

**The Bridge Project:
Strengthening K-16 Transitions Policies**

Oregon Case Study

**PHASE I
TECHNICAL REPORT**

Andrea Venezia
Andrea Conklin Bueschel
Stanford University

May 2001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT.....	5
DESCRIPTION OF POLICY PROBLEM AND PROJECT.....	5
OREGON’S STATE EDUCATION POLICY CONTEXT.....	9
OREGON UNIVERSITY SYSTEM.....	21
OUS OUTREACH.....	22
STUDENT PERFORMANCE.....	23
SYSTEM ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS.....	23
OUS REMEDIATION.....	25
K-16 DATA COLLECTION AND USE.....	25
K-16 ENTITY WITHIN OUS: THE JOINT BOARDS OF EDUCATION.....	25
OREGON EARLY OPTIONS STUDY.....	26
LAYING THE GROUNDWORK FOR PASS.....	28
THE PROFICIENCY-BASED ADMISSIONS STANDARDS SYSTEM (PASS) ...	30
BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION OF PASS.....	30
PASS ALIGNMENT WITH K-12 REFORMS.....	37
PASS AND EQUITABLE ACCESS TO HIGHER EDUCATION IN OREGON.....	38
PASS AND PLACEMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION COURSES.....	39
PASS IMPLEMENTATION.....	40
EVALUATIONS OF PASS.....	43
THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON	44
GENERAL FACTS.....	44
DATA ON ENTERING STUDENTS.....	46
GRADUATION POLICIES.....	47
STUDENT RETENTION/PERSISTENCE.....	48
CURRENT ADMISSION AND PLACEMENT POLICIES.....	49
POLICY EVOLUTION: FORMER ADMISSION, PLACEMENT, REMEDIATION POLICIES.....	56
ANTICIPATED CHANGES TO ADMISSION, PLACEMENT, REMEDIATION POLICIES.....	57
COMPATIBILITY OF ADMISSION POLICIES AND K-12 STANDARDS.....	57
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY.....	61
GENERAL FACTS.....	61
DATA ON ENTERING STUDENTS.....	62
GRADUATION POLICIES.....	63
STUDENT RETENTION/PERSISTENCE.....	63
CURRENT ADMISSION AND PLACEMENT POLICIES.....	63
POLICY EVOLUTION: FORMER ADMISSIONS, PLACEMENT AND REMEDIATION POLICIES.....	68
ANTICIPATED CHANGES TO ADMISSIONS, PLACEMENT AND REMEDIATION POLICIES.....	69
COMPATIBILITY OF ADMISSION POLICIES AND K-12 STANDARDS.....	70
ANALYSIS OF OREGON’S K-16 TRANSITION POLICIES AND REFORMS... 	72
THE STATE OF THE STATE.....	73

PLACEMENT AND HIGHER EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS	73
COLLABORATION AND POLICY COHERENCE.....	74
CAPACITY-BUILDING.....	76
SUMMARY	76
APPENDIX A: IHE AND STATE AGENCY PROTOCOLS.....	79
APPENDIX B: PHASE I INTERVIEWS	90
APPENDIX C: TIMELINE OF STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT.....	92
APPENDIX D: TRANSFER POLICIES FOR TRANSFER BETWEEN OREGON COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND OUS	94
APPENDIX E: PASS STANDARDS.....	97
APPENDIX F: PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS	100
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	101

TABLE OF FIGURES

Table A: Assessment System Measures	15
Table B: Reform Implementation Timeline.....	17
Table C - Percent of Students Statewide Meeting or Exceeding Performance Standards in 1999	18
Table D: Score Cutoffs for Meeting and Exceeding Grade Level Performance Standards	19
Table E: Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding the Standards in 2000 and Change from 1999.....	19
Table F: UO Undergraduate Enrollment, 1997.....	21
Table G: Geographic Origins of Entering Students, Fall 1998.....	44
Table I: Summary of Bachelor Degrees Granted, Fall 1997-Summer 1998.....	45
Table J: Entering Freshmen High School Grade Point Averages, 1998.....	46
Table K: Entering First-year Student SAT Scores, 1998.....	46
Table L: Data on How Many “Higher Achieving” Students Attend the University of Oregon, 1987-1997.....	47
Table M: Ten Most Popular Majors Among 1997-1998 Graduates.....	48
Table N: Retention and Graduation rates for Freshmen Entering from High School, Fall 1989 – Fall 1997.....	48
Table P: PSU Undergraduate Enrollment, by Discipline, 1998:.....	62
PASS English Proficiency Standards, Required and Recommended, for OUS Admissions, 2000	97
Example PASS Proficiency Standards and Criteria for English, 2000	97
English Assessment Guidelines for PASS, June 2000	99

PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

Description of Policy Problem and Project.

While educators and policymakers share the common goal of improving student performance, they often act in isolation; thus, efforts are sometimes conflicting or duplicated, and certain needs are sometimes never addressed. This is not the fault of a particular set of people or institutions. Rather, the current organization of secondary schools and universities is such that communication between levels is often difficult, and policies rarely provide incentives for educators to work across systems.

Literature on higher education admission-related issues and the intersection between K-12 and higher education posits that mixed policy signals and expectations can lead to an inability by students to perform well academically (Kirst, 1997; Bishop, 1996a; Powell, 1996). Bishop (1996b) stresses the need for good information, or signals, as an important part of incentive-building. In addition to signaling that academic achievement matters in real life, another form of signaling is having credible and clear measures of academic performance. He writes that the behavior of students, teachers, parents, and others in the education system is dependent upon the incentives facing them. Those incentives depend on the reliability and cost of the signals set forth regarding the outputs of the system, such as graduating from high schools and entering higher education (Bishop, 1996a). This research examines the policy signals students receive when transitioning between K-12 and higher education; who develops and implements those signals; and, in a second, Phase II report, students' knowledge of those policies.

While higher education admissions-related policies are only one of many factors shaping students' college attendance decisions, an underlying belief of this study is that if the state and other entities develop policies, then they need to be clear, consistent, compatible, and systemic. Policies are designed, often, to affect people's behavior; consequently, it is essential to ensure that the policies contain positive incentives and, in the case of K-16 transition policies, are compatible. In addition, information regarding transition policies need to be disseminated equitably to all stakeholders in order for all students to have equal access to all types of higher education opportunities.

Summary of Project.

This is the Phase I Oregon case report for Stanford University's Bridge Project. The Bridge Project is a five-year study funded by the Pew Charitable Trusts with additional funds from the U.S. Department of Education. Project researchers studied state-, higher education institutional-, high school-, and district-level K-16 student transition policies in six states and the ways in which these policies are communicated to stakeholders. Such policies include institutional admission, placement, and remediation policies and high school exit-level standards (e.g., state assessments and graduation requirements). States were chosen for inclusion in the study because they are all involved in innovative K-16 reforms and/or are experiencing legal or political changes regarding the use of affirmative action in higher education admission processes. Phase I focuses on describing and analyzing K-16 student transition policies; Phase II analyzes K-12 stakeholder understandings of those policies.

Project Purpose.

The main purposes of the project are to provide a research base that can be used to improve 1) opportunities for all students to enter and succeed in higher education by strengthening the alignment between higher education admissions-related requirements and K-12 curriculum frameworks and 2) the content and dissemination of K-16 transition policies and related information. This research aims to help K-16 stakeholders providing a description of relevant policies and processes, an analysis of disjunctures that exist in the current policy environment, an analysis of stakeholder policy knowledge and related actions, and recommendations regarding how to improve the current system(s).

Research Design.

The study proceeded in three phases, described below:

Phase I is primarily a descriptive stage focused on defining and describing the current undergraduate admissions- and placement-related policies at the state-level and in the selected universities. In this phase, researchers gained an understanding of how admissions and placement standards are set, how they evolve within institutions and state governments, and how they are operationalized by admissions officers and other institutional staff. In addition, innovative K-16 policy initiatives are documented.

Staff in state agencies who work on K-16 transition-related issues (such as the Certificates of Initial and Advanced Mastery and the Proficiency-Based Admission Standards System, all discussed later in this report) were interviewed. In addition, researchers from the RAND Corporation analyzed the content and format of high school exit and college entrance and placement assessments to determine similarities and differences. Phase I provides necessary contextual information for Phase II.

Phase I research questions include:

- What are the signals and incentives sent by existing higher education admissions and placement policies? The University of Oregon and Portland State University sections explore these issues.
- What are the formal and informal state and institutional K-16 transition policies?
- Who are the key decisionmakers and policymakers regarding K-16 transition policies in each state? The university sections and the state agency sections address this question.
- How compatible are those signals and incentives with K-12 exit-level standards and assessments? Every interviewee was asked about how compatible they believe the high school exit and college entrance level policies are in Oregon. Their responses are included in each section. In addition, a report commissioned for the project and conducted by the RAND Corporation addresses this question from a more technical perspective.
- How are higher education admissions standards and placement policies communicated to, and interpreted by, secondary school-level educators, parents and students? Are there differences in the communication processes utilized by, and understandings of, different student subgroups?

- How might specific proposals to reform college admissions policies affect or improve current patterns of communications and signaling?

Phase II examines how the policies and practices described and analyzed in Phase I are understood, interpreted, and acted upon by parents, students, and secondary school and district personnel. In this phase, project researchers surveyed students and interviewed groups of eleventh graders in focus groups, and all the included students' parents were surveyed. State agency personnel, district and school-level administrators, counselors, and teachers were interviewed. The second part of this report presents the full methodology for this research and the report focuses on the Phase II findings.

Phase II research questions include:

- How are state and higher education policies, procedures, practices, expectations, and requirements communicated to –and received by– students, parents, teachers, and high school staff?
- Do student groups differ in their reception and interpretation of undergraduate admission and placement policies?

Phase III utilizes the data from Phases I and II to assess recent admissions-related proposals to reform higher educational admissions standards, to analyze the status quo in the six states, and to propose recommendations for change.

For the Oregon case study (Phases I and II), researchers conducted field research in relevant state agencies (namely the Oregon Department of Education and the Oregon University System), Portland State University, the University of Oregon, and four high schools in three districts in the greater Portland Metropolitan area.¹ The first phase of field research focused on understanding and analyzing state-level and higher education K-16 transition policies. One objective of the research is to distinguish between policies and practices at more selective institutions and those at less selective institutions. The two universities in this study are the University of Oregon (UO) and Portland State University (PSU). Researchers chose the UO because it is one of the most selective public universities in the state in terms of its admission policies; PSU's admission policies are less selective than those at the University of Oregon, and PSU has an explicit mission to be accessible to all students in the state. University administrators, researchers, and faculty were interviewed, as were state agency personnel. Project researchers reviewed and analyzed relevant documents. (See Appendix A for the Phase I interview protocol. The Phase II report includes the Phase II interview and focus group protocols and survey instruments. See Appendix B for a complete list of Phase I interviews in Oregon.) Similar questions are asked of each stakeholder group in order to compare and contrast responses and perspectives. This report documents this Phase I research. A Phase II report is forthcoming.

In the second phase of the research, K-12 educators were interviewed, honors and nonhonors students in the ninth and eleventh grades were included in focus groups and surveyed, and their

¹ Schools and districts are given pseudonyms to protect their anonymity.

parents were surveyed.² Four high schools in the greater Portland metropolitan area were chosen for inclusion based on their level of student diversity, percent free or reduced lunch, scores on K-12 student achievement tests, college-going rates, scores on the SAT or ACT, degree to which the schools were in urban or suburban areas, and involvement in K-16 reform efforts. Project researchers selected schools from around Portland, rather than including high schools near the University of Oregon in Eugene, primarily because Portland students might have some kind of knowledge base about both Portland State University and the University of Oregon – the two universities in the study – since Portland State is near them and the University of Oregon is a flagship. High school students near Eugene would probably not receive as much information about Portland State University and, therefore, would not be able to engage in discussions about the two institutions. Eleventh graders were chosen because they presumably have spent time thinking about their post-high school plans and might have received information from the school about college. Ninth graders were included because they can share recent retrospective information about college preparation, or lack thereof, prior to high school. Researchers conducted the field research prior to the annual statewide K-12 test administration.

Timeframe of research.

The field research was conducted between 1999 and 2000; the policies of interest were in place, or in the development stage, during the 1999-2000 academic year.

Phase I began in May of 1999 with visits to the University of Oregon, Portland State University and the Oregon Department of Education. A follow-up trip in August of 1999 completed the bulk of the on-site data collection. A February 2000 trip finalized the collection of Phase I data and laid the foundation for Phase II with visits to the school districts. Phase II data collection in the high schools occurred between February and May 2000.

Structure of Report.

This report presents Phase I research findings from an examination of state- and university-level higher education admissions and placement policies in Oregon. The sections include:

- Oregon’s Education Policy Context;
- The Oregon Department of Education (ODE)
 - The Certificate of Initial Mastery (CIM)
 - The Certificate of Advanced Mastery (CAM);
- The Oregon University System;
 - The Proficiency-based Admissions Standards System (PASS);
 - The Joint Boards of Education;
- The University of Oregon Admission and Placement-Related Policies;
- Portland State University Admission and Placement-Related Policies; and
- Analysis.

² The definition of what is an honors class and what is a nonhonors class differs by state and by school. The use of those terms in our Oregon high schools is defined in the forthcoming report on the second phase of our research.

Oregon's state education policy context.

This section provides descriptions of the agencies, organizations and policies that influence the state's K-16 policy environment. It addresses the major Phase I research questions, including: 1) what are the formal and informal state-level K-16 student transition policies and 2) who are the key decision makers and policymakers regarding K-16 transition policies. The general educational policy context within the state is discussed, including sections on political climate; educational legislation and other reforms; and role of the business community.

