty remain informed, to be alert to issues and attitudes that may temporarily delay our efforts for expansion at the graduate level.

KOCAOGLU was recognized by the Chair. He asked three questions regarding engineering education: 1) Has any analysis taken place to evaluate the savings or efficiencies gained by consolidation? 2) Has there been any discussion of the effect of supervision from elsewhere on the main issue of improved engineering education in Portland? 3) Is it the case that the issue is not resources for engineering education, but rather reorganizing the supervision of it?
REARDON replied that his perception is there has been no discussion of the three issues raised. Consolidation is not being proposed for savings and/or efficiency. Consolidation is not being examined for its effect on enhancing productivity - only that it will produce more engineers. The issue of additional resources needed for the Metropolitan area is also not being addressed. It appears to be a “build-it-and-they-will-come” approach to engineering education. Reardon added it also ignores the issue of what engineering programs should be located the metro area.

A. JOHNSON asked if the Provost would report on the status of the joint PSU/UO Architecture degree program. HARDT postponed the question.

2. **VICE PRESIDENT’S(FADM) REPORT**

PERNSTEINER began by answering Question to Administrators, D1.c) regarding parking fees (see “D1”), as he had to leave for his 4:00 p.m. class. He stated the city has not ‘opened up’ parking, just changed the number of some spaces designated for short term retail use. He stated he recently received a letter which states PSU still must reduce parking by 10% to subsidize transit passes and service the debt on the parking garages, the latter being the greatest cost. PSU will continue to raise parking fees by 15% per year for one more year, according to our three-year agreement with the city, and offer subsidized transit passes.

MOOR asked how the increase in parking fees reduces the number of drivers. PERNSTEINER stated the theory is that by raising prices, the number of drivers is reduced. We have a waiting list, regardless. The increase will not, by itself, reduce trips. A. JOHNSON asked if students shouldn’t count, as they are customers. PERNSTEINER stated that was a good question. PERNSTEINER yielded to KENTON who stated that PSU has 200-300 more spaces than we should have for the square footage of our buildings.

PERNSTEINER stated Vice Provost Allen would discuss the increased Fall 1996 enrollment, but that he wanted to highlight the resulting budget implications. Our strategy has been budget cuts and revenue increase. To get additional dollars in the current biennium we have attempted to exceed the mid-point of our current enrollment corridor (8,815 three-term FTE’s) by a minimum of 351 students. If we do, we are funded at $2900/student for the number of students above the mid-point. We intend to have several hundred students above the midpoint this year. We anticipate $1.5 - $1.7 million above our current running level. The big effect of that doesn’t come this year, however. Because we convinced the Chancellor’s office that our enrollment would continue to grow, our corridor for 1997-99 has been changed to 9,700 FTEs. That would result in a minimum of $6. million in additional funding. The key is to be IN the corridor or well above it.
Finally, we have a change in enrollment patterns, making us the largest graduate school in the state. We have changed in the ratio of graduates to total FTE. That change could be worth another $1 million per year in the next biennium, and is the basis for the Provost's intent to address enhancement of graduate programs.

3. **VICE PROVOST’S(OSA) REPORT**

ALLEN reported that we are two weeks from the 4th week enrollment figure and we are 2% up in head count and 6% up in credit. There is an across-the-board rise in continuing, Freshmen, transfers, and especially graduate students. If we maintain this pattern we should be less than 100 students above the bottom of the next funding corridor. For Fall 1996 our goal is 14,900. We are hoping for 15,200 students in Fall 1997, and 15,550 students in Fall 1998. The new general education program is improving retention and we are continuing our recruiting efforts.

LENDARIS asked how close we are to meeting the corridor. ALLEN said we are doing fine - it looks very promising. OSA are estimating we will reach 9,880. REARDON noted that enrollment is good across the system, so we are not in a "safety net" mode. ALLEN stated that enrollment is level or slightly up at the other schools, with UO and OSU having the greatest potential impact.

D. **QUESTION PERIOD**

1. **QUESTIONS FOR ADMINISTRATORS**

See C1. and C2. for responses to Questions D1.a) and D1.c) by REARDON and PERNSTEINER, respectively.

b) KOCH replied to Question to Administrators D1.b) regarding a report of a state system task force on graduate education(see “D1”) In answer to the first part, he stated the Task Force started as one thing and turned into something else. Originally Roy Koch and J. Shireman represented PSU, but Shireman left after the reconstruction. The Chair was former OSU President John Byrne and it was staffed by the Chancellor’s office. The task force discussed issues, Byrne prepared the outline, and the Chancellor’s office executed the report. What was quoted in the question was from a draft report. All the institutions have objected to the staff work and resulting language, and the report is still being edited.

KOCH stated, in response to the second part, that there are several improvements we are working on or need to make regarding graduate
programs. Relations with the Board have been improved by bringing all the members (except the Chair) to campus. This has been accomplished with the help of Debbie Murdock of the President's Office, among others. PSU still needs to increase positive feedback on our programs, to be directed to the Board and the public. We need to get the word out even more. The impact of Masters programs is obvious and possibly even worries our sister institutions. Our Ph.D. programs are harder to explain as they are largely non-traditional.

KOCH stated, in response to part three, that we have several proposals. On the doctoral level, we need to build research activities. This coming year we will set up a competitive process to fund a few initiatives to develop interdisciplinary research groups here on campus. At present, this research development will be funded entirely from indirect cost recovery.

KAISER asked the source of the document quoted in “D1”. KOCH stated it was from the executive summary of the report which was circulated at the July board meeting.

2. QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR FOR THE CHAIR

A. JOHNSON asked again for a report on the status of the joint PSU/UO Architecture degree program. HARDT postponed the question due to time constraints.

E. REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. INTER INSTITUTIONAL FACULTY SENATE

ENNEKING, for Oshika, reported after C1. Provost’s Report, so that she could leave for her 4:00 p.m. class. ENNEKING noted that the October IFS meeting was rescheduled for Saturday, 12 October. IFS has not met since June. Over the summer IFS representatives attempted to monitor the “solution teams,” tasks forces, etc. to insure that they all have faculty membership, or at least that faculty are attending meetings. The agenda for the October meeting includes the issue of faculty representation on the State Board (an issue which has been on-going), and expansion of graduate programs.

2. PSU FOUNDATION AND DEVELOPMENT OFFICE

Dr. Lee Theisen, Executive Director of the PSU Foundation, gave a brief presentation on their recent activities and offered factbooks for those who wished
to take one. The size and breadth of board membership was increased and will be increased again this year. In 1995-96, income was $5.2 million against expenditures of $3.4 million in all accounts. Two years ago the worth of the foundation was a little above $4.5 million. Thiesen’s target is similar to a foundation model at U. of Arizona, which increased total worth in ten years from $7. to $43 million. Accounts have been shifted to U.S. Trust. Total assets to date are $7.4 million. The foundation hopes to consolidate the 620 equity accounts to improve efficiency and earnings; they supervised 26,000 transactions last year, including 300 checks per month. They hope to get accounts on-line this year, so departments can access data more easily. It is important to note that donations to the Foundation earn both 6% in their account as well as the state earnings of 11.5% as compared to donations to the State which earn only the latter amount.

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business.

G. NEW BUSINESS

1. REORGANIZATION OF THE SCHOOL OF URBAN AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS

WAMSER, University Planning Council Chair presented their report and reviewed the deliberation process. He noted that their decision was delayed at the time of the October Senate mailing, based on the need for additional information. Subsequently, some questions have been answered by a memorandum from UPA, which was mailed to Senators last week. The committee has not formally met since that mailing, and some committee members retain concerns. A memorandum arrived today from Dean Kaiser representing CLAS.

CEASE/GURTOV MOVED the Senate approve the “Proposal to Restructure the School of Urban and Public Affairs,” effective immediately, including:

1) Move the Department of Political Science from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences to the School of Urban and Public Affairs;

2) Rename the school the College of Urban and Public Affairs;

3) Establish within the new college a School of Government to include the departments of Administration of Justice, Political Science and Public Administration, to include a Ph.D. Program in Public Administration and Policy, and to be administered by a director with department chair status; and,
4) Rename the Departments of Urban Studies and Planning, and Public Health Education to the School of Urban Studies and Planning and the School of Community Health, respectively.

(See attached proposal for additional details of restructuring)

REARDON reviewed the history of the idea. There was a proposal made when the college was formed, to move Political Science to UPA. He was approached this year by Dean Toulan with a proposal, which included an UPA deliberation process. He then met with Dean Toulan and Dean Kaiser to consider the inclusion in the process of representatives from the college and the Political Science department. That representation was added. After the proposal was forwarded and REARDON reviewed it, he met with the Political Science department to discuss curricular rationale. REARDON stressed that he requested both parties respond to the question of curricular and program rationale. This must be the basis for the move. REARDON then forwarded the proposal with his positive recommendation to the President, and finally to the Faculty Senate Steering Committee.

REARDON reiterated his support for the proposal. An important factor is the arrival of the Public Administration program members from Lewis & Clark College. The number of Political Scientists in UPA now outnumbers those in the College. An advantage of consolidation in a School of Government is a considerably greater resource base. At the same time, REARDON shares Dean Kaiser’s concerns regarding programmatic cooperation. Most of our centers and institutes are not opened up for participation across the university, and this needs to be changed. REARDON also shares Dean Kaiser’s concern that leadership of liberal education is the role of the College, but he does not believe it is dependant on all courses involved being in the college. For example, Art, Music and Theatre all contribute significant instruction to the liberal arts core, regardless of their location in SFPA.

TOULAN stated this was a faculty driven process. Its origin evolved from a 1988 governor’s commission report which overlooked the contribution of UPA, and named Western Oregon State College as the the seat of government education in the state. At that time Provost Reardon asked how we could change this perception. In 1989, a school task force on government and public affairs, chaired by E. Kutza, recommended reorganization, including a school of government. This proposal remained in a drawer until 1995, when the President requested we resurrect the idea. Concurrently P. Niebanck recommended improvements in the Public Administration Ph.D. program. E. Kutza chaired the school task force which reviewed the reorganization proposal. Thus a conversion of forces was instrumental in the proposal you see before you today.
TOULAN yielded to E. Kutza. KUTZA reviewed the deliberation process. She was appointed to Chair the task force in January, and began by meeting with Dean Kaiser. The process was an open one, with task force members from the four departments of UPA, Political Science, the CLAS Dean’s office, and P. Niebanck. The deliberation was lengthy. In April, the task force endorsed the plan for reorganization. All departments believe that the change will improve visibility, collaboration, recruitment, program excitement and efficiencies. It is supported by all the seventy-plus faculty represented in the affected departments.

GURTOV yielded to Craig Carr, representing the Political Science Department. CARR stated their decision process was faculty-driven, and that Political Science unanimously and enthusiastically endorsed the proposal in March. The department considered proposals that they split into several curricular factions for various reasons, and they objected. They concluded that there would be no curricular or programmatic problems from a move to UPA, but that there would be several benefits (see report).

LENDARIS/A.JOHNSON MOVED to continue the meeting on October 14, 1996, at 3:00 p.m. as time was getting late. THE MOTION TO ADJOURN WAS APPROVED by unanimous voice vote.

H. ADJOURNMENT

HARDT adjourned the meeting at 5:05 p.m. until October 14, 1995, at 3:00 p.m. in 53 Cramer Hall.

THE SECOND OCTOBER MEETING OF THE PSU FACULTY SENATE WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 3:10 P.M., OCTOBER 14, 1996.

A. ROLL CALL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Approval of the minutes of October 7, 1996, was postponed until November 4, 1996.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS

The President was out of town. The Provost was called away. The Chair moved directly to agenda item D1.
D. NEW BUSINESS (CONTINUED)

1. REORGANIZATION OF THE SCHOOL OF URBAN AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS

HARDT stated we would resume hearing from the scheduled list of speakers last week after a statement from Carl Wamser, Chair of UPC.

WAMSER presented a new recommendation from University Planning Council, which met again on October 9, 1996. Based upon additional information received from UPA, the Council now endorses the proposal, in two parts with comments, the restructuring proposal (see attached recommendation). In future, guidelines should be in place for the move of a department and its restructuring under new aegis.

KAISER stated he supports the formation of a school of government. He commended the Faculty Senate for anticipating guidelines for future restructuring, especially as changes in graduate education are in the offing.

HARDT recognized John Damis, Political Science Chair. The department voted unanimously, with one abstention, on 18 March, to move to the proposed school of government. There was some pressure from UPA, the planning for the new urban center building, and Academic Affairs to come to a decision. However, there was no pressure as to the decision. There will be no change in the obligations of Political Science to students in the College, the liberal core, or to International Studies.

BRENNER asked the question, regarding administration of the School of Government (G1, page 3), if it is realistic to expect savings over time from reduction of department chairs from twelve to nine month contracts. TOULAN stated that is the way the rest of UPA is organized now. There are nine month coordinators, with no release time.

WEIKEL asked why University Planning Council changed their recommendation between the Senate meeting of 7 October and today’s. WAMSER stated that at their meeting of 27 September UPC expressed concerns and requested additional information (see G1). This additional information from Urban and Public Affairs arrived in time for a supplemental mailing to Senators on 3 October, but UPC didn’t meet again until 9 October, after the October Senate mailing and the 7 October meeting.

The question was called.
THE MOTION PASSED by thirty-four (34) in favor, one (1) against, and four (4) abstentions.

TOULAN asked to address the Senate. He stated that the process has been a long one since origination of this idea, especially as it had to do with moving a department. He stated that although the process has been arduous and sometimes painful, no one is a looser and no one will be loosing resources. In fact, this is a significant “win” for Portland State. We will all gain by the enhancement of these programs and the resulting national visibility.

G.2. AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION, General Student Affairs Committee, IV, 4k.

HOLLOWAY asked if the Educational Activities Advisory Board’s duties were to be absorbed by the General Student Affairs Committee. ALLEN stated yes. LENDARIS asked if any were not. ALLEN stated no. The Amendment now goes to the Advisory Council for consideration, and will return to the Senate in November.

A. JOHNSON asked if his question regarding the status of the joint PSU/UO Architecture program would be answered. HARDT stated the Provost was prepared to answer it today but had urgent business away from campus, and given the full agenda of today’s meeting, Hardt postponed it.

HARDT, without objection, moved the Senate to a committee of the whole to hear a discussion by Assoc. Dean Franz Rad, on engineering program reorganization activities at the state level.

H. ADJOURNMENT

At 4:30 p.m., HARDT returned the Senate to formal session. The meeting was adjourned at 4:33 p.m.

Faculty Senate Minutes. October 7 and 14, 1996
University Planning Council

Recommendation regarding the proposed reorganization
of the School of Urban and Public Affairs

The University Planning Council met on Wednesday, October 9, 1996, to continue discussion of the issue of the proposed reorganization of the School of Urban and Public Affairs. Additional information available since the previous meeting included the written response from UPA to our four items of concern and testimony at the October 7 Faculty Senate meeting.

1) The Council endorses fully the concept of a reorganized, renamed, and significantly strengthened College of Urban and Public Affairs, including a School of Government, as outlined in the proposal.

2) The Council endorses the move of the Department of Political Science to the reorganized College of Urban and Public Affairs, as outlined in the proposal.

The above two issues were separated conceptually because the process involved in the development of this proposal, and in the expected implementation of this proposal, have made it clear that the University lacks clear principles or guidelines regarding collaboration and/or relocation across departments or across schools. Appropriate principles and guidelines could enhance collaboration in general and clarify those situations where relocation of faculty or departments may be beneficial. Such principles would likely include the following:

* mutual agreement is reached between the faculty or department and the new collaborator regarding the collaboration or move
* the faculty or department's current associations and responsibilities are not substantially compromised
* the collaboration or move has a beneficial effect on affected constituencies:
  students / faculty / academic programs / the University / the community
* the budgetary implications appropriately balance with the expected benefits

In this particular case, the Council believes that application of these guidelines indicate that the proposed reorganization of the School of Urban and Public Affairs will be a positive move for the University.

The Council would welcome a directive from the Faculty Senate to develop such guidelines to inform future such decisions. In the meanwhile, the Council requests earlier involvement in restructuring plans of this type in order to assist in the development of the guidelines.

Submitted by: Carl C. Wamser, UPC Chair, 10/9/96
QUESTIONS FOR ADMINISTRATORS

D.1.a) Question from Steering Committee for Provost Michael Reardon

PSU/UO JOINT ARCHITECTURE PROGRAM.
1. What was the original agreement for the joint PSU/UO Masters of Architecture professional degree program?
2. How did this program relate to licensing practice?
3. Why did this joint program fall apart?
4. What plans are there to continue a professional architecture degree program at PSU?
5. Will such a program have a particular focus different from UO's?
6. How will it be financed?

D.1.b) Question from Steering Committee for Provost Michael Reardon

UNIVERSITY STUDIES. University Studies is now in its third year. Please provide Faculty Senate members with an update on the evaluation component of the program. As part of this update, answers to the following questions would be very helpful:

1. What evaluation procedures does University Studies have in place?
2. What forms of program data are being collected?
3. How is the program responding to evaluation findings?
4. How is University Studies determining whether it is meeting its original four goals related to inquiry and critical thinking, communication, human experience, and ethical issues and social responsibility? What criteria are being used to evaluate these goals?
5. "What are the retention rates in comparison to pre-University Studies rates?"
6. Has a cost-benefit analysis been conducted and, if so, what are the results of the analysis?
7. How will the results and findings be shared with the University community to help departments connect their goals and curriculum with University Studies?
IFS Report to PSU Faculty Senate
Beatrice T. Oshika
October 22, 1996

The IFS met at the University of Oregon on October 11-12, 1996. In addition, IFS representatives attended the Academic Council and OSSHE Board meeting at Eastern Oregon State College on Oct 17-18, 1996. Discussion items included the following:

BUDGET/LEGISLATIVE OUTLOOK
- the OSSHE Board has put into its legislative budget request the goal of raising OSSHE faculty salaries to national averages over the next three biennia. IFS President Martha Sargent is on an informal working group with Chancellor Joe Cox and others to discuss general salary issues and allocation of merit pay.