Oregon education context and legislation.

Many interviewees stated that Oregon prides itself on its progressive educational reform-mindedness, while coping with fiscal constraints. As a leader in the national Goals 2000 movement and in developing statewide educational standards and assessments, major state education policymakers believe that Oregon is a model for other states (Interview with Joyce Benjamin, Associate Superintendent for Federal Programs, August 1999). As one Oregon Department of Education (ODE) document claims, "From public beach access to the bottle bill, land use planning and health care reform, Oregon has a national reputation for solving important public policy issues with progressive, bipartisan solutions. Oregon's school improvement effort bears the same hallmark. Continuous improvement, local control and high expectations for students are key elements of Oregon's school improvement plan" (Oregon Department of Education website, 2000). The focus on local control has evolved, with the state's role increasing over time, but, throughout the state's recent political changes, the emphasis on sustained education reform has not ebbed.

As one long-time ODE official explains, "Kentucky and Oregon are two states that have these big picture views of education. Kentucky did it by judicial mandate. Oregon did it voluntarily, which has many advantages, I think" (Interview with Joyce Benjamin, Associate Superintendent for Federal Programs, August 1999). As a relatively small state, Oregon has the advantage of bringing all of the key educational players in the state together fairly easily and making sure that everyone has a place at the table. As a member of the Oregon University System (OUS) staff who has worked in other states explains, "I think where Oregon has both a plus and no minuses [is] that we're small enough as a state that things can get more easily done. You're not going to find this in Texas; you're not going to find it in Maryland or California or even in Illinois – but we're small enough as a state that it's easier to get things done" (David McDonald, January 31, 2000).

The 1983 publication of *A Nation at Risk* raised concern about student performance nationally and called for higher standards and greater accountability. Oregon responded by re-thinking its educational system and developing the "Oregon Plan for Excellence." This plan contained the seeds for the Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century (1991), legislation that mandated the development of the current standards, assessments, and certificates. An ODE official explains, "the origin of a lot of things that came out in the 21st Century Education Act...really began as the Oregon Action Plan for Excellence in 1984" (Interview with Joyce Benjamin, Associate Superintendent for Federal Programs, August 1999). The Act is discussed in more detail in the Oregon Department of Education section.

In addition, Oregon policymakers utilized the work of New Standards, a joint effort begun in 1990 by the National Center of Education and the Economy (NCEE) and the Learning Research and Development Center at the University of Pittsburgh. New Standards is based on the view that the health of the nation's economy is tied to the quality of the public schools. Its founders believe that, in order to improve teaching and learning, schools should be restructured to include aligned performance standards, incentives, and assessments, among other components. New Standards promotes:

1. the use of performance standards and assessments;
2. the development of curricula and instructional materials that are aligned with the standards;
3. the creation of school-to-work transition systems;
4. community services for students who would otherwise have a difficult time succeeding in school;
5. including parents and community members in public education; and
6. restructuring school and district organization and management.

(NCEE website, <http://www.ncee.org>, October 5, 2000)

Concurrently, the Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce published a report supporting the use of certificates of mastery that would be awarded in high school. The Commission wrote that, "Once a student has acquired the Certificate of Initial Mastery, he or she could choose a college preparatory program, go right into the workforce, or enter a program designed to culminate in a Technical or Professional Certificate. These certificate programs would combine formal education and on-the-job training in a unified curriculum" (Marshall and Tucker, 1992). Oregon's Legislature authorized the development of Certificates of Initial and Advanced Mastery. Thus, the influence of New Standards' and the Commission's focus on performance standards, performance assessments, and certificates of mastery are evident in Oregon's educational policies.

House Bill 3565 (1991) – The Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century, and the subsequent amendment to that Act, Bill 2991 in 1995, marked the beginning of a new era of education policymaking in Oregon. Important legislation from that act includes the authorization of benchmarks for all students, assessed in grades 3, 5, 8, 10 and 12; the CIM (Certificate of Initial Mastery, issued after grade 10); and the CAM (Certificate of Advanced Mastery, issued after grade 12).³ Although each of the grade level assessments is considered important, the most focus has been on the CIM and CAM.

The culmination of many reforms, the Act focuses on standards and achievement for public K-12 education in Oregon. As excerpted in the *1997-98 State Report Card*, the Act contains the following expectations:

1. Access to a quality education must be provided for all of Oregon's youth regardless of linguistic background, culture, race, gender, capability or geographic location.
2. A restructured educational system is necessary to achieve the state's goals of the best-educated citizens in the nation and the world.

³ Recent policy changes have shifted the focus from grade level performance to overall benchmarks. Rather than grades 3, 5, and 8, the assessments refer to benchmarks 1, 2, and 3.

3. The specific objectives are:

- To achieve the highest standards of academic content and performance;
- In addition to a diploma, to establish the Certificates of Initial and Advanced Mastery as evidence of new high academic standards of performance for all students;
- To establish alternative learning environments and services for students who experience difficulties in achieving the academic standards;
- To establish early childhood programs and academic professional technical programs as part of a comprehensive educational system; and
- To establish partnerships among business, labor and education in developing standards for academic professional technical endorsements and providing career-related learning experiences to help students achieve those standards.

(1997-98 State Report Card)

Oregon politics often reflect a bipartisan effort, and the 1991 educational legislation involved representatives from both sides of the aisle. In this relatively small state, almost every interviewee stressed the importance of key individuals in the development and implementation of the reforms. As an OUS administrator points out, “[The original legislation] had its group of champions, which got it started. And, over time, they are no longer in those positions of power. There’re new people who had kind of nothing to do with the beginning of this and so their level of interest in it probably ranges all over the map. So you went from a group who were true believers and really wanted to make this happen, to now something that’s probably more representative of the general population... On the part of a lot of people it’s, you know, maybe this is a good idea, maybe it isn’t. It’s not so overwhelmingly clear that this is a great idea that we should stand up and salute it.” (Interview with John Moseley, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, University of Oregon, August 1999)

This statement reflects two common questions in educational reform: Why should we do it? and, How can we sustain it? For their part, Oregon students have consistently performed near the top in national and international tests of student performance (although some question whether there has been a greater degree of sorting or self-selection of the students who take such exams in Oregon than in other states); consequently, some ask, why fix something that is not broken? The central premises of the Certificates of Initial and Advanced Mastery and the Proficiency Based Admission Standards System were built on the notion of proficiency, something that cannot always be measured by standardized tests. As a PSU administrator explains, “Our educational system is built on the notion of grades, seat time, credits, that is, in credentialing people. It is not built on this notion of proficiency. And to think that we can totally reverse hundreds of years of tradition and something that is embedded in our culture, and all of the sudden change to proficiency-based. It is going to take a long time. And we are making efforts, you know” (Interview with Janine Allen, Vice Provost and Dean for Enrollment and Student Services for PSU, August 1999). An ODE official notes, “I think the challenge right now is the crossover between a Carnegie unit system and a standards-based system, and I think we are in this for a long, long time in terms of [a] transition” (Interview with Colleen Mileham, Coordinator, Curriculum and Instruction, Professional Technical Education, August 1999). This commitment to proficiency drove the initial reform efforts.

In reaction to the 1991 legislation, the Oregon University System (OUS) developed the Proficiency-Based Admission Standards System (PASS) to reform the admission process for Oregon's public universities and to ensure that students met a high standard of academic preparation prior to matriculation into an OUS institution. Although the CIM, CAM, and PASS have different histories, philosophies, and overall goals, they are often viewed as part of the same education reform package. They are, however, two distinctly separate, but interrelated, sets of reforms. As the Director of PASS Implementation explains, "It's appearing to me that what it is, it's more like constructing a web, but purposefully, than we're held together by a common vision. But we have to keep restringing the web over and over again, making it larger, smaller, making new connections. And that's the way to policy; policy needs to continually adapt. It's literally the strands of the web that give people permission or support or create the avenues for people to keep working. And there's nothing you can pass that says you have those K-16 structures, and Bammo, here it is. Because that just doesn't happen" (Interview with Christine Tell, PASS Director of Implementation, July 2000).

As this report discusses in its analysis section, translating educational policies into practice is difficult, requiring capacity-building; buy-in from school staff and students and their families; and the alignment of policies and system activities. One of the PASS directors sums up some of the challenges by stating,

This is a seething mass of discontent. I don't know how many states there are where teachers are joyfully saying, I love state assessments, this is such a good thing for kids. Mostly they view it as subversive of kids. Because here was the promise: The promise of the standards-based system was that teachers and kids would be working in concert, they would have a relationship...it's why we all went into teaching in the first place – that we would actually be in partnership with our students, that together we would forge toward greater heights of learning. That was the promise. That's not what's happening. You can't tell everybody that they're in a culture of working together in this collegial environment towards standards and then test them with a multiple-choice test and then publish the results and then tell them their salary's contingent upon [the results]... This doesn't go together.

(Interview with Christine Tell, PASS Director of Implementation, July, 2000).

The next section describes the ODE and its purview with regard to K-16-related activities – namely the development and oversight of the CIM and CAM.

Oregon State Board of Education and Oregon Department of Education.

K-12 education in Oregon is overseen by the Oregon State Board of Education, created by the Legislature in 1951. The Board sets educational policies and standards for Oregon's 198 public school districts, 17 community college districts and 21 educational service districts. All of these agencies have separate governing bodies responsible for transacting business within their jurisdiction. The State Board consists of seven members appointed by the Governor for up to two four-year terms. One member is selected from each of Oregon's five congressional districts, and two from the state at large. Board members are unsalaried and cannot be engaged in school administration or teaching during their terms of service. The elected state superintendent is

independent of the state board and is a member of a different political party than the board members, although all positions are non-partisan. Staff members within in the Oregon Department of Education (ODE) support the Board.

The ODE consists of seven divisions:

- Assessment and Evaluation
- Curriculum, Instruction and Field Services
- Professional Technical Education
- Special Education
- State Board
- Student Services
- Administration

(<http://www.ode.state.or.us>)

The Certificate of Initial Mastery (CIM) is the responsibility of the Curriculum, Instruction and Field Services Division. The Certificate of Advanced Mastery (CAM) falls within the purview of the Professional Technical Education Division. This administrative separation has caused fragmentation that has affected the implementation of the reforms dramatically, especially since the assessment division is separate from the divisions overseeing the CIM and CAM (Correspondence with David Conley, Executive Director of PASS, February, 2001).

Oregon Public Schools.

The ODE serves 198 local elementary and secondary school districts and 21 Education Service Districts (ESDs). As of October 1, 1998, there were 542,809 elementary and secondary (K-12) students in Oregon. Students are concentrated in the four large urban centers of Portland, Eugene-Springfield, Salem, and Medford; those areas combined contain 66 percent of Oregon's students. Oregon's low-income student population (Title I) is 34.4 percent of the total. High school dropout rates increased from 5.8 percent in 1991-1992 to 6.9 percent in 1997-1998. The racial/ethnic breakdown for the entire student population in October 1998 was as follows: African American 14,754; American Indian 11,134; Asian, Asian-American, Pacific Islander 19,831; Latino 47,027; White, non-Latino 450,063; total 542,809. Since 1989, the percentage of students of color enrolled in Oregon's public schools has increased by 7.0 percent per year, with Hispanic/Latino student enrollment increasing by 11.0 percent per year. The proportion of minority enrollment to total enrollment increased from 10.2 percent in the fall of 1988 to 17.1 percent in fall 1998 (<http://www.ode.state.or.us/stats/statist.htm>).

Several recent trends have affected the ODE and OUS's policymaking efforts, including:

- Student enrollment across the state grew 11.7 percent between 1990 and 1997. During the same period, the percentage of teachers increased by 2.9 percent. In 1990-1991, the student-teacher ratio for elementary teachers was 18.7 students per teacher; in 1997-98, that ratio was 19.2 students per teacher. In middle schools in that same period, the student-teacher ratio

grew from 18.6 to 19.2 students per teacher. In high schools, the ratio changed from 17.7 to 20.5 students per teacher.⁴

- For the eighth year in a row, in 1998, Oregon's average SAT college entrance exam scores were the highest of the 23 states with at least 40 percent of high school seniors taking the test. The 1998 results are the highest since 1972, the first year for which state results are available. In 1998, Oregon students averaged a score of 528 in the verbal section and 528 in the math section. The national average verbal and math scores are 505 and 512, respectively.
- Historically, the largest source of revenue for public schools in Oregon is local property taxes. Measure 5 – the property tax limitation voters approved in 1990 – changed that dramatically by lowering, over a three-year period, the amount of property taxes schools could raise. Measure 5 required the state legislature to offset lost property tax revenue with money from the state general fund composed primarily of state income taxes. As a result, Oregon schools increasingly are supported by state, not local, dollars. In the 1990-91 school year, before Measure 5 passed, 59.4 percent of the total budget came from local property taxes and 26.2 percent came from the state. In 1997-98, nearly the reverse was true with 26.4 percent of the budget coming from local property taxes and 58.6 percent from the state.
- The total amount of money appropriated for schools increased since the passage of Measure 5, but it has not always kept pace with rising enrollment or inflation. Districts budgeted an average of \$5,522 per student in 1997-1998, as the state continued to move toward equalized funding across districts. Using slightly different data, the National Education Association's *1997 Rankings of the States* ranks Oregon 15th in current expenditures per state (*Oregon Report Card 1997-1998*).

Additionally, since the passage of the 1991 and 1995 legislation, the ODE staff has focused much of their efforts on developing CIM and CAM standards and related assessments. The next section outlines those processes.

Development of Educational Standards and Assessments.

Content Standards. Once the Legislature passed Bills 3565 and 2991, the ODE was responsible for meeting the legislative mandate and developing not only the educational standards for the 1991 Act, but also the assessments to determine students' progress in meeting those standards. The Legislation provided no funding for that work. As a member of the Curriculum, Instruction and Field Services staff in ODE explains, "...our asset and liability [is] that these mandates came without funding so the only way we can get things done in this state is through partnerships, so we've had to reach out. [However,] there is still a lot of concern. There is still a lot of work to be done, but we have done an awful lot, and we have done it with no money" (Interview with Dawn Billings, Coordinator, Office of Curriculum and Field Services for the ODE, August 1999).

⁴ These ratios include teachers who do not teach in self-contained classrooms, like art, music and physical education.

The Oregon Department of Education, with the help of parents, teachers, and other community members, developed new academic content standards for students. The standards require students to demonstrate that they are proficient in English, mathematics, science, history and other core subject areas.⁵ They are generally viewed as more rigorous than the state’s previous standards.

Performance Standards. There are specific performance standards for each assessment grade level based on the activities listed above. These standards include performance cutoffs for the state tests (multiple choice and problem solving), work samples, and in-class scored activities (e.g. speaking). Social studies and second language standards are under development.⁶

State Assessment System. Since 1991, Oregon has tested student achievement in grades 3, 5, 8 and 10. The assessments are aligned with content and performance standards for each grade, and each assessment is part of the overall progress towards the certificates of initial and advanced mastery (CIM and CAM). Ideally, the earlier grade assessments will provide “a map of student progress toward meeting CIM and CAM standards in high school” (<http://www.ous.edu/pass/stac/assessment.html>). The table below outlines the types of assessments used, the capabilities assessed, and who developed the assessment.

Table A: Assessment System Measures

Capability Assessed	Form of Measure	Source
Knowledge and Skills	Multiple-choice tests	Developed by state and administered and scored by teachers and other local educators
Problem-solving and reasoning skills	Performance assessments (scored work assignments, such as writing samples or solutions to math problems)	
Application of knowledge and skills in specific situations	Teacher evaluated classroom project work samples	Developed and scored by teachers

(<http://www.ous.edu/pass/stac/assessment.html>)

Certificates of Initial (CIM) and Advanced Mastery (CAM).

The most visible components of the new statewide standards and assessment system are the CIM and CAM. The certificates are designed to be capstones to student mastery of the standards during high school. While intended to be two parts of a continuous system, the CIM and CAM have been executed quite differently, in part because of their different development and implementation schedules. Although the CIM and CAM are often discussed in conjunction with the Proficiency-based Admissions Standards System (PASS), PASS is a product of the Oregon University System, while CIM and CAM fall within the purview of the ODE. The PASS program is discussed fully in the Oregon University System section of this report. Despite important differences in the development and implementation of the various reforms, one senior

⁵ Appendix C includes a table that charts the development of the standards.

⁶ Frameworks for content standards and performance standards can be found at <http://www.ode.state.or.us>.

ODE staffer believes, “we will win when people don’t say CIM, CAM, PASS. We will win when these people say, boy, these kids met these high standards, and now they are in college. That is what we want kids to say. We really need to de-emphasize, I think, the certificates” (Interview with Dawn Billings, Coordinator, Office of Curriculum and Field Services for the ODE, August 1999). Efforts to streamline the reforms have resulted in collaboration between CIM, CAM, and PASS staff to ensure that the standards between the three are aligned. Standards for CIM and PASS are aligned, and work is underway to align the assessments.

The CIM and CAM continue to evolve, though their legislative mandate stands. Currently, neither the CIM nor CAM is required for high school graduation or college entrance in Oregon. Following the descriptions of the standards and assessments for the certificates are updates on what recent changes have been made to the system.

The CIM.

To earn a CIM, students must demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to learn, read, problem solve, think critically, apply concepts learned in science and math across the disciplines, communicate, use technology and work effectively alone and as the member of a team (*Oregon Goals 2000: An Annotated State Plan*, Oregon Department of Education).

The CIM assessment includes a series of performance-based assessments (a combination of selected response, performance tasks, and student work samples) benchmarked to mastery levels at approximately grades 3, 5, 8 and 10. Individual assessment will be ongoing to provide students continuous feedback regarding their progress toward meeting the standards at the benchmark levels and at the CIM level. The CIM is based on an educational program that prepares students for continuing education leading to the Certificate of Advanced mastery (CAM). It is seen as a rigorous set of standards (*Oregon Goals 2000: An Annotated State Plan*, Oregon Department of Education). Students begin working on the CIM in kindergarten and complete requirements in high school. Districts were first able to award CIMs to students in their districts in June 1997. Some students will earn a CIM prior to age 16 while others may take longer. According to the ODE, accommodations will be made to student learning needs without compromising the integrity of the standards (*Oregon Goals 2000: An Annotated State Plan*, Oregon Department of Education).

For the CIM performance tasks, the state role will focus primarily on providing a quality control function. The quality control process includes three separate activities:

- Use of common tasks for the CIM portfolio;
- Certification of individual scores; and
- Assuring comparability and reliability of scoring of portfolios (*Oregon Goals 2000: An Annotated State Plan*, Oregon Department of Education).

The CAM.

The CAM is not yet implemented across the state, but the ODE is piloting it in approximately six high schools across the state. The CAM may include both college preparatory and professional training, and students will be able to earn one at the end of high school. The curriculum must include “focused opportunities for structured work experiences” or cooperative work-study programs in one or more broad occupational areas: arts and communication; business and

management; health services; human resources; industrial and engineering systems; or natural resource systems. Students are required to demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to meet high content and performance standards (*Oregon Goals 2000: An Annotated State Plan*, Oregon Department of Education).

CAM standards are divided into *Foundation Skills* and *Advanced Applications* that require the same standards of performance of all students. The CAM program provides the content and context to prepare students for their individual goals beyond high school. Students, with the involvement of parents and school staff, develop individualized plans that will build upon students' aptitudes, interests and goals. These plans provide a road map to prepare students to continue their education and to enter the work force (*Oregon Goals 2000: An Annotated State Plan*, Oregon Department of Education).

The CAM program differs from the CIM program in its fundamental purpose. Students continue to emphasize the CIM as they prepare for the CAM, but, in order to earn a CAM, they demonstrate the skills in a context requiring a more sophisticated use of knowledge and performance. It takes approximately two years to earn a CAM.

Reform Implementation.

The state developed incremental policy development and implementation plans. Below is the timeline for both the state legislated reforms and for PASS.⁷

Table B: Reform Implementation Timeline

	1998-1999	1999-2000	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006
Content Standards	Revised standards in place	Content standards reviewed and revised on a 2-year cycle						
State Testing in Place – 3, 5, 8, 10	EN, MA, SC, SS	State testing in English, mathematics, science and social sciences; district testing in the arts and a second language						
State Performance Standards	EN, MA, SC	EN, MA, SC, SS	State performance standards will be reviewed and revised on a 2-year cycle. Districts set performance standards in the arts and second languages.					
CIM	EN, MA	EN, MA, SC	EN, MA, SC	EN, MA, SC	EN, MA, SC	CIM fully implemented (EN, MA, SC, SS)		
CAM			models developed in selected schools				in all schools	fully implemented
PASS Proficiency Expected for College Admission				EN, MA	EN, MA, SC	EN, MA, SC, SS	EN, MA, SC, SS, AR	EN, MA, SC, SS, AR, SL

⁷ PASS is described in the upcoming Oregon University System section.

KEY: EN – English; MA – Math; SC – Science; SS – Social Science; AR – The Arts; SL – Second Language (*Oregon Goals 2000: An Annotated State Plan*, Oregon Department of Education)

Dissemination of the reforms.

One of the challenges for the state, given the tumultuous nature of the reforms, is communicating changes and answering questions from educators and the public. As one ODE staff member noted, “I think that [dissemination] is one of the biggest challenges of this agency in terms of a communications network” (Interview with Colleen Mileham, Coordinator, Curriculum and Instruction, Professional Technical Education for the ODE, August 1999). ODE sent materials to every school, but it is not clear how much information has reached beyond the administrative level in each school and district. Some districts have been more responsive than others in developing their own systems in conjunction with the state’s to implement the standards and assessments. For example, some schools developed their own CIM, while others are adopting more of a wait and see attitude and are following state mandates.

Results from the 1999 and 2000 Oregon Statewide Assessments.

The Oregon Statewide Assessment is a criterion-referenced assessment aligned with the Oregon Content Standards. As a result, the scores from the Oregon Statewide Assessment are somewhat different from those produced by national, norm-referenced tests. The types of scores produced from the Oregon Statewide Assessment are based on an achievement scale widely used in the Northwest. The scale for reading and mathematics, with numbers ranging from about 150 to 300, is similar to scales such as the SAT scale or other “growth” scales. Each point on the scale is an equal distance from the previous point on the scale, so changes up or down can be charted and viewed as comparable from year to year. The Performance Standards for the CIM were set by panels of teachers, curriculum specialists and community members who reviewed test items anchored to the achievement scale and determined the score a student would have to receive as evidence of having met the academic standards (*State Assessment Results*, 1999). Assessment scores are reported in specific skill areas.

1999 results. Students tested under regular conditions are those who were not absent, exempted (special education or limited English proficient), tested under modified conditions (special education, bilingual assessment, or limited English proficient), or excused by the school for other reasons. Below is information on the percent of students in the state who Met (M) the Performance Standard, Exceeded (E) the standard, or who Did Not Yet Meet (D) the standard in 1999. Data are provided for grades 3, 5, 8 and 10 and are provided for both the reading/literature and mathematics tests.

Table C - Percent of Students Statewide Meeting or Exceeding Performance Standards in 1999⁸

(D=did not yet meet standard; M=met standard; E=exceeded standard)

Grade	Reading/Lit			Math			N Rdg/Lit	N Math
	D	M	E	D	M	E		

⁸ Percentages may differ due to rounding.

3	19	37	43	30	41	29	38,623	39,995
5	31	49	19	34	51	15	38,749	39,290
8	44	26	30	48	25	27	39,699	40,130
10	48	34	17	64	24	12	36,775	37,067

(1999 State Assessment Results document)

Table D: Score Cutoffs for Meeting and Exceeding Grade Level Performance Standards

	Meet Standard	Exceed Standard
Grade 3	201 (reading); 202 (math)	215
Grade 5	215	231
Grade 8	231	239
Grade 10	239	249

2000 results. Students scored higher in 2000 than in 1999 on nine of 13 state tests in reading, writing and mathematics. The percentages of students meeting standards increased at all grade levels for mathematics, reading and writing tests since 1991. The most dramatic improvements were in 3rd grade mathematics where 40 percent more students met the standards in 2000 than in 1991 and 3rd grade reading with an increase of 30 percent over the 10 year period. Although presented in a different format from the 1999 data, the following table displays the percent of student meeting the standards in 2000 and the change from 1999. Figures for those not meeting the standards are not currently available (*2000 State Assessment Results* document).

Table E: Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding the Standards in 2000 and Change from 1999

Reading	2000	1999	Percent change (+ or -)
Gr. 3	82%	81%	+ 1%
Gr. 5	73 %	69%	+ 4%
Gr. 8	64 %	56%	+ 8%
Gr. 10	51%	52%	- 1%
Math	2000	1999	Percent change (+ or -)
Gr. 3	75%	70%	+ 5%
Gr. 5	69%	66%	+ 3%
Gr. 8	56%	52%	+ 4%
Gr. 10	40%	36%	+ 4%
Writing	2000	1999	Percent change (+ or -)
Gr. 3	86%	88% (1996*)	- 2%
Gr. 5	65%	60%	+ 5%
Gr. 8	66%	68%	- 2%
Gr. 10	Results not available		

* 3rd graders were last tested in writing in 1996.

Math Problem Solving	2000	1999	Percent + or -
Gr. 5	64%	59%	+ 5%
Gr. 8	55%	55%	+ 0%
Gr. 10	Results not available		

(2000 State Assessment Results document)

Modifications to the original legislation.

Since originally developed, the state modified the assessments – and the implementation schedules – to reflect the needs of the school staff and students. Certain CIM subject assessments, such as social studies, have been delayed, the CAM has started as a pilot program called New Century Schools, and there have been adjustments to the overall statewide assessment system. Several of these changes are highlighted below.

Changing the CIM implementation plan.

Although the schools tested tenth graders on the CIM science assessments in the spring of 1999, the work sample timeline for science was not implemented at the same time. The bigger area of concern for most schools and teachers, however, has been in social studies. The social studies standards have undergone continuous modification and there has not been clear agreement between the developers and school staff about what students are expected to know and be able to do. Because of these concerns, the State Board of Education agreed to:

- a one year postponement of the CIM timeline requiring students to meet 10th grade standards on science work samples for the CIM; and
- three years postponement of the CIM timeline requiring students to meet 10th grade standards on state social sciences tests and classroom work samples for the CIM.

Defining the CAM.

Because there has been difficulty clarifying what the CAM is and how it fits into the overall reform, ODE delayed implementation in order to define it more explicitly. Many interviewees believed that the CAM is stalled and does not have a realistic implementation timeline.

This section outlined many of Oregon’s K-12 reforms from the early 1990’s through mid-2000. Oregon’s higher education community reacted to those reforms with several measures, including the development of the Proficiency-Based Admission Standards System (PASS). The next section provides general information about the Oregon University System and its K-16 reform efforts.