- there was discussion of how to coordinate faculty activities during the upcoming legislative session, and it was suggested that faculty inform their campus legislative coordinators and Grattan Kerans (the Chancellor's legislative liaison) of any legislative contacts.

- at the Board meeting, IFS made a presentation indicating that faculty are very demoralized by the low levels of commitment to higher education by the state and are beginning to leave the OSSHE system.

ACADEMIC ISSUES
- the Academic Council is looking at calendar and articulation issues with the community colleges, including a semester calendar. It is aware of the historical baggage associated with semesters. The articulation issues are raised in the context of 'seamless' education from kindergarten through lifelong learning.

- to address the access question, new partnerships between two-year and four-year institutions are being forged. In addition, the Bend community college district is committed to establishing a four-year institution, now called Cascadia.

- IFS expressed concern that the process for bringing curricular proposals (new degree programs, etc) to the Board is being held up informally in the Chancellor's office. An example is a proposal for a PhD program in Mathematics Education submitted by PSU.
AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY

Vice Provost Allen has notified the Faculty Senate Steering Committee that the Educational Activities Advisory Board (an advisory committee established by administrative action) has been dissolved effective Fall 1996, and requested that certain duties be absorbed by the General Student Affairs Committee. The Faculty Senate Steering Committee proposes the following motion.

We, the ten undersigned members of the PSU Faculty Senate, present to the PSU Faculty Senate the following Amendment to the constitution of the Portland State University Faculty.

Text to be deleted is struck out. Text to be added is underlined.

ARTICLE IV. Organization of the Faculty.
4) Standing Committees and Their Functions.
   k) General Student Affairs. The membership of the General Student Affairs Committee shall be composed of five faculty members other than those who report to the Vice Provost and Dean of Students, and five members of the Associated Students of Portland State University. The chairperson of the General Student Affairs Committee shall be chosen from the Faculty membership. Consultants shall include, but not be limited to, one representative from the Vice Provost and Dean of Students' office. This Committee shall:

1) Serve in an advisory capacity to administrative officers on matters of student affairs, educational activities, budgets, and student discipline.
2) Have specific responsibility to review and make recommendations regarding policies related to student services, programs, and long-range planning, e.g., student employment, Educational Activities, counseling, health service, etc., and extra curricular programming.
3) Nominate the recipients of the Presidential Community Service Awards.
4) Report to the Senate at least once a year.

September 23, 1996
1. Definition of Academic Work

b. Describe or define the field of specialization with which the proposed program would be concerned.

The proposed ESL/Bilingual endorsement is concerned with the knowledge, skills and attitudes that will facilitate the new endorsement in bilingual and English as a Second Language education. This endorsement will prepare holders of either a Basic or Standard Teaching License for the regular classroom or special education to work with limited English proficient students. This new endorsement has been approved by the Oregon Teacher Standards and Practices Commission in 1995 and will become effective January 1, 1999.

The areas of concentration necessary for the ESL/Bilingual endorsements require competence in the following areas:

* Knowledge of first and second language acquisition;
* Knowledge of applied linguistics and structure and functions of spoken and written languages;
* Methods for teaching first and second languages, such as whole language, project approaches, inquiry/discovery techniques, individualized instruction, cooperative learning, cross-age grouping, and sheltered classrooms;
* Curriculum materials for teaching conversation, composition, literature and culture of the second language, and for teaching content of other academic disciplines in the second language;
* Use of technology to enhance instruction;
Knowledge of local, state, and federal laws pertaining to educating students with limited English proficiency;

Assessment of students' oral proficiency, literacy, and knowledge of academic content in their first and second languages;

Knowledge of cultural diversity and the impact of diversity on learning and communication styles;

Involvement of parents and the community in educating students with limited English proficiency;

Completion of student teaching or practicum with students with limited English proficiency; and

Documentation of proficiency in a target language for designation as bilingual teacher. An ESL endorsement is issued without this documentation.

b. What subspecialities or areas of concentration would be emphasized during the initial years of the program?

None.

c. Are there other subspecialities the institution would anticipate adding or emphasizing as the program develops?

No.

d. Are there other subspecialities the institution intends to avoid in developing the program?

No.

e. When will the program be operational, if approved?

The program will be operational in Winter, 1997.
2. Department and School Responsible for the Proposed Program

a. What department, school, or college would offer the proposed program?

The School of Education will offer the proposed ESL/Bilingual endorsement with some academic support from the Applied Linguistics Department within the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. All three departments within the School of Education plus Continuing Education in the School of Education will have some responsibility for the proposed program.

b. Will the program involve a new or reorganized administrative unit within the institution?

The proposed program will not require an administrative unit different from the existing one.

3. Objectives of the Program

a. What are the objectives of the program?

The proposed new endorsement is designed to create a pool of well prepared ESL and Bilingual teachers able to meet the challenges of educating linguistically and culturally diverse students. Those obtaining the endorsement will be qualified to work with limited English proficient students. The program objectives include:

* Develop a greater understanding of how diversity affects the teaching and learning process;

* Identify and appreciate cultural factors that affect cultural adjustment and learning;

* Understand other cultures' orientation to education and school in order to foster better relationships with students and their families;
* Gain knowledge of first and second language acquisition;

* Gain knowledge of applied linguistics;

* Identify and implement methods for teaching first and second languages;

* Develop appropriate curriculum materials for teaching ESL and bilingual education;

* Use technology to enhance second language instruction;

* Assess students’ linguistic proficiency in their first and second languages; and

* Gain knowledge about working with limited English proficient students who have special needs.

b. How will the institution determine how well the program meets these objectives? Identify specific post-approval monitoring procedures and outcome indicators to be used if the program is approved.

The preparation of ESL/Bilingual educators intended by the proposal will be assessed through the following:

* Evaluation against program outcome criteria to be used in an ongoing self-assessment process by students in the endorsement program;

* Survey questionnaires to be completed by students and practicum supervisors when endorsement requirements are met;

* The School of Education's regular evaluation questionnaire will be used for the program, as it is for all others;

* The success rate of graduates in terms of securing ESL/Bilingual positions requiring this endorsement; and
The continuing review and assessment of the program’s adequacy by accrediting agencies such as Oregon’s Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC) and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Educators (NCATE).

c. How is the proposed program related to the mission and academic plan of the institution?

The mission of Portland State University is to provide excellent programs in teaching, research and public service (Bulletin, 1996-97), and to enhance the intellectual, social, cultural, and economic qualities of urban life by providing access throughout the life span to a quality liberal education and professional and graduate programs.

In keeping with the University mission, the proposed program has been developed and will be implemented with the cooperation of metropolitan area school personnel involved in educating limited English proficient students.

The table below reveals the numbers of languages and cultural diversity of students who are being served in four school districts within the Portland metropolitan area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Portland</th>
<th>Salem</th>
<th>Woodburn</th>
<th>Vancouver (WA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CamViet</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshallese</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mien</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumanian</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>1545</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VietChinese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3268</strong></td>
<td><strong>1219</strong></td>
<td><strong>2097</strong></td>
<td><strong>333</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What are the employment opportunities for persons who have been prepared by the proposed program?

This new endorsement will be required for all school district personnel who serve limited English proficient and bilingual students beginning January 1, 1999. Currently there are 130 ESL teachers in the Portland Public Schools and roughly 400 ESL teachers within the State of Oregon. All of these professionals will need this new endorsement beginning in 1999.

In 1991-92, according to the Oregon State Office of Education, there were approximately 16,359 limited English proficient students speaking over 50 different languages and dialects in K-12 schools in Oregon; the growth in the diversity of languages and cultures of people that have and will continue to settle in this region is tremendous.

The 1970s brought Southeast Asian refugees representing Hmong, Mien, Cambodian, Lao, Chinese, and Vietnamese languages and cultures to Oregon to add to an already-growing population of Spanish-speaking students. While the growth continued in the 1980s for these language groups and others, the 1990s have added students from different continents representing new linguistic and cultural groups. Students are now arriving in public schools from countries such as Latvia, Russia, Ukraine, Poland, Somalia, Algeria, Haiti, Rumania, the Marshall Islands, and Iran. This migration trend is increasing, and currently ALL counties in Oregon report having limited English speaking students in attendance. Additionally, many Portland Public Schools hope to offer new bilingual magnet programs.
4. Relationships of Proposed Program to Other Programs in the Institution

a. List the closely related programs and areas of strength currently available in the institution which would give important support to the proposed program.

The Applied Linguistics Department has worked in conjunction with the School of Education (the Departments of Curriculum and Instruction; Educational Policy, Foundations, and Administrative Studies; and Special Education/Counselor Education) to develop the courses for this new ESL/Bilingual endorsement. Two of the required courses within this new endorsement have been developed by and carry credit through the Applied Linguistics Department.

Students will have two options for obtaining this new endorsement. Track One is the program of study described within this proposal; Track Two, the TESL Certificate, is an already existing option within the Department of Applied Linguistics. Track Two is another appropriate means to gain this new endorsement, but because it is a 40-credit program, it seems likely that currently licensed teachers will choose the Track One option, which is 19 credits and a 3-credit practicum, as a means to obtain this new endorsement.

Additionally, areas of strength currently available to support the proposed program include: well established relationships with public school districts in the metropolitan area, collaborative work with school districts, educational service districts, and the Oregon Department of Education.
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5. Course of Study

a. Describe the proposed course of study.

In this course of study, students will develop and practice using the knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed for success in working with limited English proficient students. Further, the curriculum will provide students with the foundation to foster their continuing professional and career development. Students will be able to function more effectively in diversified classrooms and broaden their professional base by linking with others in the field. The courses have been designed by an advisory group of university faculty and school practitioners who worked together to develop a coordinated approach to understanding and working effectively with linguistic and cultural diversity in the classroom.
Those seeking this endorsement already hold Basic or Standard teaching or special education licensure in the State of Oregon and have completed a substantial amount of professional work in education. TSPC's proposed program of study is 18 hours plus a practicum, PSU is proposing a 19 credit program plus a practicum.

**The course work will include:**

- **EPFA 410/510**  Impact of Language and Culture in the Classroom  3 credits
- **LING 410/510**  How People Learn a Second Language  3 credits
- **CI 410/510**  Effective Teaching Strategies and Materials for Working with Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Students  3 credits
- **SPED 410/510**  Working with LEP Children Who Have Special Needs  2 credits
- **EPFA 410/510**  LEP School Community Relations  3 credits
- **LING 410/510**  Taking Stock: Assessment and Evaluation in Programs with Language Minority Students  2 credits
- **CI 410/510**  ESL/Bilingual Program Design and Models  3 credits
- **CI 409/509**  ESL/Bilingual Practicum  3 credits

b. **What elements of the course of study are presently in operation in the institution?**

Track Two is now in operation at Portland State University in the Department of Applied Linguistics. Track One is in partial operation at PSU at this time through a series of courses offered by Continuing Education in the School of Education.

(See Appendix A)
c. **How many and which courses will need to be added to institutional offerings in support of the proposed program?**

These courses will need to be added to offer the proposed curriculum:

* ESL/Bilingual Practicum (3)
* ESL/Bilingual Program Design and Models (3)

6. **Admission Requirements**

a. **Please list any requirements for admission to the program that are in addition to admission to the institution.**

Admission to the ESL/Bilingual Endorsement Program will include the following requirements:

a) Applicant must hold a Basic or Standard Teaching license endorsed for the regular classroom or special education; and

b) Applicant must document proficiency in a target language for designation as a bilingual on their endorsement.

b. **Will any enrollment limitation be imposed?**

Based on previous enrollments in these courses, it is not anticipated that enrollment in the proposed program will exceed the normal course enrollment limits in courses offered in the School of Education.

7. **Relationship of Proposed Program to Future Plans**

a. **Is the proposed program the first of several steps the institution has in mind in reaching a long-term goal in this or a related field?**

A reasonable plan exists to achieve the goals of teaching, supervising, and advising that support this program.
b. If so, what are the next steps if the Board approves the program currently being proposed?

Not applicable.

8. Accreditation of Program

a. Is there an accrediting agency or professional society which has established standards in the area in which the proposed program lies?

NABE (National Association for Bilingual Education) and TESOL (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages) have guidelines for the training of ESL and Bilingual teachers, but they do not have established standards in this area nor do they hold any accrediting powers. TSPC is the body that has established standards for this endorsement, and this proposal exceeds their requirements. This program will also be included for accreditation by NCATE (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education).

b. If so, does the proposed program meet accreditation standards? By what date is it anticipated that the program will be fully accredited?

The proposed program exceeds Oregon accreditation standards as set by the Oregon Teacher Standards and Practices Commission. Formal approval from TSPC is needed before the program can be offered and approval is anticipated during Fall 1996. NCATE and TSPC will also be making a site visit in November, 1996. This program will be described during that visit.

c. If the proposed program is a graduate program in which the institution offers an undergraduate program, is the undergraduate program fully accredited?

Not applicable.
9. Evidence of Need

a. What evidence does the institution have of need for the program?

There are several important indicators of the need for the endorsement to be offered at Portland State University.

1) PSU is located in the most linguistically and culturally diverse part of Oregon, and the challenges to provide appropriate education to these students within the Portland metropolitan area seems critical;

2) The current demographics of Oregon indicate a growing population of limited English proficient students; the outlook is that this trend will continue well into the 21st century;

3) Both federal and state statutes require equal access to educational opportunities for students, regardless of language or cultural background; this legal requirement is also reflected in the 21st Century School Reform Act that emphasizes multicultural education; and

4) Currently teacher preparation programs in Oregon do not specifically prepare teachers for the unique academic needs of language minority students; this endorsement will meet the academic and cultural needs of language minority students and fill a growing demand.

b. What is the estimated enrollment and the estimated number of graduates of the proposed program over the next five years?

We anticipate that a large number of teachers will seek this endorsement in the beginning so that they will be able to retain their current jobs. Once these teachers have received their endorsements, we expect that there will be about 30 students per year seeking this endorsement.
c. Is the proposed program intended primarily to provide another program option to students who are already attracted to the institution, or is it anticipated that the program will draw its clientele primarily from students who would not otherwise come to the institution were the proposed program not available there?

The program would draw students who would not otherwise come to Portland State University.

d. Identify statewide and institutional service area manpower needs which the proposed program would assist in filling.

The employment opportunities listed in 3.d. reflect the statewide and institutional service needs. State and regional projections indicate a growing need for additional qualified teachers to work with limited English proficient students.

e. What evidence is there that there exists a regional or national need for additional qualified persons such as the proposed program would turn out?

Prior to and during the development of this proposed program there has been a continuing press from school districts in the state and in the metropolitan region to get this new ESL/Bilingual endorsement approved by TSPC, which it was in 1995. Since this endorsement will be required of all teachers who teach ESL and or Bilingual Education in the state by January 1, 1999, the need is both immediate and apparent.

f. Are there other compelling reasons to offer the program?

In Oregon and Southwest Washington there is a limited number of institutions of higher education offering courses for training licensed teachers in either bilingual education or ESL. The teacher training programs offered are of the traditional type, directed primarily toward the native English-speaking student. As is noted within this proposal, the number of limited-English-speaking students within the public schools is growing, and the need to prepare teachers for their unique academic, linguistic and cultural needs must be met.
g. Identify any special interest in the program on the part of local or state business or special interest groups.

An increasing number of limited English proficient students are experiencing limited educational achievement resulting from alienation from school, dropping out of school, and, finally, low participation in higher education. If these students were better served, they will be able to achieve and participate more fully in school, because education is essential for successful access to future employment opportunities.

h. Have any special provisions been made for making the complete program available for part-time or evening students?

The entire ESL/Bilingual endorsement program is specifically designed for part-time and evening students, because it is anticipated that those enrolling in courses will be professional educators.

10. Similar Programs in the State

a. List any similar programs in the state.

Because this is a new endorsement from TSPC, there is only one such program in existence. It is at WOSC. It is anticipated that other colleges and universities will want to offer this new endorsement.

b. If similar programs are offered in other institutions in the state, what purpose will the proposed program serve? Is it intended to supplement, complement, or duplicate existing programs?

Duplicate the program and to serve Metropolitan Portland, as opposed to out-state, ESL/Bilingual Teachers.

c. In what way, if any, will resources of any other institutions be utilized in the proposed program?

None.
11. Faculty

a. List any present faculty who would be involved in offering the proposed program, with pertinent information concerning their special qualifications for service in this area.

The program will draw on the expertise of faculty within Portland State University departments and support for teaching will also be provided through PSU's Continuing Education within the School of Education. Any additional faculty who might teach, supervise, or advise in this program at some future date would also have to meet the same criteria of having relevant ESL/Bilingual experience, university training, program design, and classroom experience working with limited English proficient and/or bilingual students.

1) Sharon Chasko, MAT, has been project coordinator for the Title VII Project, a migrant resources teacher, ESL teacher, project coordinator for the Women's Equity Act, and coordinator for Portland Public Schools ESL/bilingual program since 1979. Ms Chasko served on the TSPC Endorsement Committee.

2) Cynthia Cosgrave, MA, has designed and coordinated programs to serve the needs of K-12 culturally and linguistically diverse populations and currently is a Title VII coordinator/resource teacher for the Portland Public Schools ESL/Bilingual Program.

3) Kathryn Harris, Ph.D., teaches languages and linguistics at PSU. She was an undergraduate student advisor and coordinator of the ESL program at Northwestern University in Illinois.

4) Martha McCall, M.Ed., manages the data system for the ESL/Bilingual Program for Portland Public Schools. She evaluates the program and is involved in designing and administering Portland's testing program for LEP students.

5) Tou Meksavanh, MS, is the assistant director for the ESL/Bilingual Program for Portland Public Schools. She develops and implements management procedures, consistent with federal and state guidelines, for instructional and support services to limited English proficient students.
6) **Carmen Portillo**, MA, is currently teaching at Arizona State University in Tempe, AZ; her work is devoted to teaching in special education with a specific emphasis on language minority students.