OREGON UNIVERSITY SYSTEM

The Oregon University System (OUS) is governed by the Oregon State Board of Higher Education. Nine members have four-year terms and two members have two-year terms. The Chancellor and two Vice Chancellors are located in Eugene; two other Vice Chancellors are located in Portland. There are eight universities in the Oregon University System: Eastern Oregon University (regional liberal arts), Oregon Institute of Technology (polytechnic), Oregon State University (land and sea grant university with programs in the liberal arts and sciences), Portland State University (urban campus with programs in liberal arts and sciences), Southern Oregon University (regional liberal arts and sciences), The University of Oregon (major liberal arts and sciences university), Western Oregon University (regional liberal arts and sciences), and Oregon Health Sciences University (affiliated medical institution). The table below provides undergraduate enrollment and tuition information from 1997 for the OUS institutions.

Table F: OUS Undergraduate Enrollment, 1997

<i>Name</i>	<i>Undergraduate Enrollment</i>	<i>Tuition</i>
Eastern Oregon University	1,802	\$3,273
Oregon Institute of Technology	2,564	\$3,309
Oregon State University	12,066	\$3,549
Portland State University	10,860	\$3,438
Southern Oregon University	4,604	\$3,198
University of Oregon	13,368	\$3,771
Western Oregon University	3,927	\$3,198
Average		\$3,391

(Oregon University System Fact Book, 1998)

Higher education in Oregon is not traditionally well-funded in relation to the funding levels K-12 has received. In the 1997 legislative session, however, funding for all the OUS institutions and the system combined increased by approximately 25 percent. An OUS staff member believes that is a good start, and is “an opportunity to put some flesh on the bones” of “these very emaciated operations” (Interview with Shirley Clark, Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs for the OUS, August 1999).

Unlike the relationship between K-12 and business community, there has not been a history of collaboration between OUS and the business community. That is beginning to change, especially since the business community is becoming more active in education reform, and is encouraging the legislature to adopt models like those used in Washington state (Running Start) and Minnesota. OUS has started working with K-12 stakeholders and the business community “behind the scenes” in order to lobby the legislature (Interview with Holly Zanville, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for the OUS, August 1999). As the Director of PASS Implementation stated, “...frankly, OUS has been very closed. A lot of people don’t even know what it is. They don’t understand the structure of the higher ed system or anything else. So part of this [implementing PASS] is going out to schools and actually becoming a resource rather

than something that's very scary" (Interview with Christine Tell, PASS Implementation Director, July 2000).

OUS and ODE have not traditionally collaborated on programs and policy development. In interviews with OUS staff, concern was voiced that ODE is not committed to K-16 reform. As one interviewee stated, "Because ODE is not interested in admission to college, and by that I mean the concerns there are with moving students through K-12. And, yes, there certainly are people in ODE who are interested in what happens after that, but they are split in many ways. I mean, they have to have concerns about, first of all, getting more students through to [high school] graduation. That's a big issue in Oregon – is the dropout rate in K-12, so that's one thing they have to contend with...It is, in my experience, in Oregon, the Department of Ed has had very much of an attitude, and this could be changing, but I think this was characteristic of the last several years. The college-bound can pretty much take care of themselves. That's not the group of students they are most concerned about. And, of course, it is the group we are most concerned about" (Interview OUS Official, August 1999).

Through PASS and CIM alignment, this level of K-16 interaction is starting to change; OUS and ODE staff members have been meeting regularly and working together to align the PASS and CIM proficiencies. Several OUS staff members voiced some concern about the process, however. One interviewee stated that, "it's hard for us to stay tethered to a reform process that has had so many glitches in it...but we are tethered to that reform because we cannot lay on the schools a whole different system of assessments and requirements. It has to be all hooked up. So collaboration is very, very difficult and it means that if one part can't muster what it needs to do, it threatens to bring everything else down and there's a lot of concern about that, I would say." She continued by stating that,

I see it as very difficult to do PASS without K-12 being able to move further on a total reform strategy...The structures of the CIM and CAM could go away and it would not matter to PASS. It might be almost be better if they did. If they took away the certificates, but kept the curricular content changes and the curricular standards and kept this broader thinking about assessments, that is what we really need. We need the standard, [the] agreement on the standards and proficiency levels. We do not need the CIM and the CAM...there is often confusion in the states that you have to get the CIM or even you have to get the CIM and the CAM to qualify for college admission and we have said 'Oh, no you don't!' We have gotten into very hot water with our colleagues at the Department of Education. They want us to say, 'you do!' because that would help them, but we can't require those things for admission. It is really not necessary...If you can show proficiency, we literally don't care how you get it; we are ready for you. And they do not have the same understanding of that in the Department of Education.

(Interview with OUS Official, August 1999).

OUS outreach.

Every fall, OUS holds a half-day conference for high school counselors. It also has workshops on financial aid, PASS, and students with disabilities, and runs Aspire in the State to train volunteers to help high school counselors. In January 2000, OUS staff went to ten different regions in the state to talk about PASS and to recruit for OUS more generally. They spent three

hours at each site, including Medford, Ashland, Klamath Falls, Bend, Eugene, Portland, and Le Grande (Interview with David McDonald, Director, Enrollment Services and High School Relations for the OUS, January 2000).

Student performance.

OUS students score higher than the national average on the SAT. In 1998, the national average SAT scores were 505 Verbal, 512 Math. In Oregon, the average for all students who took the test in 1998 was 528 Verbal and 528 Math. OUS students did even better in 1998: 532 Verbal, 533 Math (Oregon University System Factbook, 1998).

System admission requirements.

To be eligible for admission to an OUS institution, prospective students must graduate from an accredited high school with a satisfactory grade point average and satisfactory completion of 14 units of specified subject requirements. Students who have not graduated from high school will be “selectively admitted based on a review of a submitted portfolio that includes an essay on educational goals, recommendations, GED or other test scores, grades, and any other evidence of academic and community achievement (www.ous.edu, September 2000).

The subject requirements include four units (years) of English (language, literature, speaking, listening, and writing), three units of mathematics (algebra plus two additional college preparatory years), two units of science (must be college preparatory), three units of social studies (one U.S. history, one global studies, and one elective), and two units of a second language. Alternatives to the subject requirements include:

- Score of 470 or above - 1, 140 total on three College Board SAT II: Subject Tests (English, Math Level I or IIC, and a third of a student’s choice); or
- Take make-up coursework for a specific subject requirement missed in high school and achieve a passing grade; or
- For PSU, SOU, WOU, and OIT, earn a minimum of 2.000 GPA in nine hours of prescribed summer school college-level work; or
- For students from PASS schools, subject requirements may be met through demonstrated proficiency.

(www.ous.edu, July 2000)

The courses that count for those requirements must be approved by OUS. According to OUS staff, the course approval process has some faults. An OUS Official stated that, “...we admit most students by the high school GPA and they have taken the 14 subject matter requirements, but every year we go through a process – partly it is ritual in that we call for schools to send us their approved course list that relates to the 14. Truth be known, we don’t pay much attention to that course list in here, but it is really important that the schools do it and they go on record with what we have and sometimes we find when staff inspects the list there are courses in the list that are not acceptable...and we get into it with the schools” (Interview with OUS Official, August 1999).

According to both the Director of Enrollment Services and High School Relations at OUS and the Director of PASS Implementation the course approval process will change in the near future.

As discussed above, the current process is based on approval of individual high school courses being designated “college preparatory.” The goal of the process change is to provide admission officers with more information on the rigor and content of the courses and to expand the list of courses to those not in the traditional college track (such as agricultural science) (Joint Boards website, July 31, 2000). The long-term goal is to have high school staff map their courses to PASS proficiencies and indicate whether or not students had full or partial opportunity to take the course, or if the course does not address PASS proficiencies. The Director of PASS Implementation believes that this will help to ensure that the courses resemble their descriptions because the course description document “is such an incredible point of leverage for an entire high school curriculum” (Interview with Christine Tell, PASS Director of Implementation, July 2000; Interview with David McDonald, Director, Enrollment Services and High School Relations for the OUS, January 2000).

Students must also meet certain grade point average requirements. They must have earned a 3.00 or above in high school (EOU, OSU, UO), 2.75 or above (SOU, WOU) or 2.50 or above (OIT, PSU). Alternatives to the GPA Requirement include:

- Earn SAT I or ACT scores and high school grades equivalent to predicting a 2.00 GPA (UO, OSU); 1010 SAT I or 21 ACT (SOU); 1000 SAT I or 21 ACT (PSU, OIT); 1000 SAT I, 21 ACT, or 2.00 predicted college GPA (WOU).
- For PSU, SOU, WOU, and OIT, earn a minimum of 2.00 GPA in nine term hours of prescribed summer session college-level work

Each of the institutions is authorized to admit five percent of the first time class as exceptions to the stated admission requirements. If applicants have less than a 3.00 high school GPA, they can be considered for admission if their test scores (SAT or ACT), in combination with the GPA, meet the numbers listed on the system’s Test Score Alternatives matrix (e.g., a 2.99 must have a combined SAT of 830 or over, while a 2.50 must have a combined SAT of 1110). The UO requires a personal statement for all students under a 3.00 GPA (The College Guidance Counselor’s Handbook, 1998-1999).

The Oregon State Board of Higher Education has adopted specific policies for the following admission cases:

- Optional Admission Policy beginning with the 2001-2002 academic year for Oregon public high school graduates;
- Projected Admission Policy beginning with the 2001-2002 academic year for nonresident students, students from Oregon private schools, home-schooled students, GED students, and nongraduates;
- Projected Admission Policy through the 2004-2005 academic year for graduates from Oregon public high schools; and
- Projected Admission Policy through the 2004-2005 academic year for nonresident students, students from Oregon private schools, home-schooled students, GED students, and nongraduates.

(<http://www.ous.edu/pass>, April 27, 1999)

OUS remediation.

Remediation data are not collected consistently across campuses, and there are not data gathering or analysis requirements set forth by the OUS. Some campuses have more data on the remediation-related needs of their students than other campuses. For example, PSU does not have placement exams. Many of the interviewees believed that remediation is a major problem across the OUS institutions. One interviewee stated that some OUS campuses have approximately an 80 percent remediation rate in mathematics; however, systemwide data were not available, while others believe that that number is inflated (Interview with Jim Buch, Associate Vice President for Student Academic Affairs and former Admission Director at the UO, February 2000).

According to the documents from the University of Oregon and Portland State University, courses numbered from 001 to 099 are remedial, terminal, semiprofessional, or non-credit courses that do not apply toward degree requirements (PSU Bulletin; <http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~acadaff/documents/facultyhandbook/Chapter07.html>). However, because there is not a data-collection system mandated by the OUS, it is not clear how many students enroll in these courses and how they fare in them. While remediation seems to be an issue on an informal level, there is no official structure or policy for addressing the needs of underprepared students.

K-16 data collection and use.

One stumbling block to true K-16 data sharing is that there is no umbrella organization for community colleges. There are 17 separate colleges with their own boards, and no community college system or division that collects and organizes data. The community colleges fall under the purview of the ODE. If all of the institutions and systems could use the same student identifying numbers (higher education institutions track students using their social security numbers, while K-12 uses their names), then individual student performance and academic trajectory could be analyzed. Oregon, however, has a more stringent privacy law than does the U.S. (Interview with David McDonald, Director, Enrollment Services and High School Relations for the OUS, January 2000).

OUS and PASS staff plan to track PASS students through their high school and college years and will compare them to non-PASS students. They are hoping that, by learning about successes and failures, “borderline” students can be helped, and PASS can be improved.

The Oregon Public Education Network, a clearinghouse housed at the Linn Benton Lincoln Education Service District, gives users up-to-date and searchable access to Oregon’s CIM, CAM, and PASS standards. It also houses official scoring guides, scored student writing samples, forms for monitoring student progress toward the CIM, and support materials for state writing and assessment. It does not house student- or school-based data, but it does house information about all the current reform-based policies (Oregon Public Education Network brochure, no date).

K-16 entity within OUS: The Joint Boards of Education.

The Joint Boards of Education was formed to be the K-16 entity in the state; it represents the Board of Education and the Board of Higher Education. The Associate Vice Chancellor for

Academic Affairs in the OUS stated that, “the Joint Boards of Education was formed several years ago by the governor’s executive order as an attempt to get K-12 and community college system and the four year system to get together and talk about common issues and concerns. I think the boards really used to get together once a year, but they were more social meetings and there weren’t topics of substance. The governor mandated that we meet on a more regular basis to identify some important issues and move on them” (Interview with Holly Zanville, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs in the OUS, August 1999). Another OUS official interviewed for this project stated that the Joint Board has no capacity and that its meetings are generally “feel good” experiences, rather than working meetings (Interview with OUS official, August, 1999).

The Joint Boards Articulation Commission.

The Joint Boards Articulation Commission (JBAC) was developed in 1992 to oversee, primarily, the transfer of community college students to four-year public universities within Oregon. It is charged with:

- Advising the Joint Boards on major intersector issues regarding improvement of student access and transfer, curricular development and articulation, outcomes assessment, and student data integration;
- Monitoring the implementation and revision of the Associate of Arts Oregon Transfer (AA/OT) degree policy and common course numbering for lower division courses; and
- Serving as a forum for problem solving and referral.