7) **Frances Portillo**, M.Ed., has been working in Cultural Diversity and Bilingual Education for 12 years. She received the 1995 Outstanding Interculturalist Award for Achievement from the International Society for Intercultural Education, Training and Research.

8) **Joan Strouse**, Ph.D., is a professor at PSU in the Educational Policy, Foundations, and Administrative Studies Department. Dr. Strouse has taught ESL in K-12 and community college settings and has directed Title VII programs in public schools and colleges.

9) **Marge Terdal**, Ph.D., is a professor in PSU's Applied Linguistics Department. Professor Terdal teaches various courses in PSU's TESL Certificate and M.A. TESL programs as well as supervising ESL practicum students.

b. **Estimate the number, rank, and background of new faculty members that would need to be added to initiate the new program.**

No new faculty will be added.

c. **Estimate the number and type of support staff needed in each of the first four years of the program.**

No additional support staff are needed to offer the proposed program for the first four years of operation.

12. **Library**

a. **Describe the adequacy of the library holdings that are relevant to the proposed program.**

Current library holdings meet the requirements of the proposed program.  
*(See Appendix B)*
b. How much, if any, additional library support will be required to bring the library to an adequate level for support of the proposed program?

Additional materials will be necessary only to update the course bibliographies as new research and program information becomes available, and they will added through the normal acquisition process.

13. Facilities and Equipment

a. What special facilities in terms of buildings, laboratories, or equipment are necessary to the offering of a quality program in the field and at the level of the proposed program?

Current facilities, which include classrooms in the School of Education and practicum sites in school districts located in the metropolitan area, are adequate for offering a quality ESL/Bilingual endorsement.

b. What of these facilities does the institution presently have on hand?

All of the facilities described above are currently available.

c. What facilities beyond those now on hand would be required in support of the program?

No additional facilities are necessary.
14. Budgetary Impact

a. Please indicate the estimated cost of the program for the first four years of its operation.

This program will be self-supporting since it will be offered through Continuing Education in the School of Education with the School of Extended Studies. *(See Appendix C)*

b. If a special legislative appropriation is required to launch the program, please provide a statement of the nature of the special budget request, the amount requested, the reasons a special appropriation is needed. How does the institution plan to continue the program after the initial biennium?

Not applicable.

c. If federal or other grant funds are required to launch the program, what does the institution propose to do with the program upon termination of the grant?

Not applicable.

d. Will the allocation of going-level budget funds in support of the program have an adverse impact on any institutional programs? If so, which program and in what ways?

Not applicable.
To: Teacher Education committee  
From: Applied Linguistics Department  
Marjorie Terdal  
Date: February 12, 1996

Below are some clarifications of the proposal for ESL/Bilingual Endorsement submitted by Cheryl Livneh to the Leadership Team on January 17, 1996.

1. The Applied Linguistics Department has worked in conjunction with Continuing Education to develop the series for Succeeding with Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Students. We believe that the program, when expanded to 18-19 credits, is an appropriate way for teachers to meet the endorsement. We expect that this series, referred to as Track One, is the track that most applicants for the endorsement will choose to pursue. The Applied Linguistics Department is satisfied that the two classes that carry LING credit--Assessment and How People Learn a Second Language--do meet the standards of the department.

2. We also believe that the TESL Certificate, which has been offered at Portland State for more than twenty-five years, first through the English Department and currently through Applied Linguistics, is also an appropriate means to gain the endorsement. This will be referred to as Track Two. Because it is a 39-credit program (to be 40 credits under the four-credit conversion), it seems likely that current teachers are less likely to choose this option. However, some current teachers already hold the TESL Certificate and other students earn it either while getting their B.A. degree or as Post-Baccalaureate students.

Requirements for the TESL Certificate under the four-credit conversion will include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TESOL Methods</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature/Culture</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two years Foreign Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students choosing to earn the ESL/Bilingual Endorsement will take the following course work while earning the TESL Certificate under Track Two:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Competencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TESOL Methods</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>c, d, e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Testing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Language Acquisition</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intro to Linguistics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture Learning</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(from Continuing Ed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School/Community Relations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>f, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(they could take the 2 credit Special Needs class also and substitute it for any of the culture/literature requirements)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicum</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to: Beatrice Oshika
from: Marjorie Terdal
date: December 5, 1995
re: ESL/Bilingual endorsement

This is to provide information on what I believe is everyone's understanding concerning ways that Portland State might meet the requirements for the ESL/Bilingual endorsement to go into effect January 1, 1999.

At a meeting October 25 with Dave Krug, Joan Strouse, Cheryl Livneh, Valerie Katagiri, and myself, the following proposal was made and agreed to by the participants at that meeting. PSU would offer two parallel tracks for those seeking the ESL/Bilingual endorsement.

(1) through Applied Linguistics
   Students would take the 39 credits currently required for the TESL Certificate, at either a graduate or undergraduate level. As part of this certificate, they would be required to take 9 credits TESOL Methods, which would meet competencies c, d, and e in the TSPC list of competencies. They would also take Language Proficiency Testing for competency g; Second Language Acquisition for competency a, Introduction to Linguistics or Structure of English for competency b, and Culture Learning in the Language Classroom for competency h. They could take one or two classes from the Continuing Education classes in Succeeding with Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Students, and these could be used to substitute for any of the linguistics or culture classes now required for the TESL Certificate. Specifically, the School/Community Relations class would meet competencies f and i. In addition, they would need to take a 3 credit Practicum, with teaching in K-12 with ESL or bilingual students. This practicum could also be used to substitute for any of the linguistics or culture classes now required for the TESL Certificate.

(2) through Continuing Education
   As discussed at a meeting of people involved in planning and teaching the classes for Succeeding with Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Students on December 1, 1995, this program would be the second way by which the ESL/Bilingual endorsement could be met. The program would need to be expanded slightly, increasing most of the courses to three credits, particularly the How People Learn a Second Language class, which is offered for Ling 410/510 credit, in order to cover competencies a and b. This program would need to offer at least 18 credits plus a practicum.
   As discussed with you on December 5, the Applied Linguistics department is satisfied that the two classes that carry LING credit—Assessment and Language Learning—do meet the standards of the department.

cc: Dave Krug, Valerie Katagiri, Cheryl Livneh, Joan Strouse
Appendix B
ESL/BILINGUAL ENDORSEMENT PROGRAM PROPOSAL

Professor Kathy Green of the Portland State University Library faculty has read the Proposal for the ESL/Bilingual Endorsement Program submitted by the School of Education and the Applied Linguistics Department. In light of the information contained in the proposal she has assessed library resources and determined that they are adequate to support the program.

Subject headings such as “English language—Study and teaching—Foreign speakers” (327 titles) and “Multicultural education” (171 titles) were used to determine library holdings. It was noted that many of the books were published after 1989. In the area of articles, a search of the ERIC database under “special education” and “limited English speaking” yielded a bibliography of 207 journal articles and ERIC documents.

The budget for the purchase of monographs in the field of education ($28,431 in 1995/96) and ESL ($2,034 in 1995/96) is sufficient to support the need for additional monographs in these areas. In addition the Library receives relevant titles under its university press approval plan program. Access to the ERIC database is available within the Library and at the School of Education Metropolitan Instructional Support Laboratory. The Library has a complete file of ERIC microfiche and subscribes to a substantial number of journals indexed in the system.

The Library supports the proposed ESL/Bilingual Endorsement program.

C. Thomas Pfingsten, Director of the Library
24 July 1996
August 15, 1996

ESL/Bilingual Endorsement Program Proposal

I have read the Proposal for the ESL/Bilingual Endorsement Program submitted by the School of Education and the Applied Linguistics Department. The proposal accurately describes the resources available through the Metropolitan Instructional Support Laboratory (MISL), in the School of Education.

The MISL provides a variety of materials and technologies in support of the ESL/Bilingual Endorsement Program.

Our collections include:

- samples of state adopted textbooks
- curriculum guides from various local school districts
- CIM guides from throughout the State of Oregon
- samples of commonly used tests and assessments
- computer hardware, and software from various grade levels and subject areas
- on-line access to ERIC and Internet resources
- examples of instructional technology and media commonly used in classrooms

This collection is routinely evaluated and updated, so that it meets the needs of students and faculty, as well as educators throughout our metropolitan community.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

David Bullock, Director
Appendix C
## SUMMARY OF ESTIMATED COSTS FOR PROPOSED PROGRAM

### Program: Bilingual Endorsement Program

**Effective Date:** Jan. 1, 1997

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Personnel</th>
<th>First Year Amount</th>
<th>Second Year Amount</th>
<th>Third Year Amount</th>
<th>Fourth Year Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Faculty</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Graduate Assistants</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Support Personnel</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Fellowships &amp; Scholarships</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of Total from State Funds</strong></td>
<td>-0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Other Resources</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Library</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Supplies &amp; Services</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Movable Equipment</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of Total from State Funds</strong></td>
<td>-0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Physical Facilities</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction of New Space or Major Renovation</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of Cost from State Funds</strong></td>
<td>-0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Source of Funds</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. State Funds-Going Level Budget</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. State Funds-Spec.Appropr.</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Federal Funds</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Other Grants</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Fees, sales, etc</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Other</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Program Bilingual Endorsement Program**
*Effective Date Jan. 1, 1997*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Personnel</th>
<th>First Year Amount FTE</th>
<th>Second Year Amount FTE</th>
<th>Third Year Amount FTE</th>
<th>Fourth Year Amount FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Faculty</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Graduate Assistants</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Support Personnel</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Fellowships &amp; Scholarships</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of Total from State Funds: 0%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Other Resources</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Library</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Supplies &amp; Services</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Movable Equipment</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of Total from State Funds: 0%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Physical Facilities</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction of New Space or Major Renovation</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of Total from State Funds: 0%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Source of Funds</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. State Funds-Going Level Budget</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. State Funds-Spec.Appropri.</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Federal Funds</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Other Grants</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Fees, sales, etc</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Other</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SEQUENCE OF ACTION:**  
Approved by Library See attached letters Date: 10/23/96  
Approved by Dept. Curriculum Comm. Date: 10/23/96  
Approved by Dept. Head Date: 10/23/96  
Approved by College/School Curriculum Comm. Date: 10/23/96  
Approved by College/School Dean Date: 10/23/96
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY
PROPOSAL FOR NEW COURSES

1. College or School
   School of Education

2. Department, course number & title & catalogue description
   Continuing Education/ School of Education
   EDFA 410/510
   Impact of Language and Culture in the Classroom

   Learn the importance of intercultural communication in working with children from a wide range of cultures in today’s classroom. Survey the cultural, linguistic, educational and ethic issues present in all classrooms today. Study the sociological and language issues and immigration history. Learn how to identify and appreciate cultural factors that affect social adjustment and learning. The student will:
   - acquire a higher level of cultural awareness and sensitivity to cross-cultural issues in various contexts;
   - examine important issues related to academic related and linguistic diversity in U.S. education;
   - understand the process by which all of us become culture-bearers and culture makers

3. Course intended for:
   undergraduates and graduates.

4. Normally to be offered:
   annually in the Winter

5. Hours of credit:
   3 credits and 30 contact hours

6. P/NP only:
   _YES_ X NO
7. General rationale of proposal:
The ESL/Bilingual endorsement is concerned with the knowledge, skills and attitudes that will facilitate the new endorsement in bilingual and English as a Second Language education. This endorsement will prepare holders of either a Basic or Standard Teaching License endorsed for the regular classroom or special education to work with limited English proficient students. This new endorsement has been approved by Teacher Standards and Practices Commission in 1995 and will become effective January 1, 1999.

This series of courses has been planned and adopted by an advisory committee of faculty and school and community practitioners to TSPC’s requirements for the ESL/Bilingual Endorsement. PSU’s proposed ESL/Bilingual Endorsement has successfully gone through the School of Education’s review process.

This course is part of the course sequence in Succeeding with Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Students.

8. Rationale of this proposal in terms of present courses:
This course is one of the course that comprises the needed ESL/Bilingual endorsement course sequence.

(a) Overlap with other courses. No overlap. This course has been designed with the assistance and approval from the Applied Linguistics Department, the School of Education (C&I, EPFA, SPED/COUNS, and Continuing Education).

(b) Duplication of other courses: New course.

© Alternate courses: An alternate track exists in the Department of Applied Linguistics, but because it is a 40 credit program it seems likely that current licensed teachers will select this option to obtain this new endorsement.

9. Anticipated Enrollment:
(a) Enrollment anticipated each term course is offered for first two years: 20-30
(b) Recommended optimum enrollment: 20-30
Students would take this course as: a part of a professional program towards an ESL/Bilingual endorsement

Expected distribution of registration:

- Lower Division: 0%
- Upper Division: 50%
- Graduate: 50%
- Total: 100%

Instruction:

(a) This course will be taught by: Frances Portillo-Denhart

(b) The teaching methods most likely to be used in this course:

- Lecture
- Films, slides, etc
- Case method
- Case studies
- Discussion
- Demonstration videos

Methods of evaluation to be used in the course:

For all students:
- Written position papers
- Observation logs
- Final paper/project; Experiential report on minority or LEP activity

For Graduate students:
Students taking the course for graduate credit will be expected to write longer, more in-depth papers

Adequacy of library resources:
Currently adequate

Budgetary considerations in the proposed course:

(a) Summary:
- Added faculty: None, see below
- Added specialized space: Adequate
- Additional equipment and supplies: Adequate

Other: Adjuncts funded by Extended Studies

(b) Explanation and necessary details of each estimate:
- Faculty-self-supporting via Extended Studies
- Space- these courses will be offered at non-peak times for PSU
- Equipment and supplies- any special equipment or supplies will be paid for by Extended Studies
14. Remarks:
There is a great need for this new endorsement that will be required for all school district personnel who serve limited English proficient and bilingual students. Currently there are no programs in the Portland area that are offering this endorsement and there are 130 ESL teachers in the Portland Public Schools alone who will need this endorsement beginning January 1, 1999.

15. Topical outline of course:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Subjects to be Covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | 6     | Intercultural Principals & Theory  
  - Examine issues related to academic & linguistic diversity in US education  
  - Understand process by which we become culture-bearers & culture-makers |
| 2    | 6     | Ethnic Identity Issues  
  - Survey cultural, linguistic, educational & ethnic issues present in all classrooms today |
| 3    | 6     | Cultural Stumbling Blocks  
  - Study sociological & language issues & immigration history |
| 4    | 6     | Systematic Oppression & Racism  
  - Learn to identify & appreciate cultural factors that affect social adjustment & learning |
| 5    | 6     | Intercultural Communication Issues  
  - Working with children from a wide range of cultures in today’s classrooms  
    > acquiring higher level of cultural awareness & sensitivity to cross-cultural communication skills in a variety of contexts  
    > develop skills & strategies in cross-cultural communication |
16. **Sequence of action:**

Request prepared by **Joan Strause, Ph.D.**  
Date

Approved by Unit (i.e., Dept.) Curriculum Committee  
Date

Approved by Department Chair  
Date

Approved by College/School Curriculum Committee  
Date

Approved by College/School Dean  
Date

\( g!eel\!dee\!E!\!s \!s\!c\!ue\!e\!d\! \!i\!c \)
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY
PROPOSAL FOR NEW COURSES

1. School or College:
   School of Education

2. Department, course number & title & catalogue description:
   Continuing Education/School of Education
   LING 410/510
   How Do People Learn a Second Language

   Gain an historical perspective of language teaching and look at current
   language learning and teaching models. Examine variables involved in first
   and second language acquisition, including the effect of the first language,
   individual socioeconomic factors, and instruction. Analyze natural language
   collected from second language learners. Appreciate the complexity of
   learning and studying in another language so you can understand and
   effectively help your LEP students learn successfully.

3. Course intended for:
   undergraduates and graduates.

4. Normally to be offered:
   annually in the Spring

5. Hours of credit:
   3 credits and 30 contact hours

6. P/NP only:
   YES  NO

7. General rationale of proposal:
   The ESL/Bilingual endorsement is concerned with the knowledge, skills and
   attitudes that will facilitate the new endorsement in bilingual and English as a
   Second Language education. This endorsement will prepare holders of either a
   Basic or Standard Teaching License endorsed for the regular classroom or
special education to work with limited English proficient students. This new endorsement has been approved by Teacher Standards and Practices Commission in 1995 and will become effective January 1, 1999.

This series of courses has been planned and adopted by an advisory committee of faculty and school and community practitioners to TSPC’s requirements for the ESL/Bilingual Endorsement. PSU’s proposed ESL/Bilingual Endorsement has successfully gone through the School of Education’s review process.

This course is part of the course sequence in Succeeding with Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Students.

8. Rationale of this proposal in terms of present courses:

This course is one of the course that comprises the needed ESL/Bilingual endorsement course sequence.

(a) Overlap with other courses: No overlap. This course has been designed with the assistance and approval from the Applied Linguistics Department, the School of Education (C&I, EPFA, SPED/COUNS, and Continuing Education).

(b) Duplicated other courses: New course.

Alternate courses: An alternate track exists in the Department of Applied Linguistics, but because it is a 40 credit program it seems likely that current licensed teachers will select this option to obtain this new endorsement.

9. Anticipated Enrollment:

(a) Enrollment anticipated each term course is offered for first two years: 20-30

(b) Recommended optimum enrollment: 20-30

Students would take this course as: a part of a professional program towards an ESL/Bilingual endorsement.
10. **Instruction:**
   (a) *This course will be taught by:* Kathryn Harris
   (b) *The teaching methods most likely to be used in this course:*
       - lecture
       - case method
       - discussion
       - films, slides, etc
       - case studies
       - demonstration videos

11. **Methods of evaluation to be used in the course:**
    For all students:
    * Journal Reading
    * Data Analysis
    * Learner Interview
    * Final Exam
    For graduate students:
    Students taking the course for graduate credit will be expected to write longer, more in-depth papers

12. **Adequacy of library resources:**
    Currently adequate

13. **Budgetary considerations in the proposed course:**
    (a) **Summary**
        - Added faculty: None, see below
        - Added specialized space: Adequate
        - Additional equipment and supplies: Adequate
        - Other: Adjuncts funded by Extended Studies
    (b) **Explanation and necessary details of each estimate**
        - Faculty-self-supporting via Extended Studies
        - Space: these courses will be offered at non-peak times for PSU
        - Equipment and supplies: any special equipment or supplies will be paid for by Extended Studies
14. Remarks:
There is a great need for this new endorsement that will be required
for all school district personnel who serve limited English proficient and
bilingual students. Currently there are no programs in the Portland area that
are offering this endorsement and there are 130 ESL teachers in the Portland
Public Schools alone who will need this endorsement beginning January 1,
1999.

15. Topical outline of course:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week(s)</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Subjects to be Covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The role of first language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Inter-language-systematicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Inter-language-variability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Individual learner differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Input and interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Learner strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The universal hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Formal instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Theories of the second language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Final Exam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Sequence of action:

Request prepared by Joan Strouse, Ph.D.            Date

Approved by Unit (i.e., Dept.) Curriculum Committee Date

Approved by Department Chair                      Date

Approved by College/School Curriculum Committee   Date

Approved by College/School Dean                   Date
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY
PROPOSAL FOR NEW COURSES

1. College or School:
   School of Education

2. Department, Course number & title & catalogue description:
   Continuing Education/ School of Education
   CI 410/510
   Effective Teaching Strategies and Materials for Working with Linguistically
   and Culturally Diverse Students

   What kinds of strategies and materials work in teaching children who are
   learning English? Become acquainted with the current research on
   identification, development and practice of developmentally and linguistically
   appropriate strategies and materials to effectively engage Limited English
   Proficient (LEP) students at all grade levels in the learning process. Special
   attention will be given to students’ bilingual/bicultural characteristics as
   important aspects of developing successful curriculum.

3. Course intended for:
   undergraduates and graduates.

4. Normally to be offered:
   annually in the Summer

5. Hours of credit:
   3 credits and 30 contact hours

6. P/NP only:
   _YES    _X_ NO
7. **General rationale of proposal:**
The ESL/Bilingual endorsement is concerned with the knowledge, skills and attitudes that will facilitate the new endorsement in bilingual and English as a Second Language education. This endorsement will prepare holders of either a Basic or Standard Teaching License endorsed for the regular classroom or special education to work with limited English proficient students. This new endorsement has been approved by Teacher Standards and Practices Commission in 1995 and will become effective January 1, 1999.

This series of courses has been planned and adopted by an advisory committee of faculty and school and community practitioners to TSPC’s requirements for the ESL/Bilingual Endorsement. PSU’s proposed ESL/Bilingual Endorsement has successfully gone through the School of Education’s review process.

This course is part of the course sequence in “Succeeding with Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Students.”

8. **Rationale of this proposal in terms of present courses:**
This course is one of the course that comprises the needed ESL/Bilingual endorsement course sequence.

(a) Overlap with other courses. No overlap. This course has been designed with the assistance and approval from the Applied Linguistics Department, the School of Education (C&I, EPFA, SPED/COUNS, and Continuing Education).

(b) Duplication of other courses: New course.

© Alternate courses: An alternate track exists in the Department of Applied Linguistics, but because it is a 40 credit program it seems likely that current licensed teachers will select this option to obtain this new endorsement.

9. **Anticipated Enrollment:**
(a) Enrollment anticipated each term course is offered for first two years: 20-30

(b) Recommended optimum enrollment: 20-30

© Students would take this course as: a part of a professional program towards an ESL/Bilingual endorsement.
9. Anticipated Enrollment: (continued)

(d) Expected distribution of registration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Division</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 100%

10. Instruction:

(a) This course will be taught by: Cynthia Cosgrove, Sharon Chasko

(b) The teaching methods most likely to be used in this course:

- lecture
- case method
- discussion
- films, slides, etc
- case studies
- demonstration videos

11. Methods of evaluation to be used in the course:

For all students:

* Learning (observation) logs that include;
  > lecture notes & reactions
  > description of demo lessons & reaction
  > application to own work

* 5 readings critiques

* Participation in small group discussion & class activities

* One, 1-2 page opinion paper on
  (a) use of technology; or
  (b) bilingual education, as it applies to the work of the course participant, in their district & school site

For Graduate Students:

* to develop an action plan to incorporate, initiate or study how to use effective teaching strategies with LEP students at their work site.

* Two, 1-2 page opinion paper on
  (a) use of technology; or
  (b) bilingual education, as it applies to the work of the course participant, in their district & school site
12. Adequacy of library resources:
currently adequate

13. Budgetary considerations in the proposed course:

(a) Summary
Added faculty: None, see below
Added specialized space: Adequate
Additional equipment and supplies: Adequate
Other: Adjuncts funded by Extended Studies

(b) Explanation and necessary details of each estimate:
Faculty-self-supporting via Extended Studies
Space- these courses will be offered at non-peak times for PSU
Equipment and supplies- any special equipment or supplies will be paid for by Extended Studies

14. Remarks:
There is a great need for this new endorsement that will be required for all school district personnel who serve limited English proficient and bilingual students. Currently there are no programs in the Portland area that are offering this endorsement and there are 130 ESL teachers in the Portland Public Schools alone who will need this endorsement beginning January 1, 1999.
### 15. Topical outline of course:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Subjects to covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1   | 6     | - Goals & expectations of the course / syllabus review  
      - Get acquainted, inclusion activity  
      - Theoretical & research background for the support of effective practices with LEP students  
      - Readings & critique form distributed  
      - Action Plan task discussed  
      - Video: “Visions of Literacy-Multicultural Education”  
        > Journal writing  
        > Group discussion of implementations for schools & teachers  
      - Introduction to using technology in the classroom with second language learners  
        > discussion of appropriate hardware, software & peripherals.  
| 2   | 6     | - Strategies for language acquisition & literacy  
      - Brief demo lesson, followed by processing & group discussion of each of the following topics. Each demo/discussion will be followed by a journal write & application to grade & work site.  
        (a) Language Experience to include speaking, listening, reading & writing  
        (b) Whole Language Approach for elementary & secondary students  
        © Meaning making Strategies: comprehensible input for mixed levels  
        (d) Cooperative Learning: student centered, interactive learning  
      - Continuation of technology information including utilization of Internet and resources for ESL/Bilingual instruction. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Subjects to covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3   | 6     | • Rationale for content learning approaches & brief demo-lessons for each of the following. Each approached is followed by group processing, grade & work site application;  
      (a) CALLA, Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach  
      (b) Sheltered English Approach  
      © Key Visuals Strategies  
      (d) Integrated Content Approach  
• Overview of current research on bilingual programs, including definitions of various models of two way programs that develop bilingualism.  
• Develop an awareness of bilingual program design features, schedules and roles of key stakeholders to ensure success for students. |
| 4   | 6     | • Rationale for Cooperative Learning as a means of insuring acquisition & academic success, while addressing multi levels within the classroom  
> Cooperative techniques will be demonstrated throughout the course & a list of structures will be distributed for discussion & application to grade level & learning styles.  
• Model lessons with technology, realia, hands-on learning & cooperative structures. Processing of lesson components will take place in small groups.  
• Authentic learning;  
> what it incorporates  
> how it address the special needs, interests & learning styles of second language learners  
• Overview of Lesson Plan Designs for multi level classrooms;  
> how to include strategies presented in this course into lesson plan designs for mixed level groups or classes of students, samples distributed.  
• Students will develop lesson plans for their own level & work site in cooperative grade - alike groups  
• Common questions and problems in bilingual programs; language development, translation, TAG students, code switching, learning difficulties, literacy development, critical age, home support & community stability. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Subjects to covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5   | 6     | • Review process for identifying culturally & linguistically appropriate materials for second language learners.  
• Resources for materials that reflect the approaches & strategies studied in this class.  
• Developing a checklist to ensure that curriculum, materials & program design support the needs & characteristics of bilingual/bicultural students.  
• Final group work on lesson plan designs.  
• Final process for developing a personal action plan to implement the ideas, approaches & strategies studied during this course  
• Overview of requirements for opinion papers on technology & bilingual education topics.  
• Demonstrate ways in which second language learners are using technology to share what they know in the content areas & to seek new information from web sites around the world.  
• Share appropriate Internet addresses related to language & content teaching.  
• Course & syllabus evaluation. |

16. **Sequence of action:**

Request prepared by [Joan Strause, Ph.D.](mailto:joan.straue@edu) Date

Approved by Unit (i.e., Dept.) Curriculum Committee Date

Approved by Department Chair Date

Approved by College/School Curriculum Committee Date

Approved by College/School Dean Date

\[\text{ce\dce\ESL\succeed.ets}\]
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY
PROPOSAL FOR NEW COURSES

1. School or College:
   School of Education

2. Department, course number & title & catalogue description:
   Continuing Education/School of Education
   EPFA 410/510
   School/Community Relations: LEP

   Learn how to work with families to overcome barriers to setting-up support systems in and out of school. Access appropriate community resources that can be critical for ensuring classroom success with LEP students. Gain understanding about other culture’s orientation to education and school. Learn strategies to build bridges between home, school and the community.

   Students will:
   - become familiar with different parent involvement models used in local schools as well as ethnic organizations;
   - discuss current issues in local LEP communities (e.g. Russian, Hispanic, Southeast Asian);
   - Develop building-based parent involvement plan to encourage participation of parents of LEP students;
   - learn how to access resources within various communities and cultures and set-up support systems inside and outside of the school setting for students.

3. Course intended for:
   undergraduates and graduates.

4. Normally to be offered:
   annually in the Fall

5. Hours of credit:
   3 credits and 30 contact hours
6. P/NP only:  
    _YES_X_NO

7. General rationale of proposal:  
The ESL/Bilingual endorsement is concerned with the knowledge, skills and  
attitudes that will facilitate the new endorsement in bilingual and English as a  
Second Language education. This endorsement will prepare holders of either a  
Basic or Standard Teaching License endorsed for the regular classroom or  
special education to work with limited English proficient students. This new  
endorsement has been approved by Teacher Standards and Practices  
Commission in 1995 and will become effective January 1, 1999.  

This series of courses has been planned and adopted by an advisory committee  
of faculty and school and community practitioners to TSPC’s requirements for  
the ESL/Bilingual Endorsement. PSU’s proposed ESL/Bilingual Endorsement  
has successfully gone through the School of Education’s review process.  

This course is part of the course sequence in Succeeding with Linguistically  
and Culturally Diverse Students.  

8. Rationale of this proposal in terms of present courses:  

This course is one of the course that comprises the needed ESL/Bilingual  
endorsement course sequence.  

(a) Overlap with other courses. No overlap. This course has been designed  
with the assistance and approval from the Applied Linguistics  
Department, the School of Education (C&I, EPFA, SPED/COUNS, and  
Continuing Education).  

(b) Duplication of other courses: New course.  

© Alternate courses: An alternate track exists in the Department of  
Applied Linguistics, but because it is a 40 credit program it seems  
likely that current licensed teachers will select this option to  
obtain this new endorsement.
9. Anticipated Enrollment:
   (a) Enrollment anticipated each term course is offered for first two years: 20-30
   (b) Recommended optimum enrollment: 20-30
   © Students would take this course as: a part of a professional program towards an ESL/Bilingual endorsement.
   (d) Expected distribution of registration:
       Lower Division 0%
       Upper Division 50%
       Graduate 50%
       Total 100%

10. Instruction:
   (a) This course will be taught by: Tou Maksavnh
   (b) The teaching methods most likely to be used in this course:
       lecture films, slides, etc
       case method case studies
       discussion demonstration videos

11. Methods of evaluation to be used in the course:
    For all students:
    * attendance & active participation in class & community event
    * Project; Strategies to involve LEP parents in schools
    * Class presentation & paper
    For graduate students:
    Students taking the course for graduate credit will be expected to write longer, more in-depth papers

12. Adequacy of library resources:
    currently adequate
13. **Budgetary considerations in the proposed course:**

   (a) **Summary**
       Added faculty: None, see below
       Added specialized space: Adequate
       Additional equipment and supplies: Adequate
       Other: Adjuncts funded by Extended Studies

   (b) **Explanation and necessary details of each estimate:**
       Faculty-self-supporting via Extended Studies
       Space- these courses will be offered at non-peak times for PSU
       Equipment and supplies- any special equipment or supplies will be paid for by Extended Studies

14. **Remarks:**

   There is a great need for this new endorsement that will be required for all school district personnel who serve limited English proficient and bilingual students. Currently there are no programs in the Portland area that are offering this endorsement and there are 130 ESL teachers in the Portland Public Schools alone who will need this endorsement beginning January 1, 1999.
15. Topical outline of course:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week(s)</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Subjects to be Covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1&2     | 10    | - LEP Students in our schools. Demographic trends & migration of the past 2 decades  
          |   | - Serving LEP Students. Federal, State & local mandates. The new TSPC requirements  
          |   | - Why Parent/ Community Involvement  
          |   |   > Do LEP Parents get involved in schools with their children’s educations?  
          |   |   > What are some strategies to bring LEP parents to school, to get involved  
          |   |   > Discuss Kenji Ima’s study (1988) on S.E.A. parents section & students’ own experiences  
| 3 & 4   | 8     | The various local community resources- the services they provide. Site Visits:  
          |   | 1. The International Refugee Center of Oregon (IRCO)  
          |   | 2. The Asian Family Center (AFC)  
          |   | 3. Lutheran Family Services, the Soviet Mental Health Project  
          |   | » Strategies to increase:  
          |   |   > effectiveness of school-home communications  
          |   |   > parent-child communication  
          |   |   > Native language literacy  
          |   |   > for multilingual classrooms.  
          |   | The various local resources (continued)  
| 5 & 6   | 8     | LEP Parent involvement:  
          |   | » The Portland Public Schools model  
          |   |   > Parent Involvement & Participation in Education (PIPE)  
          |   | » The Russian Speaking Pentecostal community  
          |   |   > Its issues & needs  
          |   | » The parents perspective;  
          |   |   > Hear from representatives of the Asian, Hispanic, Russian parents  
          |   |   > Why are or aren’t they involved  
| 7       | 4     | » The Southeast Asian parents’ issues  
          |   |   > a study by San Diego University Sociologist, Dr. Kenji Ima  
          |   | » Promoting Academic success for ESL students by Dr. Virginia Collier  

\texttt{g:\\ce\dce\ESL\succeed.scr}
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY
PROPOSAL FOR NEW COURSES

1. School or College:
   School of Education

2. Department, course number & title & catalogue description:
   Continuing Education/School of Education
   LING 410/510
   Taking Stock: Assessment and Evaluation in programs with Language Minority Students

   Consider ways to expand the assessment domain so that it describes the full range student work and includes all populations. Learn about technical standards needed to ensure fair, accurate, and meaningful information. Discuss using assessment results to focus school and district services for language minority students.
   - learn to use valid and appropriate assessment and evaluation techniques such as portfolios, non-standardized assessment, standardized assessment, and task-based assessment in the culturally and linguistically diverse classroom;
   - understand the purpose and limits of assessment
   - become familiar with testing terminology and basic concepts;
   - know how to interpret results and communicate them to others;
   - become acquainted with commercial tests;
   - learn to develop tests for different uses.

3. Course intended for:
   undergraduates and graduates.

4. Normally to be offered:
   annually in the Winter

5. Hours of credit:
   2 credits and 20 contact hours
6. P/NP only:  
   _YES X NO

7. General rationale of proposal:  
The ESL/Bilingual endorsement is concerned with the knowledge, skills and 
attitudes that will facilitate the new endorsement in bilingual and English as a Second Language education. This endorsement will prepare holders of either a Basic or Standard Teaching License endorsed for the regular classroom or special education to work with limited English proficient students. This new endorsement has been approved by Teacher Standards and Practices Commission in 1995 and will become effective January 1, 1999.

This series of courses has been planned and adopted by an advisory committee of faculty and school and community practitioners to TSPC’s requirements for the ESL/Bilingual Endorsement. PSU’s proposed ESL/Bilingual Endorsement has successfully gone through the School of Education’s review process.

This course is part of the course sequence in Succeeding with Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Students.

8. Rationale of this proposal in terms of present courses:  
This course is one of the course that comprises the needed ESL/Bilingual endorsement course sequence.

(a) Overlap with other courses: No overlap. This course has been designed with the assistance and approval from the Applied Linguistics Department, the School of Education (C&I, EPFA, SPED/COUNS, and Continuing Education).

(b) Duplication of other courses: New course.

© Alternate courses: An alternate track exists in the Department of Applied Linguistics, but because it is a 40 credit program it seems likely that current licensed teachers will select this option to obtain this new endorsement.
9. Anticipated Enrollment:
   (a) Enrollment anticipated each term course is offered for first two years: 20-30
   (b) Recommended optimum enrollment: 20-30
© Students would take this course as: a part of a professional program towards an ESL/Bilingual endorsement.
(d) Expected distribution of registration:
   Lower Division 0%
   Upper Division 50%
   Graduate 50%
   Total 100%

10. Instruction:
   (a) This course will be taught by: Martha McCall
   (b) The teaching methods most likely to be used in this course:
       lecture films, slides, etc
       case method case studies
       discussion demonstration videos

11. Methods of evaluation to be used in the course:
    For all students:
    * paper discussing selected assessment issues
    * assessment project
    * mid-term exam
    * final paper exam
    For graduate students:
    Students taking the course for graduate credit will be expected to write longer, more in-depth papers. Plus a more substantial project.