(JBAC website, July 31, 2000)

The 1999-2000 JBAC members represented the following entities: community colleges, OUS staff, public four-year university representatives, ODE, private colleges, and the Oregon Department of Community Colleges and Workforce Development (JBAC website, July 31, 2000). The guidelines for the AA/OT, along with the JBAC’s March 15, 2000 Principles for Practice: Transfer Student Admission and the Proficiency-Based Admission Standards System draft statement, are in Appendix D.

The JBAC’s future or long-term goals are:

- Develop guidelines for articulation of career ladders where proficiency requirements cut across academic and professional technical program degrees and courses;
- Establish benchmarks for transfer/articulation; and
- Revise the AA/OT degree to reflect proficiency standards and level of performance information.

(JBAC website, July 31, 2000)

Oregon Early Options Study.

Senate Bill 919, adopted in the 1997 Legislative session, calls for continued experimentation with, implementation of, and costing out of the various accelerated baccalaureate degree models at state higher education institutions, including programs that are jointly developed with the State Board of Education. In September 1997, the Joint Boards approved the initiation of a statewide study of current policies and practices regarding the early participation of high school students in college courses and programs. The Oregon Early Options Study, published January 20, 1999, was a result of that work. The report provides information about future policy recommendations

regarding early entry to college-level curricula (“Early Options Study,” prepared by OUS for the Joint Boards, January 20, 1999, p.1).

Although some high schools voluntarily offer AP, IB, College High (a program in which courses taught by high school teachers result in college credit), concurrent enrollment (a program in which college faculty teach high school students in courses that award college credit), and 2+2 and other tech prep programs, there is not a statewide program that emphasizes offering early entry into college preparation courses. There are not statewide incentives for high school students to move toward college-level work when they are assessed to be college ready. The report states that, “because of this, unevenness exists in Oregon’s programs; some high schools (typically the larger metropolitan high schools with significant numbers of college-bound students) offer a range of early options programs...Other schools, particularly rural schools, are finding it difficult to meet the demands of small populations of talented and motivated college-bound students. Through its high school survey, the report’s researchers found that 39 percent of high schools that responded are dissatisfied with their current early options; approximately 6,660 students participate each year in early option programs; 11,237 students are estimated to be capable of performing satisfactorily in a college-level class; and the total number of students taking AP courses is 6,731 (students may be counted more than once if they participated in more than one AP course) (“Early Options Study,” prepared by OUS for the Joint Boards, January 20, 1999, pp.1, 4-5, 12-13).

The issues for consideration, outlined in the Early Options Study, that are relevant for this study are:

- The need for equitable access to higher education courses. There is inequitable access to college courses both geographically and programmatically throughout Oregon.
- New dual-admission and co-enrollment policies developing between community college and OUS institutions have implications for early college options.
- Although Oregon high schools appear to have a number of early options programs in place, many of these do not necessarily lead to acceleration toward a baccalaureate degree. Oregon is among the bottom grouping of states in students taking tests that could lead to college credits being awarded for participation in AP. A related issue is accurate tracking of high school students taking college courses. Neither community colleges nor OUS institutions have a way to identify high school students who may be enrolling in colleges to take college courses.
- There is a need to reimburse postsecondary institutions as an incentive to provide college courses to high school students. Currently, only community colleges may be reimbursed from the state for providing college-level courses to high school students.
- Transcripts are not unified across higher education institutions, and students often attend multiple institutions.
- There is a need for appropriate college advising. Students need to be better advised regarding what college-level courses to take if they want to accelerate progress toward a college degree.
- There needs to be more study of the capacity of Oregon’s early college options to serve students.

- There is a lack of financial incentives in place to encourage students to accelerate their progress toward pursuing a college degree.
 (“Early Options Study,” prepared by OUS for the Joint Boards, January 20, 1999, p. 9)

Laying the groundwork for PASS.

As the forthcoming PASS section describes, K-12 reform-focused legislation passed in 1991 and 1995, particularly the 1991 legislation, spurred the current changes that are being made in Oregon’s public university admissions policies. In 1993, the Office of the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs in the Oregon State System of Higher Education and the University of Oregon published a Task Force report entitled, “Shared Perspectives Project: Creating a Dialog on Standards for Education in Oregon” that reported on identifying “some of the knowledge, abilities, and behaviors that students should acquire in grades one through twelve in order to prepare for successful entry into four-year colleges and universities in Oregon and elsewhere in the U.S.” (“Shared Perspectives Project: Creating a Dialog on Standards for Education in Oregon,” January 1993, p.2).

The Task Force’s purpose was to “explore the possibilities of developing performance standards as the basis for matriculation into higher education.” The project was designed to explore the implications for high school and for the UO of the movement to an outcomes-based system as the basis for determining whether or not students are prepared for higher education. This followed on the heels of H.B. 3565 that stated that mastery must be demonstrated on identified outcomes in order for students to receive a CIM or CAM. The Task Force was comprised of 32 people – members of the University of Oregon’s academic faculty and high school teachers from Lane County schools. It was divided into the following five teams: 1) science and mathematics; 2) foreign languages; 3) social sciences; 4) music, drama, and fine arts; and 5) writing and written reasoning (“Shared Perspectives Project: Creating a Dialog on Standards for Education in Oregon,” January 1993, p. 2).

Each team was asked to develop a performance statement containing the following elements:

1. Statement of performance area
2. Extended description of performance area
3. Rationale for inclusion
4. Performance indicators
5. Mastery performance level
6. Possible assessment strategies

(“Shared Perspectives Project: Creating a Dialog on Standards for Education in Oregon,”
 January 1993, p. 6)

There were several areas of commonalities between the teams. Each team independently identified the following student abilities as critical to success as an educated person:

- a. Students will demonstrate the ability to read and comprehend written material.
- b. Students will demonstrate the ability to speak and write in a style that is clear, credible, and convincing, and that reflects their own thinking.
- c. Students will demonstrate the ability to secure information from a variety of sources and to organize and evaluate that information in a useful way.

- d. Students will demonstrate the ability to use critical thinking skills to define and solve problems, postulate theories, develop arguments, and otherwise manipulate information productively.
- e. Students will demonstrate the ability for original and creative thinking by producing unique communications. These communications may be in a variety of forms, verbal or non-verbal.

(“Shared Perspectives Project: Creating a Dialog on Standards for Education in Oregon,”
January 1993, p. 6)

The next sentences discusses the Proficiency-Based Admission Standards System (PASS).

THE PROFICIENCY-BASED ADMISSIONS STANDARDS SYSTEM (PASS)

Background and description of PASS.

Legislation mandating the development of the CIM and the CAM was passed in 1991 and 1995 and spurred the development of PASS by the OUS. As UO's Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs, John Moseley, explained, "...given CIM and CAM, something like PASS becomes a necessity. And it's certainly not something we would have done in the absence of CIM and CAM because there is no need for it – no use for it." There was no concern about the capacity of the state's public universities. He stated that, "...we're not at a capacity limit where we're actually, you know, rejecting apparently qualified kids while accepting others" (Interview, August 1999). Higher education officials were concerned that the CIM and the CAM would not have the incentives and requirements necessary to ensure that students would be prepared to enter, and succeed in, Oregon's public universities.

Consequently, the Proficiency-Based Admission Standards System, or PASS, was initiated by the OUS in 1993 to examine how higher education's needs fit in with the CIM and the CAM, and to ensure that high standards were developed and maintained. According to the Executive Director of PASS, a major impetus for PASS was that the OUS did not want to lose control of admissions. The campuses wanted more and better students and were concerned that CIM would be mostly focused on remediation, while the CAM would be more career/vocationally-based. There was nothing in the two reforms that was seen as college preparation-focused (Interview with David Conley, PASS Executive Director, May 1999). PASS is part of a movement to support the development of higher standards to increase students' preparation for college-level work, to improve the school-to-work process for students, and to decrease the amount of time it takes for students to graduate from college (OUS memo dated November 6, 1997). Since 1992, PASS has been supported by state funds (through the Chancellor's Office budget), several federal grants, and generous funds from the Pew Charitable Trusts that OUS has matched. OUS asked for a specific allocation from the legislature in 1999, but did not get support in the Governor's budget or in the legislature. OUS's Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs stated that, in terms of getting new or designated funds, OUS "did very well, but we really didn't get any money for PASS" (Interview with Shirley Clark, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs in the OUS, August 1999).

The Executive Director of PASS, David Conley, an Associate Professor at the University of Oregon and the primary architect behind PASS, modeled PASS in part after Australia's standards-based education system. The initial phases of PASS development were a series of interviews and discussions with people in higher education. They focused on what higher education should do in the wake of the 1991 education reform legislation. The initial reaction of higher education stakeholders was that, "The K-12 reform is really aimed at those students who are not college bound and doesn't much affect us." However, it quickly became apparent to people in higher education that, "if the whole system of assessments that are used to measure student progress through the K-12 system changed and our system for judging readiness for

college is based on the old Carnegie system, we have a problem. We either have to quickly adopt some other set of screens to determine who's ready for college or pay attention to what's going on at K-12" (Interview with Jim Buch, Associate Vice President for Student Academic Affairs and former Director of Admission at the UO, February 2000).

The Director of Admission at the UO described PASS by stating that it, "...says what people should know, gives them several ways of proving it that would allow people who think differently to prove it differently, and then standardize what those scores mean" (Interview with Martha Pitts, Director of Admissions for UO, August 1999).

In PASS brochures, the three main reasons for implementing PASS are:

1. PASS aligns college admission with the statewide K-12 school-improvement plan. The PASS proficiency standards required for admission in English, math, and science are based on CIM standards.
2. The current admission system of subject-area requirements and cumulative grade point average does not assure that students will have the knowledge and skills they will require to be successful in college. The current system also does not inform teachers of what skills and knowledge students need for college.
3. PASS provides admission directors with better, more detailed information about students' ability and their level of college readiness.

("An Introductory Guide to PASS for Secondary School Administrators," prepared by The Confederation of Oregon School Administrators, The OASSA Issues Forum, and PASS, 2000, p.1)

PASS is moving the focus of the admission process from the courses taken to the knowledge and skills mastered. When PASS is fully implemented, in order to gain admission to a public university in Oregon, students will have to demonstrate that their knowledge and skills meet or exceed the required PASS standards (PASS office brochure, 1997-1998, "Proficiency Standards: Summary Charts of Criteria for All Content Areas").

One of the researchers' main questions about PASS was, Why PASS? How was it possible to "sell" PASS since all of the public universities in Oregon have the capacity to admit more students, none of them is highly selective in terms of admissions, and the state has no challenges to affirmative action and, therefore, does not need to introduce new indicators into admission systems. All of the respondents questioned about this returned to the statement that the OUS was very concerned that the CIM would not have "college preparation" standards, and that the CAM would have too much of a vocational slant. Consequently, public higher education stakeholders in the state wanted to have a system put in place that would ratchet up standards past those promised by the CIM. The Executive Director of PASS explained that this has worked so far, that, "...the high schools just panicked particularly when their scores were put out and the first set of CIM scores come out in September and they panicked and are going to dump resources into that and they are going to reconfigure programs around that. They are not going to give any

thought to university admission results, and the big loser will be [higher education] unless we have our own place at the table... what we did was save the college preparation portion of the high school curriculum [or] at least keep [high schools] invigorated in the face of all this [reform]" (Interview with David Conley, PASS Executive Director, August 1999).

The proficiency areas are broken down into six academic content areas: English, math, science, visual and performing arts, second languages, and social science. Each content area has between four and seven standards. Each subject area has proficiency standards along with criteria that describe what students should know and be able to do for each standard. English, math, and science are the first standards to be phased in ("An Introductory Guide to PASS for Secondary School Administrators," prepared by The Confederation of Oregon School Administrators, The OASSA Issues Forum, and PASS, 2000, p.1). For this paper, when examples of proficiencies and criteria are presented, English will be the example subject area.

Proficiency is demonstrated through activities in class and through test taking. Students receive a summary judgment score for each of the PASS standards in a content area. There are five possible scores: Exemplary (E), High-level mastery of the proficiency (H), Meets the proficiency (M), Working toward the proficiency (W), and Not meeting the proficiency (N). Students who score Es and Hs may be eligible for scholarships, special programs, advanced class placement, and university credit possibilities ("An Introductory Guide to PASS for Secondary School Administrators," prepared by The Confederation of Oregon School Administrators, The OASSA Issues Forum, and PASS, 2000).

Results from CIM tests and CIM work samples can contribute to determining proficiencies. Higher scores can result in the awarding of college credit. Teacher scoring guides will be coordinated with the CIM and CAM guides so that student work will not have to be scored more than once. Other recognized standards-based assessments, such as the SAT II, AP, IB, ACT, and various language proficiency tests will be acceptable means to show proficiencies in the designated subject areas. Students who do not meet the proficiencies can be reviewed for admission on a case-by-case basis during the standards implementation process (2001-2005) (www.ous.edu/pass, August 2000; OUS memo dated November 6, 1997).

Proficiency standards were adopted in 1994, and, since then, the OUS has worked to develop more detailed descriptions of the knowledge and skills required to prepare for college. Teams of faculty members from high schools, community colleges, and all the four-year campuses have been involved in developing and refining the proficiencies (The College Guidance Counselor's Handbook, 1998-1999). The PASS standards were initially developed from an analysis of standards documents and curriculum reports from Oregon and from states across the nation. The architects of PASS included other states' documents because they wanted to make sure that the proficiency-based system would prepare students for out-of-state institutions of higher education, as well as Oregon institutions. PASS has ongoing working relationships with Stanford, the University of Washington, and the University of California System, and other institutions of higher education across the country; those institutions and systems have all indicated in writing that they are interested in having students with proficiencies apply. Out-of-state applicants to Oregon public universities will continue to be assessed by their attainment of Carnegie units and their grade point averages (<http://www.ous.edu/pass>, April 27, 1999).

Students who do not meet the proficiency standards initially may resubmit work or retake tests without retaking a course to meet a certain proficiency, if the school policy allows. Students who do not meet all proficiency levels may still be reviewed for admission on a case-by-case basis during the implementation period for the proficiency standards (2001-2005), or, as the PASS website states, students “may have other options available to them to demonstrate proficiency, particularly in cases where they lack proficiency only in one or two areas (<http://www.ous.edu/pass>, April 27, 1999). The PASS proficiencies are judged by teacher verification and state assessments (PASS Report, “Admissions Officers Head Back to School, undated, p.4). Appendix E has the proficiency standards, example criteria, and assessment guidelines for English.

By the Fall Term 2001, it is expected that all resident applicants from Oregon public high schools applying to a four-year public university in Oregon will:

1. Demonstrate a level of proficiency as specified by PASS in mathematics and English. Proficiency will be determined by specified scores on tests required for the CIM and CAM, teacher verifications of student proficiency through the use of the PASS standards, and/or national proficiency-based tests recognized by PASS; and
2. Meet current subject area requirements in science, social studies, and second languages, and the minimum grade point average as required by each public four-year institution of higher education in Oregon; and
3. Submit SAT or ACT scores. (The College Guidance Counselor’s Handbook, 1998-1999)

The training of teachers and other educators to score student work is the responsibility of schools, districts, and ESDs. PASS has developed both a statewide network of teacher trainers, and training materials for use in any school in the state. (PASS office brochure, 1997-1998, “Proficiency Standards: Summary Charts of Criteria for All Content Areas”)

During the 1998-1999 academic year, PASS staff worked with English and mathematics teachers at the 60 PASS schools to train them about how to generate collections of student work and how to assess student proficiency. At Counselors’ Forums across the state, participants most frequently requested the following: more information; simplified explanations; and that the CIM, CAM, and PASS be aligned. Three major concerns emerged, “How should schools transition from the work of collecting individual student work samples for the CIM to assembling collections of evidence that measure students’ work over time for PASS? Second, how can the assessments be made to align? For example, one counselor wrote, ‘How is CIM/CAM/PASS going to be made seamless?’ And third, how should the collections be recorded and stored?” Many of the Forum participants said that storage is a major problem; since no one knows how the CIM and PASS will be aligned, they are keeping every document and piece of student work in case they are needed later. (PASS Reports, Spring 1999, No. 2, “Issues in the Proficiency-based Admission Standards System”)

The relatively complex procedures and standards, as compared to traditional teaching and learning methods, have inspired some criticism. Most of the interviewees’ comments were focused on the rigorous nature of the standards. As one OUS official stated, “The rhetoric

around PASS is [there is] sudden death if you don't meet their Renaissance man test... Well, the University of Oregon's going to let you in. They're going to say [you're admitted and], by the way, you don't have these X number of proficiencies" (Interview with OUS Official, August 1999).

Course approval.

Participating high schools must submit a Proficiency Standard Mapping and College Preparatory Course List form to the PASS Office for each course that will teach PASS proficiencies. The high school must certify which proficiencies will be covered and whether the course provides a full opportunity for students to demonstrate proficiency, partial opportunity to demonstrate proficiency, or if the course does not address the requirements for this proficiency ("An Introductory Guide to PASS for Secondary School Administrators," prepared by The Confederation of Oregon School Administrators, The OASSA Issues Forum, and PASS, 2000, p. 13).

PASS Transcript.

PASS staff are aware that many people have been concerned about "bankers' boxes stacked in hallways, rooms that were filled to the ceiling with student work samples waiting to be filed, and teachers hauling storage crates from classroom to classroom as they conducted their advisor-advisee meetings" (Interview with Martha Pitts, Director of Admissions for UO, August 1999). PASS literature states that, "until people have clear guidelines about how CIM and PASS fit together, they have no idea of what needs to be kept" (PASS Reports, "Alignment and Assessment Top Concerns at Counselors' Forums," Spring 1999, No.2, p.3). In addition to working on alignment issues, PASS staff has been streamlining the recording process.

There will eventually be a single record for all student information, including PASS. The electronic transcripts will allow for the data to be accessed from several different places with a minimum amount of work. The networked computer system might be hooked to the Oregon University System (PASS Reports, "Alignment and Assessment Top Concerns at Counselors' Forums," Spring 1999, No. 2, p.3). Until that process is developed and implemented, students who have successfully completed PASS proficiencies will include that information on a supplement to their transcripts when they apply to an OUS institution. PASS will have paper and electronic transcript options for the 2000-2001 academic year ("An Introductory Guide to PASS for Secondary School Administrators," prepared by The Confederation of Oregon School Administrators, The OASSA Issues Forum, and PASS, 2000, p. 32).

The most recent PASS Transcript Report (PTR), developed in 1998, contains the following information:

- Student information – student name, Social Security or Identification Number, graduation date, gender, parent name, parent address;
- School Information – school name, school code, school address, counselor name, counselor phone;
- PASS Proficiencies – scores on each of the proficiencies in each of the subject areas⁹

⁹ The 1998 PTR includes the old scoring process: 1 = Explores the types of work that are required to be admitted to college; 2 = Produces work that is approaching a level that indicates readiness to be admitted to college; 3 = Produces work that indicates student is capable of doing college-level work; 4 = Demonstrates content knowledge

- Supplemental Information – Date awarded a diploma, date awarded a CIM, date awarded a CAM or career-related learning standards, career-related experience; and
- Other Explanatory Information.

(PTR, 1998)

The Admission Director at the University of Oregon has been actively involved in the development of the PASS transcript. She has seen several completed PASS transcripts and have not yet found them useful because, "...the people I have seen have been people who have exceptionally high scores. They were people who came in on a one to five scale with all fives and it was verified because they had taken IB exams and made sevens on their IB exams. The counselor wanted to see what we would do when we got a PASS transcript...I don't think the young woman [applicant] ever had any intention of coming here, or any place, quite honestly, in the state of Oregon. She was an exceptionally good student and I think she had her sights set on other places. I believe that eventually it may help us make some of those distinctions. I believe it will be most helpful in placement. I believe it will be much more helpful in placement" (Interview with Martha Pitts, Director of Admissions for UO, August 1999).

Teacher Verification and PASS Implementation at the School Level.

Teachers who intend to verify PASS standards must complete a PASS orientation. PASS offered one-day training sessions for teachers throughout the state between August 2000 and August 2001. One English, mathematics, and science teacher from each accredited high school in Oregon will be offered a stipend to attend the one of the sessions. OUS institutions began offering PASS-focused professional development opportunities beginning in January 2001. ("An Introductory Guide to PASS for Secondary School Administrators," prepared by The Confederation of Oregon School Administrators, The OASSA Issues Forum, and PASS, 2000, p. 12).

The verification is a two-step process. First, teachers must determine the sufficiency of the evidence presented and of the student's performance. Sufficiency and performance are inter-related and the teacher considers both before making a judgment. Sufficiency exists when "enough evidence has been accumulated to serve as a basis for reliable scoring. A sufficient collection includes evidence across the range of criteria described in the Proficiency Scoring Guide. It also includes representative pieces of student work collected under varied opportunities and conditions, including some independent projects." Proficiency is determined by considering, but not by rating, each piece in a student's collection. Not all criteria have the same weight in determining proficiency (English: Guide to Teaching and Assessing Proficiency for University Admission," PASS Office working document, for use at PASS Partnership High Schools during the 1999-2000 school year, p.2).

In the second step of the verification process, teachers assign a summary judgment score. That score is "a decision about one proficiency based on the student's performance as demonstrated in the collection of evidence. The fundamental reference point for an summary judgment score is the degree to which the score indicates readiness for entry-level college coursework...To

and skills that exceed college-entry level and have been externally validated; and 5 = Demonstrates content and knowledge and skills that substantially exceed college-entry level and have been externally validated. This scoring process changed in the 1999-2000 academic year to the process described in this report.

increase the confidence of their judgments, scorers should make provision for the cross-scoring [of] some collections of evidence” (English: Guide to Teaching and Assessing Proficiency for University Admission,” PASS Office working document, for use at PASS Partnership High Schools during the 1999-2000 school year, p.2).

In May 1999, the PASS Evaluation Coordinator conducted a survey with all PASS teachers and held five focus groups with English and math PASS teachers to identify classroom practices associated with the implementation of standards. The findings were compiled into a December 31, 1999 report entitled, “The Impact of The Oregon University System Proficiency-Based Admission Standards System (PASS) On Teachers.” In the survey, teachers responded to questions regarding departmental practices, classroom instructional practices, implementing PASS standards in the classroom, overall understanding of and experience with implementing PASS, impact of PASS activities on teachers’ professional development. The Evaluation Coordinator analyzed the relationship between teachers’ abilities to produce sufficient collections of student work and their responses to survey items. The key findings are listed below.

- **Departmental practices:** High school English and math departments are engaging in activities that support the implementation of standards. English and math teachers are designing instructional and assessment activities to help students meet educational standards. English and math teachers are struggling with the dual implementation of PASS and CIM.
- **Classroom practices:** PASS English teachers are engaging in standards-based instructional and assessment activities to greater degrees than are PASS math teachers. Teachers who have been involved with PASS for many years are more engaged in standards-based teaching activities. English and math teachers’ approaches to the implementation of standards vary.
- **Implementing PASS standards in the classroom:** Both English and math teachers are confident of their skills and the strategies they use to implement PASS standards. Both English and math teachers have made relatively minor changes in their curricula to teach PASS standards. The longer teachers have been involved with PASS, the greater are their levels of confidence in their skills and knowledge and in changes in practice.
- **Overall understanding and experience with implementing PASS:** Teachers feel that implementation of PASS is feasible in the courses they teach. Teachers’ work with PASS has positively influenced their implementation of CIM. Teachers feel confident that they will be able to use training materials to assist their department colleagues in the implementation of PASS.
- **Impact of PASS activities on teachers’ professional development:** Teachers’ skills in implementing PASS standards have increased in areas focused on during professional development. The longer teachers have been with PASS, the more they collaborate with other teachers in the design of curriculum, instruction, and assessment. The relationship between teachers’ abilities to produce sufficient collections of student work and their responses to survey items.

(Lynde Paule, “The Impact of The Oregon University System Proficiency-Based Admission Standards System (PASS) on Teachers,” December 31, 1999)

From a professional development standpoint, a Teachers Training Teachers (T3) model was developed and implemented whereby PASS teacher build internal capacity in their schools by training new PASS teachers. PASS staff also hired a group of teacher facilitators on personal services contracts to be visible PASS proponents. Teachers will receive \$100 to attend a full day of PASS training. Administrators will be notified of the results of any teacher she or he sends to the training, and teachers will be able to continue their scoring practice. In order to get every school on board, PASS will try to “seed” at least one person at each school. They will pay teachers \$500 each in each content area: English, math, and science. PASS is giving certificates to people who help them during this phase. Much of the implementation phase will be focused on marketing PASS to schools and parents (Interview with Christine Tell, PASS Director of Implementation, July 2000).

PASS Alignment with K-12 Reforms.

PASS staff worked with ODE staff to align the content standards for grades 3, 5, 8, 10, and 12 with the PASS proficiencies. The OUS states that, “This alignment will create a continuous set of performance expectations for students so that they will know clearly what they need to do at each benchmark level, and, ultimately, what they must do to be acceptable for university admission.” The other major area of key coordination with the ODE focuses on the development of the assessment system that will provide data for the CIM and CAM determinations, and for university admission (OUS memo from 1996-1997).

PASS documents state that, “The Certificate of Initial Mastery (CIM) serves as the foundation for PASS. As students earn their CIM in a content area, such as math, they may already have demonstrated proficiency in one or more of the PASS standards.” Two types of assessment can be used to determine students’ level of proficiency: teacher judgment or state and national tests, but only one method is necessary for each PASS standard. Students may use CAM collections to demonstrate PASS proficiencies if the CAM collections meet proficiency and sufficiency criteria (“An Introductory Guide to PASS for Secondary School Administrators,” prepared by The Confederation of Oregon School Administrators, The OASSA Issues Forum, and PASS, 2000, pp.11, 13). The Director of PASS Implementation stated that, “Because the standards are aligned, it would be very hard to actually earn your proficiencies in PASS and not meet CIM standards” (Interview with Christine Tell, PASS Director of Implementation, July 2000).

Several of the higher education stakeholders interviewed for this project indicated that PASS developed more quickly than did CIM and, in some instances, drove the alignment between the two systems. As the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs at the University of Oregon stated, “To some extent, I think the work on PASS has facilitated the CIM and the CAM because Conley and the project has been more successful, I think, in setting standards than the CIM and the CAM processes were, and therefore, they have [aligned their work with PASS]. And so it’s good for us because at least they won’t be teaching toward and measuring one kind of thing and we’re expecting something else over here. So I think that having the PASS project has had a kind of an integrative effect between what the CIM – the expectations of the CIM and how

that's going to be evaluated – and what PASS is expecting” (Interview with John Moseley, Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs at the University of Oregon, August 1999).