12. Adequacy of library resources:
    currently adequate
13. **Budgetary considerations in the proposed course:**

(a) **Summary**
- Added faculty: None, see below
- Added specialized space: Adequate
- Additional equipment and supplies: Adequate
- Other: Adjuncts funded by Extended Studies

(b) **Explanation and necessary details of each estimate**
- Faculty: self-supporting via Extended Studies
- Space: these courses will be offered at non-peak times for PSU
- Equipment and supplies: any special equipment or supplies will be paid for by Extended Studies

14. **Remarks:**
There is a great need for this new endorsement that will be required for all school district personnel who serve limited English proficient and bilingual students. Currently there are no programs in the Portland area that are offering this endorsement and there are 130 ESL teachers in the Portland Public Schools alone who will need this endorsement beginning January 1, 1999.
15. **Topical outline of course:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week(s)</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Subjects to be Covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Overview; Grading, Testing, Basic Concepts &amp; Intentions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2       | 2     | Uses & purposes of assessment;  
- connection to curriculum  
- legal mandates  
- communication |
| 3       | 2     | Technical terms & concepts;  
- reliability & validity  
- test domain  
- tasks - criterion & norm referencing  
- scores & rating scales |
| 4       | 2     | Types of tests & statistical models - appropriate use;  
- standardized models  
- alternative assessment  
Paper due |
| 5       | 2     | Commercially available tests  
Midterm |
| 6       | 2     | Discuss Midterm in terms of concepts we have covered so far  
Continue presentation on commercially available tests |
| 7       | 2     | Tasks- selection & development  
Scores, ratings & scales |
| 8       | 2     | Communicating Assessment information - numerically, verbally, graphically  
- to students  
- to non-English speaking parents  
- to outside agencies, citizen groups, funding sources  
- to administrators & board members |
| 9       | 2     | Projects Due, Course review |
| 10      | 2     | Final Exam |

16. **Sequence of action:**

Request prepared by **Joan Strouse, Ph.D.**  
Approved by Unit (i.e., Dept.) Curriculum Committee  
Approved by Department Chair  
Approved by College/School Curriculum Committee  
Approved by College/School Dean
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY
PROPOSAL FOR NEW COURSES

1. School or College:
   School of Education

2. Department, course number & title & catalogue description:
   Continuing Education/School of Education
   SPED 410/510
   Working with LEP Children Who Have Special Needs

   Examine the current research in special education and see where it is
   appropriate in working with the Limited English Proficient (LEP) child.
   Consider issues including testing and diagnosis, appropriate teaching material
   and method, and placement. Discuss political, social and community concerns
   in working with LEP students with special needs.

3. Course intended for:
   undergraduates and graduates.

4. Normally to be offered:
   annually in the Summer

5. Hours of credit:
   2 credits and 20 contact hours

6. P/NP only:
   _YES_ X NO

7. General rationale of proposal:
   The ESL/Bilingual endorsement is concerned with the knowledge, skills and
   attitudes that will facilitate the new endorsement in bilingual and English as a
   Second Language education. This endorsement will prepare holders of either a
   Basic or Standard Teaching License endorsed for the regular classroom or
   special education to work with limited English proficient students. This new
endorsement has been approved by Teacher Standards and Practices Commission in 1995 and will become effective January 1, 1999.

This series of courses has been planned and adopted by an advisory committee of faculty and school and community practitioners to TSPC’s requirements for the ESL/Bilingual Endorsement. PSU’s proposed ESL/Bilingual Endorsement has successfully gone through the School of Education’s review process.

This course is part of the course sequence in Succeeding with Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Students.

8. Rationale for this proposal in terms of present courses:

This course is one of the course that comprises the needed ESL/Bilingual endorsement course sequence.

(a) Overlap with other courses: No overlap. This course has been designed with the assistance and approval from the Applied Linguistics Department, the School of Education (C&I, EPFA, SPED/COUNS, and Continuing Education).

(b) Duplication of other courses: New course.

© Alternate courses: An alternate track exists in the Department of Applied Linguistics, but because it is a 40 credit program it seems likely that current licensed teachers will select this option to obtain this new endorsement.

9. Anticipated Enrollment:

(a) Enrollment anticipated each term course is offered for first two years: 20-30

(b) Recommended optimum enrollment: 20-30

© Students would take this course as: a part of a professional program towards an ESL/Bilingual endorsement

(d) Expected distribution of registration:
Lower Division 0%
Upper Division 50%
Graduate 50%

Total 100%
10. Instruction:
   (a) **This course will be taught by:** Frances Portillo
   (b) **The teaching methods most likely to be used in this course:**
       lecture films, slides, etc
       case method case studies
       discussion demonstration videos

11. **Methods of evaluation to be used in the course:**
    For all students:
    * Journal Entries (14 entries + 1 summary & 15 reader reactions)
    * Field Based Project (observation, paper & report)
    * Group Project (paper, group evaluation & report)
    For graduate students:
    Students taking the course for graduate credit will be expected to write longer, more in-depth papers

12. **Adequacy of library resources:**
    currently adequate

13. **Budgetary considerations in the proposed course:**
    (a) **Summary**
        Added faculty: None, see below
        Added specialized space: Adequate
        Additional equipment and supplies: Adequate
        Other: Adjuncts funded by Extended Studies
    (b) **Explanation and necessary details of each estimate:**
        Faculty-self-supporting via Extended Studies
        Space- these courses will be offered at non-peak times for PSU
        Equipment and supplies- any special equipment or supplies will be aid for by Extended Studies

14. **Remarks:**
    There is a great need for this new endorsement that will be required for all school district personnel who serve limited English proficient and bilingual students. Currently there are no programs in the Portland area that are offering this endorsement and there are 130 ESL teachers in the Portland Public Schools alone who will need this endorsement beginning January 1, 1999.
15. Topical outline of course:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Subjects to be Covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1   | 5     | • Introduction to Bilingual/Multicultural Special Education; Review Syllabus & Course Assignments  
      • Multicultural Education  
      • Bilingual Education |
| 2   | 5     | • Second Language Acquisition/ESL/Sheltered English Techniques  
      • Journal Assignments Reviewed & Group Project Initiated  
      • Presentation / Discussion of Bilingual/ESL Observations |
| 3   | 5     | • Assessment Practices:  
      > IEP referral process  
      > Language Proficiency  
      > Non-discriminatory Assessment  
      > Interpreters  
      • Bilingual Special Education Service Delivery Options  
      • Characteristics of CLDE Students  
      • Instructional Strategies |
| 4   | 5     | • Family & Community Involvement  
      • Group Projects  
      • Putting it All Together: Student group Projects  
      • Final Experience |

16. Sequence of action:
Request prepared by Joan Strause, Ph.D.   Date

Approved by Unit (i.e.,Dept.) Curriculum Committee   Date

Approved by Department Chair   Date

Approved by College/School Curriculum Committee   Date

Approved by College/School Dean   Date
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY
PROPOSAL FOR NEW COURSES

1. School or College:
   School of Education

2. Department, course number & title & catalogue description:
   Continuing Education/School of Education
   EPFA 410/510
   ESL and Bilingual Program Design and Models Serving Students Learning English

   Exemplary schools provide second language learners with a rich intellectual diet, not a remedial or basic skills curriculum. They expect all students to achieve high standards in literacy and other academic areas. Learn how these schools combine their understandings and apply the knowledge of local, state, and federal laws and policies along with pedological considerations to create effective programs. Participants will examine a variety of local, regional and national program models for ESL and Bilingual instruction. This will create opportunities to develop expertise in assessing the critical components of programs serving pre-school through adults.

3. Course intended for:
   undergraduates and graduates.

4. Normally to be offered:
   annually in the Spring

5. Hours of credit:
   3 credits and 30 contact hours

6. P/NP only:
   _YES_X_NO
7. General rationale of proposal:
The ESL/Bilingual endorsement is concerned with the knowledge, skills and attitudes that will facilitate the new endorsement in bilingual and English as a Second Language education. This endorsement will prepare holders of either a Basic or Standard Teaching License endorsed for the regular classroom or special education to work with limited English proficient students. This new endorsement has been approved by Teacher Standards and Practices Commission in 1995 and will become effective January 1, 1999.

This series of courses has been planned and adopted by an advisory committee of faculty and school and community practitioners to TSPC’s requirements for the ESL/Bilingual Endorsement. PSU’s proposed ESL/Bilingual Endorsement has successfully gone through the School of Education’s review process.

This course is part of the course sequence in Succeeding with Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Students.

8. Rationale for this proposal in terms of present courses:
This course is one of the course that comprises the needed ESL/Bilingual endorsement course sequence.

(a) Overlap with other courses: No overlap. This course has been designed with the assistance and approval from the Applied Linguistics Department, the School of Education (C&I, EPFA, SPED/COUNS, and Continuing Education).

(b) Duplication of other courses: New course.

Alternate courses: An alternate track exists in the Department of Applied Linguistics, but because it is a 40 credit program it seems likely that current licensed teachers will select this option to obtain this new endorsement. The TESL program in the Linguistics Department is already at student capacity. The TESL program does not have a specific K-12 focus.
9. Anticipated Enrollment:
   (a) Enrollment anticipated each term course is offered for first two years:
       20-30
   (b) Recommended optimum enrollment: 20-30
   (c) Students would take this course as: a part of a professional program
       towards an ESL/Bilingual endorsement.
   (d) Expected distribution of registration:
       Lower Division  0%
       Upper Division  50%
       Graduate       50%
       Total          100%

10. Instruction:
    (a) This course will be taught by: Cynthia Cosgrave
    (b) The teaching methods most likely to be used in this course:
         lecture films, slides, etc
         case method case studies
         discussion demonstration videos

11. Methods of evaluation to be used in the course:
    For all students:
    * pre and post written position papers
    * observation logs
    * group participation
    * 5 article critiques
    * final examination

    For graduate students:
    Students taking the course for graduate credit will be expected to write longer,
    more in-depth papers and class presentations

12. Adequacy of library resources:
    currently adequate
13. Budgetary considerations in the proposed course:
   (a) Summary
       Added faculty: None, see below
       Added specialized space: Adequate
       Additional equipment and supplies: Adequate
       Other: Adjuncts funded by Extended Studies
   (b) Explanation and necessary details of each estimate
       Faculty-self-supporting via Extended Studies
       Space- these courses will be offered at non-peak times for PSU
       Equipment and supplies- any special equipment or supplies will be paid for by Extended Studies

14. Remarks:
There is a great need for this new endorsement that will be required for all school district personnel who serve limited English proficient and bilingual students. Currently there are no programs in the Portland area that are offering this endorsement and there are 130 ESL teachers in the Portland Public Schools alone who will need this endorsement beginning January 1, 1999.
15. Topical outline of course:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week(s)</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Subjects to be Covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1&amp;2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Historical Foundations &amp; Legislation on Language Programs - discussion of section 1 of text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>National Standards, Goals 2000, TESOL, NABE, NCTE, Oregon Standards, Content Framework &amp; Benchmarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Class Jigsaw on Section 2 of text; Implementing Policy in Schools; Structuring Schools. Student presentation (in pairs) with discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Examining political &amp; pedagogical considerations that support or block the development of ESL &amp; Bilingual programs, Standards for Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Identification, placement &amp; exit of students in ESL &amp; Bilingual programs. Roles &amp; rights of parents &amp; schools, documentation, Office of Civil Rights. Video: “What Students Want From Their Teachers &amp; Programs”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Class Jigsaw Section 3 of text “Using Bilingualism in Instruction”. Students present in pairs with class discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Critical Components of effective language programs pr-k to adult. Student presentations / projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>How to access resources &amp; information about programs for second language learners. Student presentations Sect 4 of text &amp; discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>How to keep second language learners at the center (or at least included) in school-wide reform efforts Student presentations Final Exam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AN INDUSTRY-DRIVEN,
INVESTMENT-BASED APPROACH
TO
OREGON'S ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY
EDUCATION AND RESEARCH NEEDS

THE METROPOLITAN CONSORTIUM

PRESENTED TO:
THE OREGON STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENGINEERING

TOM IMESON, CHAIR
GAIL McALLISTER
LES SWANSON, JR.

PRESENTED BY:
JUDITH A. RAMALEY, PRESIDENT

NOVEMBER 1, 1996
Dear Mr. Imeson,

Attached is an alternative solution to Oregon's engineering education challenge, a proposed consortium of metropolitan area education and research resources, governed by an industry-driven board. This proposal was developed by faculty and staff at Portland State University and has been provided to representatives of industry, the metropolitan community and other involved institutions for review. The Consortium proposes an entirely different approach to the issue of engineering and technical education than the current proposal under consideration by the Engineering Solution Team.

- Rather than focus on two engineering schools at two universities, the Consortium engages the entire spectrum of the education system in a balanced, coordinated way, recognizing that higher education can no longer consider itself separate from other aspects of the educational system but must become an integral part of the overall educational continuum.

- Rather than focus on re-drawing lines of program control, the Consortium focuses on directing strategic investments to priority areas through already existing programs, maintaining institutional integrity.

- Rather than remove program control from the institutions, industry and communities of the metropolitan area, the Consortium strengthens local control through an industry-driven governing board.

- Rather than attempt a plan for state-wide, national and international engineering education, the Consortium establishes a model for strategic investment in relevant educational programs in Oregon's metropolitan region, a model that can be replicated as needed in other areas of the state.

- Rather than focus control of engineering-technical education in one institution, geographically removed from the current region of priority need, the Consortium creates an independent mechanism for regionally directed, strategic investments, encouraging institutional collaboration.

- Rather than create a new state-wide school (in effect, an eighth OSSHE institution), the
Consortium operates with existing institutional programs and existing institutional infrastructures.

- Rather than developing proposals which spark inter-institutional rivalries, the Consortium encourages inter-institutional cooperation.

This and other proposals dealing with engineering-technical education should be reviewed in the context of how well they address key issues. I have attached a list of the issues I consider most relevant. I believe the Consortium proposal responds in positive and creative ways to these issues while maintaining institutional integrity, encouraging collaboration, and giving industry the kind of direct voice that is necessary if we are to gain their support now and in the future.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Judith A. Ramaley,
President
Essential Elements of Successful Proposals

Engineering-Technical education and research in the Portland Metropolitan Area must react to the issues of program quantity/capacity and quality. There are a number of objectives that any solution to these issues must address.

**Workforce training and development**: Provide educational programs that meet the needs of Oregon industry with a particular focus on the Portland metropolitan area.

**Access (programs and location)**: Provide quality educational programs in appropriate fields and accessible locations for the citizens of the Portland metropolitan area and elsewhere in the state of Oregon, whether they are full time first time students, returning students who are changing careers or completing degrees on either a full time or part time basis, or practicing professionals seeking continuing professional development.

**Research in critical areas**: Develop appropriate facilities and critical mass of faculty to provide basic and applied research to support industry in the metropolitan area and the state.

**Focus on high technology industries**: In the near term, the activities must assure that academic programs at all levels specifically address the demand for engineering and technology workforce and research needs in the metropolitan area with a particular focus on the high technology industry.

**Flexible approach for a changing future**: Since it is difficult to forecast what the educational and research priorities will be even a decade into the future, any approach to dealing with metropolitan educational and research issues must be flexible and able to respond to changes in demands for various levels of education and areas of emphasis.

**Local coordination and accountability**: There should be an industry-based, locally coordinated approach across all educational levels and educational and research institutions to address the educational and workforce development needs of the Portland metropolitan area, one that involves industry, governmental and educational leaders in the community and is responsive and accountable to the community.

**Strong linkages to industry**: All education and research programs must be designed with strong industry linkages, including opportunities for joint work-learning experiences (internships, practica, capstone projects), continuing education and professional development, flexible scheduling and on-site delivery where appropriate.

**Customer sensitivity**: Provide greater roles for industry in program development and design.

**Measurable results**: There must be agreed upon measures for success, established in concert with industry.
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An Industry-Driven, Investment-Based Approach
To Oregon's Engineering/Technology Education and Research Needs

The Challenge:
Oregon needs a mechanism to focus its public and private post-secondary educational resources on the state's immediate and future needs in engineering-technical education to meet its economic objectives. The Oregon Business Council report, "Gaining Competitive Advantage," included eight specific objectives for this mechanism:

- Be customer driven and adaptable to change
- Include high, definable levels of skills and knowledge for all graduates
- Improve access and utilization of Oregon educational institutions
- Provide practicum experiences for students and faculty in industry
- Provide a large menu of customized continuing education courses for current employees
- Provide technical training to meet growing industry demands
- Strengthen undergraduate education in high technology areas
- Provide advanced education in close proximity to metropolitan region high tech industries

The development of engineering and computer science programs in Oregon has been dispersed geographically, preventing the establishment of a truly outstanding program at any one location. The challenge facing the state is simultaneously to make the best use of these distributed resources, to maintain access across regions of the state, and to create a mechanism to focus new investment in areas of priority need. It must be a system that can respond not only today, but in the future as well, when the character of immediate educational needs may change. It cannot be isolated at one or two sites, or in one or two academic institutions, but must involve the complete public and private educational continuum, from K-12 through graduate programs and continuing education. It must not diminish existing programs, but should build on them, focusing resources at areas of priority need. And, most importantly, it must include the significant presence of business and industry as full partners, providing industry participation in the design, support, implementation and evaluation of engineering-technical education and research.

The following proposal fulfills these fundamental criteria and responds to industry's desire for a "customer driven" post secondary education system with a single point of contact. The consortium arrangement described below will fulfill the objectives proposed by the OBC report and will give Oregon the means to address the critical needs identified by the Governor's Task Force on Education and the Economy:

- Double the number of graduates in computer science and electrical engineering;
- Improve program quality;
- Increase connections with industry;
- Provide high quality graduate and continuing professional education for existing employees.
Making the most of metropolitan area educational resources

There are considerable educational resources within the Portland metropolitan area that have roles to play in providing engineering/technical education and research. Post secondary institutions include one comprehensive public University (PSU); two private institutions, University of Portland and Oregon Graduate Institute; and three community colleges, Mt. Hood, Clackamas and Portland. Two other public universities (OSU and UO) and a technology institute (OIT) offer some programming in the area either via distance education and joint programming with PSU or at remote facilities. The majority of metropolitan area technology programs are provided through OIT and the community colleges while PSU and OGI provide the majority of undergraduate and graduate engineering programs. These programs are provided at sites in Multnomah, Clackamas and Washington Counties.