A PASS staff member had similar views, stating that, “we’re being realistic about the variability and capriciousness of state bureaucracies and agencies. And what we’re doing is taking a much more active role. So we’re saying over the next year, ‘so we presented our schematic, this is how we think CIM forms the foundation for PASS. What do you think?’...Rather than have the Department [of Education] say to us, ‘This is what we think PASS should do.’ So, in that way, hopefully we’ll keep out of being co-opted.” About the CAM, the interviewee said, “We’ll take CAM collections. They don’t even have CAM collections[yet]; they don’t have a CAM assessment system...in areas where they do have the CAM, we’re going to make it work for schools. And we’re going to take CAM collections that meet PASS proficiencies and proficiency criteria ” (Interview with PASS staff member, July 2000). This strategy ensures that the schools and ODE will have to follow PASS, as long as PASS is a statewide program, rather than vice versa.

From a logistical perspective, PASS will follow a phased implementation plan in order to be coordinated with the CIM timelines. The high school class of 2001 will have the option of reporting proficiency in mathematics and in English. 1999 was the first year in which students could earn a CIM. The PASS proficiencies will change every year between 2001 and 2005 in order to reflect additional CIM requirements. The complete implementation of the PASS will begin with students in the 2005-2006 academic year; this is two years after the full implementation of the CIM. The CAM might be implemented by then. This strategy was developed to ensure that the PASS, CIM, and CAM can be aligned, and that teacher training and assessments can be developed in a coordinated fashion. (The College Guidance Counselor’s Handbook, 1998-1999)

PASS and Equitable Access to Higher Education in Oregon.

One of the major tenets behind PASS is that it will improve access for more students to enter, and succeed in, public higher education in Oregon (Interview with David Conley, PASS Executive Director, August 1999). Access was a theme highlighted by all OUS and UO interviewees who discussed PASS. As the Director of Enrollment Services and High School Relations stated, “But where PASS, I think, is going to really help the students is those borderline kids. The stars will get in no matter what system we use. I mean that’s easy. The students who don’t belong in college are screened out no matter what system we use. Those ends of, the two standard deviations on both ends are easy to screen, easy to identify; we know what to do with them. They’re clean. It’s everyone in between, that ninety percent in between, that’s really the challenge of any admissions process. Well, the kids who are right next to the cut-off, this is where PASS really helps because it gives our admissions officers more information” (Interview with David McDonald, Director, Enrollment Services and High School Relations for the OUS, January 2000).

The Executive Director of PASS stated that they are trying to get around curriculum tracking issues, “...by saying as we develop the assessment system, ‘Two students can be in the same learning experience and decide – the student can decide – which assessment method they want to

use. Do they want to meet the PASS proficiencies or something that meets CAM standards...and that the standards are similar enough where the learning experiences are accommodating a wide range of students. This may be around work versus learning; I can't imagine a mathematics class that has too wide a range, but, on the other hand, I can't imagine a school continuing with consumer math under this system either, so [PASS] is not tracking them...in the classic sense of separating kids off. It is more of a kind of a stacking, where you have kids at various levels of performance within the same overall kind of cognitive intellectual framework and what would be worse or better off – stacking or tracking?" (Interview with David Conley, PASS Executive Director, August 1999).

PASS documents describe OUS' view on this issue by stating that, "OUS will study the performance of all students admitted via proficiency assessments to determine if any requirements have detrimental effects on any student population. This systematic review will examine the effects of PASS on groups from all ethnic and cultural backgrounds, as well as on persons with disabilities. The system will be modified as needed to meet the OUS goal of making PASS as equitable as possible while retaining high standards for all students. Students with identified, documented special learning needs will be eligible for accommodations and modifications for any proficiency" ("An Introductory Guide to PASS for Secondary School Administrators," prepared by The Confederation of Oregon School Administrators, The OASSA Issues Forum, and PASS, 2000, p. 31).

One UO official interviewed for this study did not believe that PASS will create a more equitable environment for all students to prepare for, and enter, college. He stated that, in his view, "The potential is there [for PASS to create a more equitable system], but the potential is also there for even greater numbers of students to be overlooked in the process. I'm particularly concerned about those students who come from...families where there's not a tradition or expectation of continuing education at any level...The grade point average or the level of performance in the traditional measures, I think, it's maybe easier to spot and identify students heading for trouble as well as students who are doing very well. I worry that the PASS effort is all at the end and so that system, rather than being a record of achievement over four years, may be a glimpse ...[of] cobbled together work and achievement that may not help us identify students who really do have the potential to succeed once they get here." He stated that while he really wants PASS to be implemented and to try it, "the stakes are so incredibly high that I think, well, let's make sure that we're very careful, that we don't, in our rush to try the new thing, trample on too many students who have real potential that this system isn't going to identify" (Interview with OUS official, Winter 2000).

PASS and placement in higher education courses.

PASS data might, at some point in the future, be used for university course placement. Action has not been taken to begin the process of using PASS data for placement, but many respondents were positive about the future possibilities. The PASS Executive Director stated that PASS "will probably be used more for placement over the next five years than anything" (Interview with David Conley, PASS Executive Director, August 1999).

PASS Implementation.

The next five years will be crucial for PASS. It is currently in approximately 65 schools, and has the involvement of 2-3 teachers in each of those schools. English, mathematics, and science teachers (one per discipline per school) are trained and then return to their schools to implement PASS in their classrooms and train other teachers. In the next two years, PASS must become both more deeply spread into existing PASS schools and more widespread within schools that have not yet been involved with PASS. PASS staff have decided to “put PASS out across the state and open up options to every single high school” because “it has not worked that small groups of people redesign systems, get them fully in place, and then hand them to the rest of the world. Doesn’t work.” Staff plans to evolve the system using lessons learned from the initial 65 schools (Interview with Christine Tell, PASS Director of Implementation, July 2000).

Until the 1999-2000 academic year, implementation was not a word that PASS staff used publicly. As OUS’s Director of Enrollment Services and High School Relations stated, “...very little attention has been spent on how to implement [PASS] because it really wasn’t appropriate” at the earlier stages (Interview with David McDonald, January 2000). Instead of using the word implementation, PASS purposely titled the groups of higher education staff working on PASS issues “Implication Teams.” There are Implications Teams at each public university in the state. Those teams, made up primarily of admission staff and faculty, discussed the possible ramifications of PASS on their campuses. As the Executive Director of PASS stated, “...when you sit down with a bunch of university professors, it is the right frame of mind to have – let’s just talk about what does this mean – they are more comfortable with that. You sit them down and say let’s talk about putting this in place and they all get a little more nervous, so right now we are dealing with the implications, and at places like the U. of O., it’s a fruitful discussion” (Interview with David Conley, PASS Executive Director, August 1999). PASS implementation has to create change at both the higher education and K-12 levels, but the initial priority is being placed on the K-12 side (Interview with Christine Tell, PASS Director of Implementation, July 2000).

In the 1999-2000 academic year, PASS staff began to turn its focus toward implementation. As the Director of PASS Implementation noted, “I think the conceptual phase of a project is very different than the implementation phase of a project. I think at the conceptual level, you’re dealing with broader policy issues, and so on. And you’re framing out what you think it might be... What happens is that, at the conceptual level, you think that things should be a certain way and you have a certain construct that emerges. You put in into place and you find out all the unintended consequences and you find out what works and what doesn’t work when real teachers and real faculty work with proficiencies. You find out quite a bit. Then it causes you to reexamine your internal processes and what should come next. And then comes the really hard work and that’s working with groups of people to change the details and get down to the very fine detail work.” PASS staff members are currently in the latter stages by asking teachers about such issues as: does the scoring is working for them? How they would refine the process? How would they make it more teacher-friendly? (Interview with Christine Tell, PASS Director of Implementation, July 2000).

The OUS also made staffing changes, signaling an increase in PASS implementation efforts. It hired a new Director of Enrollment Services and High School Relations and the Associate

Director of PASS became the Director of Implementation. A major responsibility of the new Director of Enrollment Services and High School Relations is to develop and foster relationships between high schools and OUS, focused on PASS. He is developing new literature based on what counselors have said they need and is “trying to be very responsive to their suggestions” (Interview with David McDonald, Director, Enrollment Services and High School Relations for the OUS, January 2000).

Also, in 1999-2000, individual campus’ Implication Teams began talking about using PASS data for placement in courses. They are starting to examine their institutions’ homegrown placement tests and question whether PASS data would be useful instead of the traditional test data, or as a supplemental piece of information. PASS staff conduct two main activities with the teams. They convene the chairs of the Implication Teams from across the OUS institutions and have them discuss PASS implementation issues. Secondly, they hold calibration sessions in which faculty conduct blind scoring of collections of student work that have already been scored by high school faculty. Staff then study the variability between the sets of scores; they believe this activity is important in its symbolism, and it also involves faculty in discussions about what students will be doing when PASS is fully implemented (Interview with Christine Tell, PASS Director of Implementation, July 2000).

Another implementation development during the 1999-2000 year included the elimination of the word “project” in the title of the PASS effort. Up until then, PASS was referred to as “the PASS Project.” Staff believed that using project made PASS sound like a temporary effort, rather than a permanent system. Also, starting in 1999-2000, all materials published by PASS have the PASS and OUS logos rather than just PASS logos as a deliberate strategy to signal integration of the “project.”

There have been several unanticipated findings during the initial implementation phase. The main surprise centered on how many proficiencies students have to meet or exceed. When PASS was developed, the staff believed that all of the proficiencies were essential and that students should meet or exceed each one. Teachers and others involved in assessing PASS told PASS staff that students could not be expected to meet or exceed all of the proficiencies and, consequently, PASS staff had to re-think their vision. They decided that, “Basically, college faculty want students to be able to speak reasonably intelligently, participate in, you know, conversations and so on, write, read, and do research. End of story. And, of course, math” (Interview with Christine Tell, PASS Director of Implementation, July 2000). They met with a group of teachers and made the first cut, narrowing down the number of required proficiencies. Then they met with people who have been involved in PASS since its inception and developed Preferred and Recommended lists of proficiencies. In order to gain admission to OUS institutions, students will need to meet the preferred list. In order to be considered for Advanced Placement credit, scholarships, or other such activities, students need to meet the Recommended list. As the Director of PASS Implementation stated, “What’s emerging now is that everybody doesn’t have to be proficient at everything. So that’s something that we held from the very beginning that said absolutely everybody has to be at the proficient level. And here’s the reality – you implement stuff and college people go, ‘you know, we’re getting transcripts at the end of the junior year. I mean, c’mon, let’s be real. They’re not proficient at everything” (Interview with Christine Tell, PASS Director of Implementation, July 2000).

The first class of students who will be fully affected by PASS will be students in the 9th grade during the 2001-2002 academic year. Beginning in fall 2001, PASS will be an optional admission system for all OUS universities (“An Introductory Guide to PASS for Secondary School Administrators,” prepared by The Confederation of Oregon School Administrators, The OASSA Issues Forum, and PASS, 2000, p. 23).

PASS’ implementation timeframe is as follows:

- 2000: Financial aid planning and implementation
- 2001: Admissions implementation (become optional)
- 2002: Begin working retention issue; science becomes additional option
- 2003: Visual and performing arts added
- 2004: Second languages added in 2004
- 2005: PASS implemented in all six subject areas (social sciences added); PASS becomes the preferred method of admission to OUS institutions

During the phase-in period, OUS will provide high school staff with orientation sessions, counselor conferences, regional counselor forums, and professional development sessions (Interview with David Conley, PASS Executive Director, May 1999; “An Introductory Guide to PASS for Secondary School Administrators,” prepared by The Confederation of Oregon School Administrators, The OASSA Issues Forum, and PASS, 2000, p. 23).

It will not be necessary for every high school teacher to become trained in PASS – only those who will be verifying proficiencies will need to be trained. Students will not need to demonstrate proficiency in all PASS standard and content areas in order to be admitted to an OUS institution during the optional implementation period. In 2005, when PASS becomes the preferred method of admission to all OUS institutions, students will need to demonstrate proficiency in the required PASS proficiencies in order to meet the minimum admission requirements for the institutions (“An Introductory Guide to PASS for Secondary School Administrators,” prepared by The Confederation of Oregon School Administrators, The OASSA Issues Forum, and PASS, 2000, p. 31).

At the March 15, 2000 Joint Board Articulation Committee (JBAC) meeting, the Director of PASS Implementation and OUS’ Director of Enrollment Services and High School Relations described two implementation issues:

1. The verification of Communication proficiencies is up in the air because there is a difference between how the ODE and PASS view them. PASS is more interested in students being able to communicate with technology and ODE is most interested in speech communication.
2. Problems caused by the complexity of PASS were acknowledged. PASS streamlined the process of showing how the CIM proficiencies can meet the PASS proficiencies. Two additional proficiencies are needed for minimum admission to OUS institutions, and admission into a major or placement in advanced courses might require an additional set of higher scores.

(Joint Boards website, July 31, 2000)

The Director of Admission at the UO is concerned about how to implement PASS without having multiple admission systems in place as well. She described her concern by stating that, "...we're going to have to run two admission systems. Well, actually three. One for in-state students who do PASS, one for in-state students who don't do PASS...Then there would be the non-residents who will be eligible to prove their PASS proficiencies if they would like, but they don't have to. And so we'll still take California kids who don't have PASS proficiencies, but some California students will and some won't. How are we going to standardize that? It's a little bit of a nightmare, but much less of a nightmare than what we first thought when we first thought that people were going to be bringing in their portfolios" (Interview with Martha Pitts, Director of Admissions for UO, August 1999).

Evaluations of PASS.

To date, PASS has conducted its own evaluations. In its most recent evaluation of student knowledge regarding PASS, from January 1997 through March 1997, a PASS evaluator conducted focus groups with students from across the state who have been involved in PASS. Teachers who serve as PASS Site Coordinators, with the assistance of PASS staff, chose the student participants at each school. Some of the main findings are listed below.