In the future, consideration will also need to be given to the higher education resources in the Vancouver area which include the developing campus of Washington State University that will offer upper division and selected graduate level professional programs, and a community college providing lower division and other associate degree programs.

In addition, there is a developing cadre of proprietary and industry-related education offered in the region, including national programs available through the internet and telecommunications.

Within this educational milieu is a potential student body as wide spread and diverse as the area's educational resources. Students no longer move in a straight academic line from K-12 schools, through undergraduate and graduate education. Recent studies show that students increasingly are following decidedly non-traditional academic paths in reaching their educational goals, moving back and forth between community colleges and four-year institutions, for example. And, the changing nature of careers and rapid developments in telecommunications and high technology industries has created a growing need for continuous professional development programs. In many cases, these programs are most ideally offered at industry sites and tailored to specific industry needs.

Obviously, the diverse nature of the metropolitan region's educational needs and resources, as well as the nature of the potential student body requires an approach to engineering/technical education and research that is comprehensive and flexible.

Issues to be Addressed
A number of studies have addressed the need for higher education in the Portland metropolitan region, the most recent of which was released in June, 1996, by the Oregon Business Council and others. Among these issues are:

1. Quantity and capacity
There are ample data to suggest that Oregon industry, principally located in the Portland
metropolitan area and principally the high technology sector, requires considerably more trained workers than are produced by the post-secondary institutions at nearly all levels. Current shortages are noted for technicians, technology graduates and undergraduate engineers. This problem is expected to increase in the future. Industry is calling on all of post-secondary education to work together to meet this demand. Many of these positions are at the higher end of the wage scales and, as a result of the shortage of Oregon residents to fill them, it is necessary to recruit for worker from outside the state.

An analysis of the underlying reasons for this shortage of skilled workers reveals a number of conditions that contribute to the problem. Current academic programs at all levels in the Portland metropolitan area are not filled to capacity. This is also the case at the Universities outside the metropolitan area. As an example, it is estimated that Portland State University, with additional laboratory facilities, could educate approximately 20 percent more students in the electrical engineering and computer science with existing faculty resources. Similarly, the technology programs offered by OIT in the metropolitan area are not fully subscribed. While there are exceptions in some program areas, as a rule, the demand by potential students has not yet exceeded our ability to serve them. Thus, at least initially, the problem may not be one of capacity but one of appropriate preparation of students at the K-12 level, motivating those students to pursue educational programs and careers in engineering and technology, and recruiting those students into Oregon institutions.

However, while there is some additional capacity in existing program in the metropolitan area and elsewhere in the state, this capacity is woefully insufficient to meet expected work force demands even in the near future. It will therefore be necessary to increase the capacity of our institutions to educate additional students if we are to meet even a reasonable proportion of this demand.

2. Quality
Concerns have also been expressed regarding the quality of the educational experience received by graduates of our institutions of higher education. There is a concern that some graduates are not at the current state-of-the-art with respect to technical skills and equipment. In addition, there is a continuing concern that our current graduates are not sufficiently prepared to perform in the workplace where communication, team work and problem solving skills are required in addition to technical knowledge.

The first concern, quantity, can be dealt with partially through improved technological infrastructure, equipment and laboratory facilities in engineering/technology education programs. The second concern, quality, is being addressed through changes in the undergraduate general education curriculum at Portland State and, through coordinated curriculums at community colleges and area high schools. This nationally recognized undergraduate curriculum, called University Studies, stresses those qualities most often mentioned by employers: Critical thinking skills; Communications; Ability to work in teams; and, Understanding of the relationship of academic studies to real world issues.
3. Accessibility and Responsiveness:
Building additional capacity and improving quality within the education system is not enough. The resulting programs must be accessible to a wide range of students with diverse learning goals. First, programs and facilities must be appropriately located or available via electronic means, where the subject matter and laboratory requirements permit. Second, while we must serve those who are full-time, first-time students, industry tells us we also must serve those who are returning students and those currently in the work force. Therefore, programs must be offered at times and at locations that make them accessible to this growing student population. An additional dimension is the need for programs of professional development that do not lead to a degree or certificate but provide critical and timely information on new technologies and methods required to retain a competitive advantage in the industry.

Objectives:
Given these issues as a statement of problems facing engineering/technology education and research, we have identified a number of objectives that any solution to these problems must address. The degree to which particular activities contribute to one or more of these objectives becomes a measure of how well they address the basic issues of quantity/capacity and quality of engineering and technology education and research in the Portland metropolitan area.

**Work force training and development:** Provide educational programs that meet the needs of Oregon industry with a particular focus on the Portland metropolitan area.

**Access (programs and location):** Provide quality educational programs in appropriate fields and accessible locations for the citizens of the Portland metropolitan area and elsewhere in the state of Oregon, whether they are full time first time students, returning students who are changing careers or completing degrees on either a full time or part time basis, or practicing professionals seeking continuing professional development, and improve access for women and minorities to engineering-technology programs.

**Research in critical areas:** Develop appropriate facilities and critical mass of faculty to provide basic and applied research to support industry in the metropolitan area and the state; strengthen collaboration with industry and government agencies in R&D in the metropolitan area; and, provide critical mass for a nationally recognized engineering and technology consortium.

**Focus on high technology industries:** In the near term, the activities must assure that academic programs at all levels specifically address the demand for engineering and technology work force and research needs in the metropolitan area with a particular focus on the high technology industry.

**Flexible approach for a changing future:** Since it is difficult to forecast what the educational needs and research priorities will be even a decade in to the future, any approach to dealing with metropolitan educational and research issues must be flexible.
and able to respond to changes in demands for various levels of education and areas of emphasis.

**Local coordination and accountability:** Develop an industry-based, locally coordinated approach across all educational levels and educational and research institutions to address the educational and work force development needs of the Portland metropolitan area, one that involves industry, governmental and educational leaders in the community and is responsive and accountable to the community.

**Strong linkages to industry:** All education and research programs must be designed with strong industry linkages, including opportunities for joint work-learning experiences (internships, practica, capstone projects), continuing education and professional development, flexible scheduling and on-site delivery where appropriate.
Executive Summary

The Chancellor's strategic plan contains the charge to "Build greater critical mass in engineering education and research, and raise programs to a national ranking through investment and consolidation." This document presents a proposal that meets the challenges posed by the OSSHE Strategic Plan, industry, the Oregon Business Council (OBC), and the Governor's Task Force on Education and the Economy.

Proposed is a consortium for regional engineering (including Computer Science), and technology education to be funded centrally by the legislature and administered through a governing board, the Oregon Board for Engineering and Technology (OBET). OBET will have eleven members: Seven from industry; three from governing boards of educational institutions that serve Oregon industry (K-12 and community colleges, State System of Higher Education, private colleges); and, one member from the Oregon Economic Development Department. Members will be appointed by the Governor (with confirmation by the State Senate) to four-year terms.

OBET has an Executive Director for Engineering and Technology, reporting to the Board. The executive director has no real or implied tie to any institution, avoiding conflict of interest, and should be based in Portland where the focus of the consortium's operations is located. The consortium institutions receive base funding in the traditional way, but state and industry funding for enhancements and strategic initiatives in engineering and technology education and research is assigned directly to the consortium. OBET, with advice from stakeholders, will channel funds according to identified needs in a competitive manner. This approach will automatically direct the engineering enhancement resources to identified priorities in engineering, with accountability and no diversion of funds.

The consortium is a "Virtual School of Engineering (and Computer Science)" from the point of view of the customer, and a seamless system solution. The "virtual school" consists of the combined engineering, computer science, and technology resources of the state-supported universities which deliver services to the Portland metropolitan area -- PSU, OSU, UO; Private entities which provide engineering education to the state's citizens, such as OGI and the University of Portland; and, community colleges and OIT. OCATE and OJGSE should be incorporated into the consortium. The consortium faculty and staff are housed on their current home campuses. Governance, collective bargaining, promotion and tenure, and related issues reside on the home campuses. Institutional integrity is left intact, simplifying engineering students' interface with and access to other campus programs integral to their education and degrees.

The Executive Director under the direction of OBET sets overall policy, priorities, and quality guidelines for engineering and technology education in the region, but implementation details are left with the consortium campuses (e.g., PSU, OSU, OIT, and UO) to accommodate their specific audiences. The Executive Director (OBET) provides central coordination of state and
industry resources for enhancing access to academic engineering education and research. OBET allocates funding in a competitive manner for program development and enhancement to the consortium members based on a developed set of priorities. Flexibility and accountability are assured by this competitive funding mechanism, but institutional stability is maintained by the traditional method of assigning base budgets. The consortium is designed to address efficiently and with minimal disruption and delay, the critical issues facing the region's and state's needs.

The advantages of the consortium are immediate. Among them:

- Access to classes in any program and on any convenient campus is facilitated.
- User-friendliness is provided through a single point of entry and easy transfer of courses and program work.
- Critical mass is established through larger faculty in coordinated programs.
- Improved collaboration of the consortium faculty and programs among the state's institutions is mandated.
- Faculty involvement with business and industry through joint research and teaching is enhanced.
- Increased continuing education services are offered through access to the coordinated engineering education resources of the region.
- Rapid response to Portland's engineering education and research needs is facilitated.
- No engineering program is viewed or treated as an extension to a main campus. No institution will be advantaged or disadvantaged over any other one.
- Administrative disruptions, student and faculty anxiety, union/non-union campus issues, and tampering with institutional individuality and integrity are avoided.
- The institutions' local management is preserved.
- A national model is created for collaboration to meet critical regional and state needs.
- All programs are encouraged to cooperate and collaborate for the common good of better engineering education for Oregon.
The Metropolitan Consortium
And the Oregon Board for Engineering and Technology

1. Background
It has long been believed that education and research in engineering and computer science in the State of Oregon need to be enhanced. The number of engineers and computer scientists needed by Oregon far exceeds the current capacity to produce these graduates in Oregon institutions. Engineering education in Oregon needs investment to be able to increase accessibility, the quantity of graduates as well as the quality of their education, and to provide affordable local education.

As part of the Chancellor’s Strategic Plan, the charge has been issued to “Build greater critical mass in engineering education and research, and raise programs to national ranking though investment and consolidation”. A model is proposed below.

2. Metropolitan Consortium for Science, and Technology Education

Proposed here is the formation of a metropolitan consortium for engineering, science, and technology education. The consortium will be governed by an Oregon Board for Engineering and Technology (OBET) which will coordinate engineering, science, and technology enhancements on the campuses of OSU, PSU, U of O, OIT, OGI, U of P, and the community colleges.

It is feasible, and perhaps advisable, to form these consortia in various regions of the state, such as the Southern and Eastern regions. This could become the prototype, eventually providing a mechanism for state-wide access to engineering education. The specific region we propose here is the Portland metropolitan area.

3. Administrative structure of the consortium

The Oregon Board for Engineering and Technology
The Oregon Board for Engineering and Technology (OBET) will have eleven members: Seven will be from industry; three from governing boards of educational institutions that serve Oregon industry (K-12 and community colleges, State System of Higher Education, private colleges); and, one member from the Oregon Economic Development Department. Members will be appointed by the Governor (with confirmation by the State Senate) to four-year terms. OBET is to be a governing board, not advisory. It will be assisted by a technical advisory committee consisting of educational representatives. The Board will "sunset" in four years pending an evaluation of its effectiveness. The Board's responsibility will be to circulate Requests for Proposals which will respond to critical state priorities. Initially, these have been identified by the Governor's Task Force on Education and the Economy as:

- Double the number of graduates in computer science and electrical engineering.
- Improve program quality.
• Improve connections with industry.
• Provide high quality graduate education for existing employees.

The Board's principal responsibilities will be identification of priority needs; development of RFPs; evaluation of proposals; determination of target investments; and development of benchmarks for evaluation of program effectiveness. The Board will be assisted in these tasks by the technical advisory committee. Successful proposals to OBET will include elements of inter-institutional and community collaboration and the potential for leveraging additional funds.

OBET will employ an Executive Director for Engineering and Technology. The Executive Director has no real or implied tie to any institution, avoiding conflict of interest, and is based in Portland where the focus of the consortium's operations is located. The Executive Director speaks with a unified voice for engineering and technology issues in the region to the OSSHE Board, the Governor, the Legislature, and industry to harness resources for education and research.

Decision-making Process
All Consortium members provide input to OBET which will include representatives from industry and education. Engineering and Technology faculty and staff are housed on their home campuses. Governance, collective bargaining, promotion and tenure, and related issues reside on the home campuses.

Engineering, Science, and Technology Enhancement Budget
OSSHE assigns the Engineering and Technology base budgets to the various campuses, which has been the standard practice. Extra investments in engineering and technology education and research will be assigned to OBET, which in consultation with the Technical Advisory Committee appropriates the budget to the engineering and technology programs on various campuses.
Investment Opportunities

The Oregon Board for Engineering and Technology will receive state funds to use to invest in initiatives that enhance engineering and technology education and research. The Board will initially address the Portland metropolitan area because of the growing high technology industry located in the region. The OBET will be an industry-driven board that will invest state funds in programs that reinforce a new direction for engineering education in Oregon. The funds will be distributed according to a “request for proposal” process that will invite participation from elementary and secondary schools, community colleges, and public and private higher education institutions. As a result of careful investment in programs that demonstrate performance, it is expected that the private sector will contribute to the effort and leverage the limited state funds. Final decisions for investment will be made by the Board based on its plan and identified priorities.

To make this proposal concrete, the following are suggestions for investment initiatives based on recommendations of the Oregon Business Council et al, an assessment of the major issues (quantity/capacity, quality, and access) and an understanding of the pool of current and potential students and the existing facilities and resources in the region. These projects serve as examples of the initiatives that the OBET might undertake and costs are provided to give an indication of the investment required to achieve these initiatives. Please note that these are only suggestions. Once the funding process has been established by the OBET, other institutions working together to address identified problems will, more than likely, develop many other exciting and innovative proposals.

The majority of the investment opportunities that have been proposed will not require continuing funding, but provide start-up costs for the ventures that will eventually, through the traditional funding mechanisms, become self sustaining. The few exceptions are continuing investments in scholarships and tuition remissions, equipment replacement and specialized equipment acquisition and in the administration required for coordination of educational activities in the region. Many of the programs, for example the K-12 curriculum and faculty development program are candidates for grants to federal agencies and private foundations, thus either enhancing the program or removing at least some of the funding burden from the OBET. A brief description of the budget items for each investment opportunity is presented along with the time line, staffing requirements and cost. In all cases, these are approximate numbers but are fair representations of the level of cost to be expected in each initiative. A four year time horizon is proposed beginning with the 1997-98 academic year. Many of the programs are proposed to phase in over that time. The budget is summarized in tabular form at the end of the description.

1. **Double the number of graduates in computer science and electrical engineering (Quantity and Capacity).**

One of the greatest challenges facing Oregon higher education and the engineering community is the lack of highly qualified students entering OSSHE engineering programs. We have identified
two important strategies for addressing this problem: 1) to increase the number of qualified students immediately, provide incentives to those students who are now qualified to enter engineering programs but select other institutions out of state; 2) to ensure a continuing pool of qualified students, work to improve the quality of educational experiences available in K-12 schools and community colleges.

A. Develop a program of incentives to encourage an adequate number of students, including Oregon’s best and brightest, to pursue engineering and technology programs.

Create the Oregon Engineering Scholarship Program. This scholarship program will help public and private higher education institutions recruit the “best and the brightest” Oregon students into Oregon undergraduate and graduate engineering and technology programs. The awards of up to $10,000 would include a tuition remission and cash stipend. Most of these scholarship funds would go to students interested in studying in the areas of highest priority such as electrical engineering, computer science, and computer engineering. Students would receive these awards for up to four years.

Establish the Engineering and Technology Tuition Remissions Program. Currently the State provides funds for the “Oregon Laurels” program that is a tuition remission program for highly qualified graduate students. This program has been successful in helping OSSHE institutions attract graduate students who might, because of financial offers, choose to attend graduate school elsewhere. A similar program aimed at undergraduate engineering students would complement the Scholarship program and help attract more students to engineering programs.

The Budget Plan:

Beginning in 1997-98 academic year, the incentive program will be initiated with 10 full scholarships including a stipend and tuition remission to total $10,000 ($15,000 for graduate students) and 30 tuition remissions to be awarded on a competitive basis to qualified Oregon residents by the OBET. The plan assumes that there will be one graduate student for four undergraduate awards. Each year, a similar number of awards will be made so that at the end the four year period, there will be 40 students attending Oregon institutions under full scholarship and another 10 who have had their tuition waived.

Staff:

The staffing requirement is for a person at the OBET to manage the scholarship selection and distribution process and assure adequate performance and progress toward the degree. That individual will be included in the administrative costs of OBET, presented in a subsequent section. Individual institutions can be enlisted to assist in the process and monitor student progress.
**Time line and cost:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Scholarships</th>
<th>Tuition remissions</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>$440,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Enhancement of the quantity and quality of the pool of potential students for engineering and technology programs from the K-12 and community college systems.

**Expand programs that encourage students from underrepresented populations to study math and science.** Several programs exist to foster appreciation for math and science in young children throughout their educational career. The MESA (Math, Engineering, Science Achievement) and SMILE programs have a history of success with middle school through high school students. These programs work with girls and minority students to help them succeed in math and science and to plan for a higher wage career in these fields. Students from these programs go to college. However, more needs to be done. Additional investment in MESA and SMILE will mean that more students participate. Additional investment in programs targeting parents and children in younger grades will also benefit industry in the future.

**Strengthen the K-12 and community college curriculum and improve faculty development programs through partnership with higher education.** The educational community is challenged to keep the curriculum current with advancements in the workplace. This is especially crucial in the K-12 grades where teachers are responsible for much more than teaching the core curriculum. As a result, teachers need help in updating the curriculum, connecting the field of study to the real world, and actively involving all students in the educational process. This is even more necessary in the math and science educational curricula. Expanding current programs where higher education faculty work with mathematics and science educators to develop new approaches and lesson plans for teachers to use in the classroom is a high priority.

In addition, new versions of the Business Compact (which connects teachers to business) would provide real opportunities for elementary, secondary, and community college teachers to work in the high technology industry to acquire first hand knowledge of the problems faced in the workplace and the tools being used to address them. In workshops, University faculty would assist teachers in integrating these problems and solutions into appropriate courses. A program of this type has been developed as part of a Teacher Collaborative grant application to NSF and can be implemented immediately. Components include one or more teachers-in-residence at an engineering school to assist in developing curricular material by working with faculty and industry on real world problems.

**Develop an Introduction to Engineering as a senior elective for high school students.** To reward students who have demonstrated an interest and aptitude in math and science and who
want to pursue a career in engineering, a college level “Introduction to Engineering” course could be delivered in high schools as a senior elective. This course could meet selected introductory higher education engineering requirements to both help decrease the time to college graduation and introduce high school students to college level work. The course will include the concepts and tools for engineering design and a number of hands-on experiences. This project will be undertaken in conjunction with the curricular development and enhancement project and selected high school teachers will work with engineering faculty to develop and offer the course at the high schools.

Create an “engineering recruitment” corps to work with prospective students at the K-12 and community college levels. Giving prospective students timely information about programs and facilitating the application and enrollment process is necessary. Currently, all higher education institutions are underfunded and student services have been hit hard by budget reductions. A concentrated and coordinated recruiting effort, delivered by upper division engineering students from all campuses and coordinated with engineering faculty and admissions staff, would help provide prospective students with information on the college experience, the professional opportunities in engineering and technology fields, and the required high school and community college courses for admission. These students could also serve as mentors for prospective students during their first year in the engineering program.

The Budget Plan:

A number of initiatives are proposed to enhance the quality and the number of high school students who will pursue careers in engineering and technology fields.

Staff:

Some additional administrative staff will be required to coordinate the recruiting activities. Funds will also provide support for faculty during the summer months to participate in the workshops. Funds will also be required for the teachers who are on leave for the curriculum development activities and for stipends and expenses for participants in the summer workshops.
Timeline and costs:

1997-98  
2 HS faculty  
Summer workshops - University faculty $25,000  
Workshop participant costs $30,000  
Recruiting - 0.25 FTE staff $10,000  
Total $205,000

1998-99  
2 HS faculty  
Summer Workshops - University faculty $25,000  
Workshop participant costs $30,000  
Recruiting - 0.25 FTE staff $10,000  
Total $205,000

1999-00  
Summer workshops - University faculty $25,000  
Workshop participant costs $30,000  
Recruiting - 0.25 FTE staff $10,000  
Total $65,000

2000-01  
Summer workshops - University faculty $25,000  
Workshop participant costs $30,000  
Recruiting - 0.25 FTE staff $10,000  
Total $65,000

C. Expand the capacity for engineering and technology education with the objective of doubling the production of undergraduate engineers in fields that support the high technology industry

Although initial efforts by the Oregon Board for Engineering and Technology will be directed at filling some existing capacity, any substantial increase in the quantity of undergraduate and graduate level engineers will require additional faculty, support staff, space and equipment. The acquisition by PSU of the 4th Avenue/US WEST building and by OSSHE of the CAPITAL Center will provide a short term solution to the space problems while the development of equipment acquisition funds would address equipment. The need for more engineering faculty and staff at all institutions in the metropolitan region will have to be addressed. A plan is proposed where, based on a successful recruiting program, additional graduates would be produced within the state. Funding for faculty and associated support staff would be initially provided by the OBET with the expectation that increased enrollments would generate appropriate levels of tuition and associated state support to ultimately support these faculty and staff. Thus, funding for faculty and staff can be considered start-up costs and would be provided by the Board to assist in expanding system capacity. These funds would be available to all institutions with recognition that the primary short term objective is the development of
additional capacity and capability in the Portland metropolitan area in electrical engineering and computer science.

**The Budget Plan:**

Although the first efforts to increase enrollment will simply fill the current capacity, the expectation is that capacity will be reached within the first biennium and that new faculty will be required beyond that point. The objective of doubling graduates is expected to take at least five years beginning with the recruiting activities and financial incentive programs in 1997-98. Funds will be requested from OBET as start-up to fund the new faculty until enrollments have stabilized at the new level. At that point, the internal OSSHE funding mechanisms (for state institutions) and tuition incomes at private institutions will be sufficient to meet the costs of the additional students.

**Staff:**

It is expected that a minimum increase in the faculty of 30 will be required to serve an expanded student body where approximately 300 additional degrees are awarded in the high technology fields and to allow for some additional increases in other field since the recruiting activities are likely to produce on overall expansion. Of the 30 faculty, it is estimated that 5 will be recruited during the first year to serve the Software Engineering Program and the remainder will be brought on recruited in two increments so that a full complement will be in place by 2002.

**Timeline and costs:**

(Note that these costs are cumulative as the obligation for faculty continue in succeeding years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>1998-99</th>
<th>1999-00</th>
<th>2000-01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>Faculty recruitment for SWE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>4 SWE faculty and continued recruitment</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$1,510,000</td>
<td>$2,670,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Support staff</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$280,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Graduate assistants</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$418,000</td>
<td>$1,810,000</td>
<td>$3,160,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **Improve program quality in higher education engineering and technology programs (Improved Quality).**

The quality of engineering educational programs and the quality of the graduates produced has been identified as one of the most important concerns facing higher education and industry in the metropolitan region. While studies show Oregon's engineering graduates perform better than others on national exams and in competitions, many in private industry hold the perception that more must be done to improve the ability of our students to transfer from the educational setting to the work place. While national rankings are one indicator of program quality, the other and more important evaluation standard must always be how our graduates perform on the job. In order to prepare our students for the work place environment, investments must be made in programs that respond to unique market needs, programs that create stronger linkages with the private sector, in cutting edge research, and in equipping our classrooms with appropriate state-of-the-art technology.

A. **Develop appropriate new academic programs and other offerings to meet workforce needs of the high technology industry.**

There are a number of new and innovative academic programs currently being developed to serve the Portland market or that are particularly appropriate for this labor market. Funding is needed to establish these programs and hire the faculty.

**Establish a Master of Software Engineering program.** This graduate program in software engineering is being developed jointly by the three state universities and OGI. It has been designed in cooperation with the software industry and has strong industry support. An investment here could allow the program to begin almost immediately and to develop to full capacity over a two year period. Software is one of the fastest growing sectors of the high tech industry as well as being an essential part of many of the established companies.

**Expand the “OPT for Co-Op” concept.** This program is an innovative approach to developing the technician and technology workforce with an initial focus on the high technology industry. Developed by the Oregon Institute of Technology, the program starts in high school and follows a path of alternating work experience and classroom activities from that point, through a community college associate degree and ultimately to a technology degree, with students entering the workforce, either permanently or temporarily at any of the completion points. The program provides a coordinated career development path and integrates high school, community college, and bachelors level technology education.
The Budget Plan:

These new programs will require start-up funds. They will become self-sufficient by the end of the second biennium.

Staff:

Staff requirements are outlined in individual proposals for the Master of Software Engineering (MSE) program and the OPT for Co-Op programs. The MSE request has been disaggregated so that only the start-up costs are reflected here. The personnel and other facilities costs are included in appropriate investment initiatives. The professional development activities are also restricted to start-up costs for market survey, interviews etc. to determine demand. Personnel for professional development are included in the administration of the consortium and OBET.

Timeline and costs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Start-up for Software Engineering</th>
<th>Start-up for OPT for Co-Op</th>
<th>Professional development start-up</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$2,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$1,550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$775,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$775,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Create opportunities for undergraduate and graduate students to undertake a significant professional experience with industry and other agencies.

To better prepare students for the work place, it is important for them to both work in an industry environment and to experience first-hand the problems commonly faced by engineers at work. Many students, particularly the full-time, traditional aged student, benefit from work place internships. All students should be required to have a work place experience and to produce a capstone project that integrates engineering principles with other disciplines to address a problem.
**Assist campuses to increase the quantity and quality of internship experiences.** Building on the successful OSU MECOP program, each institution should revise the undergraduate and graduate curriculum to provide the opportunity for significant industry-based experiences that build on the academic program. This requires the students to work in industry, be involved in work-based projects and staff teams. In addition, more effort needs to be directed toward coordinating the placement of students in positions, supervising the students, and working with industry. Every institution should designate a coordinator for industrial internships to work with industry to create the placements and to match the students with identified opportunities. The OBET staff can serve as the liaison between industry and the campus coordinators.

**The Budget Plan:**

The role of the institutions will be to coordinate the program with industry using any connections that can be gained through the OBET. Costs will only be for administrative staff who coordinate placements. The program will be developed in the first year and implemented gradually over the four year period. At the end of that period, the costs will be internalized by the institutions but assistance will still be provided by OBET staff.

**Staff:**

It is assumed that a total of 2 FTE staff support should be adequate across the participating institutions (including OSU and UO) to support this program, distributed in rough proportion to the level of participation. The same people involved would also coordinate the faculty internship program since this is not likely to require the commitment of a full time person. This support will be phased in over the four year period beginning in the metropolitan area. These costs would be borne by the consortium for the first four years and be internalized by the institutions following that period.

**Timeline and costs:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>FTE Staff Coordination</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C. Develop opportunities for faculty to undertake a significant professional experience with industry and other agencies.**

To further enhance the educational experience, it would benefit faculty to spend significant time
in industry on a periodic basis to assure familiarity with current practice and industrial problems and to incorporate the latest technology into the curriculum.

**Assist campuses to develop faculty internships in industry.** A program will be developed to identify internship opportunities that may be from three to six months in duration. This program would be supported by the OBET and the individual campuses in the same manner as the student internship program. The OBET staff will serve as a central point of contact and will work to identify placements for faculty in industry and agencies where significant projects exist. Each institution will provide a coordinator for industrial internships to match faculty with opportunities identified either directly or with the assistance of the OBET staff.

**The Budget Plan:**

The Dean of Engineering at Portland State University has developed a faculty internship program that can serve as a model for the consortium. The program places the faculty in an industrial or agency position for a six month period at an average cost to the industry of $100,000 annual rate (including fringe benefits). All costs for the faculty during the internship are borne by the industry. The only incremental costs are for coordination and administration of the program.

**Staff:**

It is assumed that a total of 2 FTE staff support should be adequate across the participating institutions (including OSU and UO) to support this program, distributed in rough proportion to the level of participation. The same people involved would also coordinate the student internship program since this is not likely to require the commitment of a full time person. This support will be phased in over the four year period beginning in the metropolitan area. These costs would be borne by the consortium for the first four years and be internalized by the institutions following that period.

**Timeline and costs:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Staff Support</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>1.0 FTE staff coordination</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>1.5 FTE staff coordination</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>2.0 FTE staff coordination</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>2.0 FTE staff coordination</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D. Enhance the educational infrastructure by providing state-of-the-art equipment and technology for all engineering and technology education programs.**
One further enhancement of quality at all levels is the acquisition, maintenance, and upgrade of equipment. This is an acute need in engineering and technology fields, particularly in the high technology area where computing and related equipment can be expected to be useful only for about three years.

**Support the acquisition, maintenance, and upgrade of equipment.** An acquisition fund for basic equipment (computing equipment, basic testing and measurement equipment, etc.) to be used in programs identified by the OBET as meeting critical needs will be created. The equipment would be available to all participating institutions and coordination of use would be handled by the OBET. In addition, the OBET would facilitate the disposition of surplus industrial equipment that may be useful for instructional purposes.

**The Budget Plan:**

Upgrading equipment has been a challenge for all of education during this decade of is a continuing burden in the recent environment of declining resources. A substantial investment is required to replace outmoded computing and lab equipment in all programs with particular emphasis on those serving the high technology industry. An aggressive program in the first biennium is followed by another substantial infusion in the second biennium.

**Staff:**

No staff are included in this request.

**Timeline and costs:**

1997-98 Major equipment upgrades $1,000,000  
1997-98 Major equipment upgrades $1,000,000  
1999-00 Equipment replacement $500,000  
2000-01 Equipment replacement $500,000

**E. Enhance and support for the infrastructure required to undertake cutting edge research in selected areas that support industry and agencies in the Portland metropolitan area.**

The high technology industry grows based on innovations and continuing developments in technology. This depends on a research-based environment at higher education institutions that connects faculty work with opportunities in industry. It is important that such an environment is fostered in the metropolitan area. Currently, faculty at institutions in the metropolitan region are engaged in very high quality research, particularly in areas related to the high technology
One further enhancement of quality at all levels is the acquisition, maintenance, and upgrade of equipment. This is an acute need in engineering and technology fields, particularly in the high technology area where computing and related equipment can be expected to be useful only for about three years.

**Support the acquisition, maintenance, and upgrade of equipment.** An acquisition fund for basic equipment (computing equipment, basic testing and measurement equipment, etc.) to be used in programs identified by the OBET as meeting critical needs will be created. The equipment would be available to all participating institutions and coordination of use would be handled by the OBET. In addition, the OBET would facilitate the disposition of surplus industrial equipment that may be useful for instructional purposes.

**The Budget Plan:**

Upgrading equipment has been a challenge for all of education during this decade of is a continuing burden in the recent environment of declining resources. A substantial investment is required to replace outmoded computing and lab equipment in all programs with particular emphasis on those serving the high technology industry. An aggressive program in the first biennium is followed by another substantial infusion in the second biennium.

**Staff:**

No staff are included in this request.

**Timeline and costs:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>Major equipment upgrades</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>Major equipment upgrades</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>Equipment replacement</td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>Equipment replacement</td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E. Enhance and support for the infrastructure required to undertake cutting edge research in selected areas that support industry and agencies in the Portland metropolitan area.**

The high technology industry grows based on innovations and continuing developments in technology. This depends on a research-based environment at higher education institutions that connects faculty work with opportunities in industry. It is important that such an environment is fostered in the metropolitan area. Currently, faculty at institutions in the metropolitan region are engaged in very high quality research, particularly in areas related to the high technology
industry, but it is limited in scope simply due to the numbers of individuals involved. As the faculty are increased, the quantity and quality of research will grow. However, it is essential that the current and future faculty have the basic support to compete for grant funds at the federal level and to perform research and develop applied projects for local industries. Initial investments by the state in equipment allow the faculty to be successful in attracting funding. Some of these investments can ultimately be recovered through indirect costs associated with grants. Once acquired, the specialized equipment and the expertise of the associated faculty and staff would be made available to all faculty in the consortium. The faculty and graduate students hired to address the quantity issue will come with specific expertise in areas of critical importance to industry. However, these faculty must be supported in their research in order to be successful. A key component to a research agenda is access to specialized equipment.

**Establish a fund for specialized and highly technical equipment that will facilitate research.**

A fund will be established, to be accessed by the institutions in the consortium, for the acquisition of specialized research equipment in support of institutional initiatives to develop research capabilities in selected areas. In addition, the OBET staff will maintain an inventory of specialized research equipment and capabilities at all institutions. They will assist in coordinating access to that equipment among the faculty from the participating institutions.

**The Budget Plan:**

A fund will be established that will be accessed by proposal from the participating institutions in the consortium for the purpose of building in infrastructure of sophisticated and specialized research equipment and matching federal funds where required.

**Staff:**

No staff are required for this program.

**Timeline and costs:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Research equipment</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>Research equipment</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>Research equipment</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>Research equipment</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>Research equipment</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Make the engineering educational opportunities and programs responsive and accessible to students with diverse learning goals (Access and Responsiveness).**

The engineering programs currently offered to students in the metropolitan region do not meet
the varied needs of the population. Students today must have access to coursework throughout the day and evening. The courses must be delivered in many different ways, on campus, at work, at home. And, faculty must be flexible to accommodate the disparate requirements of the students.

A. Expand and enhance the physical facilities to provide adequate space for program operation and develop a plan for collaboration in offering programs at existing sites.

The consortium of institutions in the Portland metropolitan area represent a geographic coverage of the area. With at least one notable addition (the CAPITAL Center) the current distribution of facilities presents the possibility of offering programs on site throughout the metropolitan region. To accomplish this will require a coordinated effort of the consortium partners. However, it will be very difficult to begin any additional activities, such as new academic programs, without additional space for classrooms, laboratories and offices. There are currently two locations that are available and provide the possibility for solving the space shortage at least in the short term. Acquisition of these facilities for support of engineering and technology education and research is essential to future development.

Support the expansion of currently held facilities to serve more students and to support research. Currently only about half the CAPITAL Center is occupied. The remainder is undeveloped but is particularly well suited as a space to serve the high technology industry in Washington County. This space should be acquired to make it available for new activities including the Masters of Software Engineering, OPT for Co-Op, the expansion of OIT technology degree completion programs and the development of selected research laboratories in support of industry. Also, although PSU is a co-owner of the US WEST/4th Avenue Building, the financing for the building required much of the space to be leased to outside agencies for non-educational uses. The remainder of the building should be acquired and dedicated to development of engineering and technology programs in the downtown area. This location is central to both the Washington County and recent development in east Multnomah County and is accessible by light rail from both locations.

Coordinate use of allocated space to allow on-site offering of selected programs. The OBET will coordinate the use of space among the institutions to allow for courses and programs to be offered at appropriate locations throughout the region. This will make engineering education accessible to more metropolitan area residents. For example, an agreement to use space at a community college to offer some upper division or graduate level course work, thus making it accessible to residents in the suburban areas.

Increase the ability of all institutions to deliver engineering courses using distance learning and technology. In order to provide educational programming directly to the student at work or at home, all institutions will need enhanced distance learning classrooms. The campuses must be equipped as both receive and send video sites. In addition, access to multimedia technology is necessary in order to provide a curriculum that meets industry standards.
The Budget Plan:

The acquisition of space for program expansion is a substantial item. The proposed sequence is to first acquire, that is defease, the debt on the CAPITAL Center so that it is available to the consortium to establish programs without the ongoing requirement of rent. This facility is strategically located to serve a large number of high technology companies and alternative space in Washington County is limited. The second phase of the proposal is to acquire the former US West building by exercising the current option. This would occur in the second biennium since most of the building is currently under lease and space would not be available until that time.

Staff:

No additional staff are required for this project.

Timeline and costs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>Acquire CAPITAL Center building</td>
<td>$6,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Build out remaining space</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operation and distance learning</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,300,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>Operation and distance learning</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>Acquire US West Building</td>
<td>$6,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Build out remaining space</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operation (CAPITAL Center)</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operation (US West)</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distance Learning</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,300,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>Operation (CAPITAL Center)</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operation (US West)</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distance Learning</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,500,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Provide coordination of engineering and technology education and research activities in the Portland metropolitan area.

One of the most important activities of the OBET is the coordination of higher education programs in the Portland metropolitan area. This will require administrative staff, including an Executive Director and support staff for both administrative and programmatic coordination. The coordinating office will provide the following services:
• Develop and maintain a single catalog and produce a quarterly course schedule for all engineering and technology related offerings by all institutions in the Portland metropolitan area.

• Develop and maintain a directory of faculty resources, research expertise, research facilities and specialized research equipment, along with abstracts of recently complete research projects.

• Provide a single point of access for information on academic programs, requirements, procedures for admission, etc.

• Coordinate recruiting and scholarship programs with the assistance of the participating institutions.

• Identify professional development and continuing education requirements for local industry, focusing initially on high technology, and facilitate, with the participating institutions, the development of appropriate short courses, workshops and related activities.

• Support the activities of the Oregon Board of Engineering and Technology

All of the information would be available electronically via the World Wide Web and the web page of the OBET would be connected to each of the participating institutions to facilitate the search for more specific information.

The Budget Plan:

The activities of the metropolitan area consortium will be coordinated through the OBET which will require an administrative staff. The staff will perform a number of coordination, administrative and informational functions. The Offices would be located at the CAPITAL Center. These costs would continue throughout the life of the Board and the consortium.

Staff:

The staff would include an Executive Director, two program personnel one for information and one for program development, particularly related to professional development and continuing education, and two support staff, one secretarial and the other computer support for the development of Web pages.
Timeline and costs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 professional staff</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 support staff</td>
<td>$ 80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Material and supplies, etc.</td>
<td>$ 25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>Recurring costs</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>Recurring costs</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>Recurring costs</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Develop a university-level seamless engineering educational system that allows for common charges for credit hours and tuition sharing.

Although there are a number of university-level educational institutions in the metropolitan area, the fact that some are public and others are private has made it difficult, if not impossible for students to move among the institutions and take advantage of the variety of course work that is already available. This problem has been solved elsewhere in the country and a primary objective of the OBET would be to work with the participating institutions to facilitate the development of a tuition sharing plan. The basic elements are relatively simple and include:

- A consistent cost per credit hour for each level of course work, i.e., lower division undergraduate, upper division undergraduate, masters and doctoral. Each institution would be reimbursed for students who attend courses but are enrolled outside that particular institution. Students at the private institutions would be charged the full cost while students in the public system would be charged the subsidized rate with the remaining increment coming from the state funds.
- Guidelines for minimum enrollments, etc. to ensure that the courses are financially viable.
- Administrative procedures to transfer course credit between institutions and program residency policies that recognize courses taken at a participating institution as meeting requirements toward degree completion.

The Budget Plan:

There are no costs associated with the development of a plan to provide seamless access for students to all metropolitan areas programs in engineering and technology. This plan will need to be developed by the academic and financial administrators at the institutions with coordination provided by the Executive Director of OBET.
### Incentive Investment Program - Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Incentive programs for students</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Curriculum and Faculty Development</td>
<td>$205,000</td>
<td>$205,000</td>
<td>$205,000</td>
<td>$205,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Capacity expansion</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$418,000</td>
<td>$1,810,000</td>
<td>$3,160,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Improve quality</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. New academic programs</td>
<td>$2,700,000</td>
<td>$1,550,000</td>
<td>$775,000</td>
<td>$775,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Student work experiences</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Faculty internships</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Equipment upgrade and acquisition</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Research equipment</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Access and responsiveness</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Expanded physical facilities</td>
<td>$9,300,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$9,300,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Metro area coordination of activities</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Metro area tuition sharing</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Investment Package</td>
<td>$14,240,000</td>
<td>$5,368,000</td>
<td>$13,945,000</td>
<td>$7,495,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bienniel totals

|         | $19,608,000| $21,440,000|
Conclusion

The coalition of metropolitan area educational resources, governed by the industry-driven Oregon Board for Engineering and Technology, addresses the goals established by the Oregon State System of Higher Education strategic planning process (See Attachment I), and the recommendations of the Oregon Business Council report, “Gaining Competitive Advantage,” (See Attachment II). It differs in scope from more limited approaches such as the Oregon Joint Graduate Schools of Engineering (OJGSE) in several important ways.

- OJGSE is targeted to enhance only a portion of the graduate education program while OBET will coordinate the entire region’s engineering and technology enhancement investments in a comprehensive way.
- OJGSE’s management so far has not been shared with equal responsibility by the participating campuses. OBET will predominantly consist of members from industry, with equal input from all participating campuses.
- OJGSE has no entity charged with the responsibility to effect changes in response to industry’s needs, to provide strategic focus, and to elevate quality, with accountability. OBET will have the charge and the resources to carry out these responsibilities, with equal input from all participating campuses. OBET and the Executive Director for Engineering and Technology will be accountable for the results.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBC Report Criteria</th>
<th>Statewide College</th>
<th>Regional Consortium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Customer driven; adaptable to changing market needs</td>
<td>Statewide Industry Advisory Council consults on direction and programming.</td>
<td>OBET, industry-driven governing board, sets priorities, determines investments, sets performance marks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. High, definable level of skills and knowledge for all graduates</td>
<td>Addresses undergraduate and graduate level curriculum in engineering at the Statewide College of Engineering.</td>
<td>Provides pathway to higher standards at all levels, K-12, community college, university, and includes engineering and technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Improved access and utilization of Oregon institutions</td>
<td>Potentially provides access to engineering classes now available only in Corvallis.</td>
<td>Envisions a seamless educational system including public and private institutions and spanning K-12, community colleges, universities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Practicum experience for students and faculty with industry</td>
<td>Envisions a selective (200 positions) program based on MECOP model</td>
<td>Envisions internships for all students who are not working in their field; includes the Opt for Coop program of OIT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Larger menu of customized continuing education courses</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Technical training to meet growing demands</td>
<td>Not addressed directly.</td>
<td>Consortium includes OIT and community colleges for technology training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Stronger undergraduate education in high technology areas</td>
<td>Addresses change in undergraduate engineering curriculum.</td>
<td>Addresses undergraduate engineering and technology, and includes community colleges and OIT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Advanced education in proximity to metropolitan area high tech industries</td>
<td>Does not address specifically.</td>
<td>Consortium and OBET directly address metropolitan area needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposal Vision</strong></td>
<td>Create top-20 ranked program by 2005.</td>
<td>To improve engineering and technology education and research in the metropolitan area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The OGI and Computer School proposals are more narrowly drawn, addressing one aspect of engineering-technology education -- graduate level programs and computer science.*
THE CONSORTIUM AND OREGON BOARD FOR ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY PROPOSAL responds to the Strategic Objectives identified by the Oregon State System of Higher Education.¹

The goals and objectives of OSSHE’s Strategic Plan relate directly to the goals and outcomes identified for the proposed Consortium and Oregon Board for Engineering and Technology.

1. **Develop a barrier-free admission and transfer process**

   The OBET will function as a coordinating entity to foster common standards, admission forms, fees, course catalogs, and transfer processes.

2. **Partner with community colleges to provide baccalaureate capacity and access**

   The Consortium and the OBET will provide a single hub to coordinate seamless programs with community colleges in the region to increase capacity and to enhance access through program articulation.

3. **Establish accelerated three- and four-year baccalaureate programs**

   The Consortium and the OBET will coordinate course scheduling among colleges and universities to facilitate rapid progress to baccalaureate degrees. The feasibility of accelerated degree programs, through for example, establishing year-round course offerings, can be discussed on a regional and statewide basis.

4. **Create a virtual university initiative — expanding technology capabilities system-wide**

   The Consortium and the OBET will create one “coordinated investment strategy” for engineering and technology programs and will expand technology capabilities at all participating institutions and throughout Oregon.

5. **Develop academic schedule and calendar flexibility to provide greater access**

   The OBET will work with the Consortium to coordinate program enhancements, including providing calendar flexibility for better access.

6. **Build critical mass in strategically needed graduate education and research programs key to Oregon’s future**

¹OSSHE priorities as identified in the OSSHE NOW, June-July 1996, published by the Oregon State System of Higher Education
The OBET, through coordination of all engineering and technology program enhancements in the region, is charged with the task of making selected investments that will build a critical mass in graduate and research programs.

7. Develop greater graduate/research capability in the Portland metropolitan area

The Consortium, working with the OBET, will have expanded graduate and research capacity in the metropolitan region. Every institution, will have an opportunity to seek selected investments to strengthen graduate and research programs.

8. Build greater critical mass in engineering education and research, and raise programs to national ranking through investment and consolidation

The high-quality and diverse faculty of all the institutions involved in engineering and technology education, all contributing with their own unique strengths and identity, can build critical mass in engineering and technology education and research. The faculty will provide the synergism and strength to raise programs to higher ranking. These objectives require selected investment and cooperation of faculty. Cooperation and successful performance are much easier achieved through an investment model, rather than a consolidation model imposed on faculty without their input or direction.

The OBET is in a strong position to coordinate efforts to create centers of excellence. It has the advantages of avoiding unnecessary duplication, and of coordinating and consolidating faculty talents on the various campuses.

9. Expand availability/accessibility to technology/technician education to better serve Oregon’s high-technology industry

By involving all educational partners, the Consortium is able to expand and provide seamless access to higher education in engineering and technology at all levels to better serve Oregon’s high-tech industry and Oregon’s residents. The silicon forest industries extending from Vancouver to Eugene will be the main beneficiaries of a coordinated approach.

10. Open a graduate education center in Portland to serve as a gateway for appropriate university graduate programs from across the state, and create and fund a professional development, life-long learning center to serve as a single contact point for all of Oregon.

This will perhaps be one of the greatest advantages achieved by this model. A coordinated plan, coordinated schedules and programs that are adequately funded, will naturally lead to a virtual graduate education center in Portland for all appropriate graduate engineering programs from across the state.
11. *Increase the number of experientially based programs, practica, and internships*

The engineering and technology programs in Oregon have had extensive experience in this area. The OBET can enhance the internship and co-op programs by providing resources, a single point of access for the region, and strengthening connections to industry.

12. *Focus the Chancellor’s Office on policy, criteria setting, system strategy and necessary central services ensuring the institutions have appropriate support, flexibility, and incentives to achieve strategic objectives.*

The OBET is to be funded centrally by the Legislature and managed by an Executive Director. OBET, with contributions from all participating campuses and industry, will be able to focus on policy and criteria setting for region-wide engineering and technology education, as well as on regional strategy. The Chancellor’s Office will then be able to focus on setting policy for the publicly funded institutions in cooperation with the OBET.
THE METROPOLITAN CONSORTIUM AND THE OREGON BOARD FOR ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY PROPOSAL IS CONSISTENT WITH THE OREGON BUSINESS COUNCIL REPORT, GAINING COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE, THE NEED FOR CUSTOMER-DRIVEN HIGHER EDUCATION.¹

Following are the recommendations outlined in the Oregon Business Council (OBC) Report, compared with the goals of the Oregon Board for Engineering Technology and The Metropolitan Consortium proposal.

1. **A customer-driven mode of operation.**
   By retaining the individuality of its campuses, the OBET and Consortium approach will be driven by the customers of the engineering and technology programs. Business and industry will determine funding priorities. Business and industry will evaluate program effectiveness. Business and industry will decide performance indicators.

2. **Quality assurance.**
   The undergraduate programs at OSU, PSU, and OIT are nationally accredited, hence they meet national standards. However, continuous improvements must be made to the curricula of all participating institutions. These improvements can be carried out with a variety of tangible and measurable elements, such as faculty size, teaching loads, class sizes, laboratory space and equipment, office and technical support, and computing facilities.

3. **Improved system access and utilization.**
   Access for students and industry to higher education programs is improved through creation of the OBET, a barrier-free admission and transfer process, and expanded technology capabilities system-wide.

4. **Practicum experience.**
   Engineering and technology programs in Oregon have had extensive experience in this area. One very successful model is OSU’s MECOP program. Industry-based experiences can be enhanced by providing investments targeted for access, and strengthened connections to industry and business.

5. **Customized continuing education.**
   Engineering programs at the public and private institutions are accustomed to providing continuing education courses and seminars. The OBET will identify the need for additional customized continuing education and will work with appropriate educational institutions.

institutions -- community colleges and higher education -- to develop appropriate programs.

6. *Increased training of technicians.*
   The OBET will have resources that can be invested in programs that will result in more trained technicians.

7. *Stronger high-technology undergraduate education.*
   The OBET will make strategic investments in programs that will increase the quantity and quality of engineering and technology undergraduate students.

8. *Advanced education in proximity to the high-tech industry.*
   Oregon needs top-ranked Electrical Engineering and Computer Science programs close to the heaviest concentration of industry, the Portland metropolitan area. A strong feature of the OBET will be to enhance the size and quality of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science in the Portland area. More resources and a more active and focused student recruitment are needed to enhance the programs and increase the number of graduates. Indeed, not only Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, but also other engineering programs such as Manufacturing, Engineering Management, Environmental Engineering, and Transportation Engineering, may become likely candidates for enhancement through this proposal. The important element is that all investments will be industry-driven to make sure that the maximum benefit will be realized for the areas with the greatest need.

The OBC Report also provides a list of ideas for change.

*Access*

- *A three-year bachelors degree for prepared and qualified students*

  The OBET will be in a position to evaluate this idea and make targeted investments in programs that will be effective in delivering this program. Coordinated course schedules will undoubtedly lead to accelerated degree programs.

- *Increased utilization of distance technology*

  Investment in distance learning programs and capacity can be an important strategy pursued by the OBET.

- *More convenient credit transfer from community colleges to four-year schools*

  PSU already has a common articulation standard with the community colleges, but the Consortium, through better coordination, will improve the articulation.

- *Increased financial aid for academically qualified but financially needy students*

  Funding of scholarships and tuition remission programs can be a part of the OBET
investment portfolio.

- Increasing opportunities for life experiences to be used for credit that applies to degrees.

These opportunities currently exist on various campuses, but the OBET, with involvement of the participating institutions, could produce uniform guidelines in conformity with accreditation criteria.

Quality Assurance in Teaching

A major criterion in engineering and technology accreditation is faculty quality, measured partly by how well they stay current in their fields, their teaching effectiveness, and professional activities. The OBET could invest in programs that improve teaching effectiveness patterned after the American Society for Engineering Education’s Teaching Effectiveness Institutes.

Another important component of engineering education is teaching laboratories. The centralized enhancement vehicle through the OBET will be instrumental in laboratory development and generating funding for equipment and tools for state-of-the-art laboratories.

Continuing Education

Engineering programs are quite accustomed to providing continuing education courses and seminars. The proposed Consortium, working with the OBET could create a virtual university and expand technology education programs in the metropolitan region and statewide.

Decentralization to the Campus Level

It has been recommended in the OBC report, that to create stronger incentives for customer service the higher education system should consider decentralizing governance to the campus level. This proposal responds to that recommendation. There is no proposed change in governance or structure. The unique missions and characteristics of the participating campuses must be maintained to assure responsive customer service and to provide diversity of engineering education to the citizens of Oregon. The existing diversity is viewed as a strength that must be enhanced.

Centers of Excellence

The OBET, with participation by faculty, is in a strong position to create centers of excellence. It has the advantages of avoiding unnecessary duplication, and of coordinating and consolidating faculty talents on the various campuses. The following are examples of the type of centers that might be created: Software Engineering, Microwaves and Optoelectronics, Lasers, Materials Science, Water Resources, Earthquake Engineering, Bioresource Engineering, Technology Management, Computer Engineering, Data Intensive Computing, Computer Security, Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering, and Software Quality.
Essential Elements of Successful Proposals

Engineering-Technical education and research in the Portland Metropolitan Area must react to the issues of program quantity/capacity and quality. There are a number of objectives that any solution to these issues must address.

**Workforce training and development:** Provide educational programs that meet the needs of Oregon industry with a particular focus on the Portland metropolitan area.

**Access (programs and location):** Provide quality educational programs in appropriate fields and accessible locations for the citizens of the Portland metropolitan area and elsewhere in the state of Oregon, whether they are full time first time students, returning students who are changing careers or completing degrees on either a full time or part time basis, or practicing professionals seeking continuing professional development.

**Research in critical areas:** Develop appropriate facilities and critical mass of faculty to provide basic and applied research to support industry in the metropolitan area and the state.

**Focus on high technology industries:** In the near term, the activities must assure that academic programs at all levels specifically address the demand for engineering and technology workforce and research needs in the metropolitan area with a particular focus on the high technology industry.

**Flexible approach for a changing future:** Since it is difficult to forecast what the educational and research priorities will be even a decade into the future, any approach to dealing with metropolitan educational and research issues must be flexible and able to respond to changes in demands for various levels of education and areas of emphasis.

**Local coordination and accountability:** There should be an industry-based, locally coordinated approach across all educational levels and educational and research institutions to address the educational and workforce development needs of the Portland metropolitan area, one that involves industry, governmental and educational leaders in the community and is responsive and accountable to the community.

**Strong linkages to industry:** All education and research programs must be designed with strong industry linkages, including opportunities for joint work-learning experiences (internships, practica, capstone projects), continuing education and professional development, flexible scheduling and on-site delivery where appropriate.

**Customer sensitivity:** Provide greater roles for industry in program development and design.

**Measurable results:** There must be agreed upon measures for success, established in concert with industry.