As compared to traditional methods of schooling, students believe that, in PASS classrooms, 1) there are specific performance expectations, 2) there is a greater balance between traditional lecturing and classroom discussion, 3) teachers and students are facilitators of learning, and 4) projects and group activities are used to develop and demonstrate student knowledge and skills. In terms of assessment differences between traditional classes and PASS classes, in PASS classes there is an increase in the performance tasks and assessments and scoring guides are used to provide feedback to students. The two main criticisms were that there were inconsistencies in teachers' interpretations of the requirement levels across content areas and incongruities between performance grading and traditional grading (PASS Reports, "Implementing the PASS System: How Students Perceive Its Effects on Their Learning," Fall 1998, No.1, pp.1-5).

The last section of the Phase I report provides more of an analytical discussion of PASS's implementation and future issues. The next section provides a description of K-16 transition policies and practices at the University of Oregon.

THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

This section addresses the following research questions: 1) What are the signals and incentives sent by existing higher education admission and placement policies, 2) What are the formal and informal institutional-level K-16 transition policies, and 3) who are the key institutional decision makers regarding K-16 transition policies?

General Facts.

The University of Oregon (UO) opened its doors in 1876. It was elected to membership in the American Association of Universities in 1969 and is accredited by the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges and the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. There are six professional schools and colleges, and the College of Arts and Sciences. It currently employs 770 full-time faculty and 380 part-time faculty – and enrolls approximately 17,200 undergraduate and graduate students. Thirty-five percent of the students are from out-of-state, 10 percent from other countries, and the rest are from Oregon (The University of Oregon catalog, 1999-2000, Eugene, Oregon, p.1). The table below shows the geographic origins of the entering students from fall 1998:

Table G: Geographic Origins of Entering Students, Fall 1998

Geographic Origin	Number
Alaska	152
Arizona	103
California	1,737
Colorado	184
Hawaii	230
Idaho	86
Montana	65
Nevada	95
New Mexico	71
Oregon	10,485
Utah	77
Washington	483
Wyoming	17
Central, NE	344
Central, SE	43
Central, NW	244
Central, SW	107
Mid-Atlantic	236
New England	171
South Atlantic	228
Other U.S.	17
Other countries	1,605

(University of Oregon Campus Profile, Fall 1998, Eugene, Oregon, p.1)

The University of Oregon is working to transform its general education program by developing a personalized focus on learning and advising for first year and sophomore students. UO is trying to attract more nontraditional students and is developing more outreach activities. It is planning to show marked improvement in three of the system's targeted performance areas: student retention, student recruitment, and time to degree. None of the performance indicators or measures is related to K-16 collaboration. (From Performance measures and indicators: 1998 Baseline Performance Reports for Institutions, June 19, 1998, Oregon State Board for Higher Education Revised, July 30, 1998)

In 1998, there were approximately 12,659 undergraduates enrolled at the UO (The University of Oregon catalog, 1999-2000, p.328). The counties that send the greatest number of students (fall 1997) are: Lane: 2,700; Multnomah: 1,281; and Washington: 1,019. The racial/ethnic breakdown of the student body in 1997 was:

Table H: UO Undergraduate Racial/ethnic Breakdown, 1997

	<u><i>N</i></u>	<u><i>percent</i></u>
Euro-American	12, 437	72.3
Total Minority	2,094	13.0
Nonresident Alien	1,623	9.4
Unknown	1,054	6.1
Total Enrollment	17,208	100.0
African American	246	1.4
American Indian	188	1.1
Asian American	1,133	6.6
Hispanic Latino	527	3.1
Total Students of Color	2,094	13.0

(From Performance measures and indicators: 1998 Baseline Performance Reports for Institutions June 19, 1998 Oregon State Board for Higher Education Revised July 30, 1998)

When graduate students are included, the UO's enrollment is close to 17,000 students. The former Director of Admission and current Associate Vice President for Student Academic Affairs anticipates that by 2004 or 2005, the university will reach closer to 20,000 students and that increase will be mostly in the number of in-state undergraduate students. He anticipates that the number of out-of-state students will increase from about 3,500 to 4,300 in the next four or five years and then will stabilize at the higher level (Interview with Jim Buch, Associate Vice President for Student Academic Affairs, February 2000).

The following table outlines the number of students who earned specific undergraduate degrees between fall 1997 and summer 1998.

Table I: Summary of Bachelor Degrees Granted, Fall 1997-Summer 1998

Bachelor's Degrees	Male	Female	Total
Bachelor of Arts	463	863	1,326
Bachelor of Science	684	843	1,527
Bachelor of Architecture	20	41	61
Bachelor of Fine Arts	30	35	65
Bachelor of Interior Architecture	9	3	12
Bachelor of Landscape Architecture	12	12	24
Bachelor of Education	1	1	2
Bachelor of Music	15	12	27
Total	1,234	1,810	3,044

(The University of Oregon catalog, 1999-2000, p. 328)

Quarterly tuition for a full-time student during the 1998-1999 school year was \$1,242 for residents and \$4,170 for nonresidents (The University of Oregon catalog, 1999-2000, p.24).

Data on entering students.

The tables below outline information regarding entering students' high school performance.

Table J: Entering Freshmen High School Grade Point Averages, 1998

Range	Number of Students	Percent of Total
4.00	74	3.23
3.75-3.99	389	17
3.50-3.74	431	18.8
3.25-3.49	470	20.5
3.00-3.24	415	18.9
2.75-2.99	286	18.1
Below 2.75	173	7.6
Unknown or GED	49	2.1
Mean GPA: 3.35		

(University of Oregon Campus Profile, Fall 1998, p. 2)

Table K: Entering First-year Student SAT Scores, 1998

Range	Number of Students	
	Verbal	Math
700-800	125	90
600-699	566	564
500-599	968	972
400-499	495	534
300-399	58	54
Below 300	2	4
Middle 50 percent of scores	495-615	495-605

(University of Oregon Campus Profile, Fall 1998, p. 2)

Table L: Data on How Many “Higher Achieving” Students Attend the University of Oregon, 1987-1997

	1987	1989	1991	1993	1995	1997
Mean HS GPA	3.23	3.38	3.34	3.27	3.30	3.32
percent >3.75 (number of students)	12.7 percent (277)	18.1 percent (347)	18.0 percent (330)	15.3 percent (384)	16.8 percent (417)	19.1 percent (446)
	1987	1989	1991	1993	1995	1997
Mean SAT Scores	1096	1115	1105	1104	1102	1099
percent > 1200 (number of students)	24.5 percent (529)	27.5 percent (521)	25.0 percent (469)	25.8 percent (665)	27.5 percent (702)	26.0 percent (614)

(“Performance Measures and Indicators: 1998 Baseline Performance Reports for Institutions,” OUS, July 27, 1998).

Graduation policies.

In order to graduate from the UO, students earning a Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science, Bachelor of Education, and Bachelor of Music must complete 180 credits with passing grades. A total of 220 credits is required for a bachelor of fine arts and the bachelor of landscape architecture. The bachelor of interior architecture requires 225 credits, and the bachelor of architecture requires 231 credits (The University of Oregon catalog, 1999-2000, p.15). All students must earn 45 graded credits (A, B, C, or D) as regularly admitted students in order to graduate. They must complete an additional 123 credits with grades of A, B, C, D, or Pass (Pass is the grade given when a course is taken on a Pass/No Credit basis) (University of Oregon, Schedule of Classes, Fall 1999, p.20).

A maximum of 24 credits may be earned in the following areas (with no more than 12 credits in any single area):

- Lower division vocational/technical courses
- Physical education and dance activity courses
- Studio instruction in music, except for music majors

As of fall 1987, a maximum of 12 credits in Academic Learning Services courses may be counted toward the 180, 220, 225, or 231 credits required for a bachelor’s degree (University of Oregon, Schedule of Classes, Fall 1999, p.6).

The table below shows the most popular majors from which to graduate.

Table M: Ten Most Popular Majors Among 1997-1998 Graduates

Department	Number	Percent of Total
Business Administration	360	12
Psychology	279	9.1
Journalism	273	8.9
Sociology	233	7.6
Environmental Studies	174	5.7
English	154	5.0
Political Science	139	4.6
Spanish	121	3.8
Economics	109	3.6
Fine and Applied Arts	107	3.5
Number of Bachelor Degrees Awarded, 1997-1998: 3,047		

(The University of Oregon Campus Profile, Fall 1998, p. 2)

Student retention/persistence.

The UO has been working to increase the percentage of students who graduate from the university. The table below outlines the number and percentages of students enrolled and graduating between fall 1989 and fall 1997.

Table N: Retention and Graduation rates for Freshmen Entering from High School, Fall 1989 – Fall 1997

Terms of Entry	Fall 1989	Fall 1990	Fall 1991	Fall 1992	Fall 1993	Fall 1994	Fall 1995	Fall 1996	Fall 1997
# of students in entering class	1,923	2,116	1,889	2,168	2,455	2,401	2,504	2,430	2,233
percent enrolled the following fall term	83.3	78.4	80.3	77.3	76.6	77.2	76.5	80.3	81.0
percent graduated after 4 years	32.9	31.3	35.4	34.7	37.3	36.0			
percent graduated after 5 years	56.1	51.1	54.7	52.5	54.8				
percent graduated after 6 years	60.6	56.0	59.3	56.7					

(The University of Oregon catalog, 1999-2000, p.328)

University staff analyze persistence by race/ethnicity, geographic location, GPA, test scores, special admission status, if students are in a learning community, if students are in the honors college, what freshman seminar students take, what Freshman Interest Group (FIG) students are in, and whether and what type of financial aid students receive. Staff use a six-year cycle for their analyses, but they do not conduct consistent retention studies over a long period of time. As the former Director of Admission and current Associate Vice President for Student Academic Affairs stated, “We might have looked at the performance of students in FIGs, for example, for three consecutive years and then we get tired of doing that, and so we look at some other group. And when we look back then at a ten-year history, we don’t have it consistently. We do with the

gross cohort – with everyone who started in, for example, fall 1991 for the first time from high school and took 12 credits. You are then in the cohort by definition” (Interview with Jim Buch, Associate Vice President for Student Academic Affairs, February 2000).

Current Admission and Placement Policies

Admissions Governance and Policymaking.

In recent years, the UO saw the average GPA of its entering students rise, the number of its National Merit Scholars increase, the number of enrolling students increase, and its diversity increase. The Admission Director believes that the University is doing very well in the areas of excellence and access. She noted that recently she has seen, “more students coming in with AP courses and more students coming in with honors level courses from Oregon schools...As incomes in Oregon rise and as the state turns more to economies that are based on technology and industry and less on production and timber, I see more and more students preparing themselves academically to be competitive at schools across the country” (Interview with Martha Pitts, Director of Admissions for UO, August 1999).

Basic application procedures and current undergraduate admission policies.

To be admitted to the UO, students must complete fourteen total units of college preparatory work and meet the grade point average or test score alternatives outlined below. Specific subject requirements include the following:

- **English** (4 years). All four years should include preparatory composition and literature with an emphasis on writing expository prose.
- **Mathematics** (3 years). Study must include first-year algebra and two additional years of college preparatory mathematics such as geometry, advanced algebra, trigonometry, analytical geometry, calculus, finite mathematics, advanced applications, probability and statistics, or courses that integrate topics from two or more of these areas. It is recommended that an advanced mathematics course be taken in the senior year. Regardless of the pattern of mathematics courses or the number of years of mathematics taken, the mathematics course work must culminate at the Algebra II or equivalent level or higher.
- **Science** (2 years). Study must include a year each in two fields of college preparatory science such as biology, chemistry, physics, or earth and physical science (one laboratory science is recommended).
- **Social studies** (3 years). Study must include one year of United States history, one year of global studies (for example, world history or geography), and one year of a social studies elective (American government strongly recommended).
- **Second language** (2 years). Two years of study in one language.

(The University of Oregon catalog, 1999-2000, p.11)

In order to be admitted to the UO, applicants must have graduated from a standard or accredited high school and completed the requirements outlined above. In addition, applicants must have a 3.00 high school grade point average (GPA) or higher in all high school subjects taken toward graduation. Applicants whose GPA is lower than 3.00 may be considered for admission based on a combination of high school GPA and SAT I or ACT scores. Such applicants must submit a one-page personal statement discussing what motivates them to succeed academically, in

addition to their regular application. Fulfilling the admission requirements does not guarantee admission to the UO (The University of Oregon catalog, 1999-2000, p.11). Grade point averages are computed as follows: A=4, B=3, C=2, D=1, F=0 (The University of Oregon catalog, 1999-2000, p.12).

When discussing the UO's GPA and SAT score requirements, the Director of Admissions stated, "...if a student has below a 3.0 – I think it's easiest to talk about it in two phases...If you have above a 3.0, the SAT is not particularly important. If you have below a 3.0, then the SAT can be used as a qualifier. It's never a disqualifier. We never turn a student down because of low SATs. But there is a chart and if a student has below a 3.0, then the lower the GPA, the higher the SAT that is needed to qualify. That helps us control for things like there are some schools that don't give us very many As...the SATs kind of help us standardize. So it helps us with Oregon residents if a student is below a 3.0 and they meet that chart we guarantee them admission to the University. If a student is outside the state of Oregon and they meet the chart, then they are considered for admission. The ones we worry about the most are the really low GPAs with the really high SATs. The classic underachievers...but we look at that more carefully with the out-of-state students than with the in-state students...with the out-of-state students, we actually set an artificially high automatic admission level...[we] don't automatically take every student that meets the minimum requirements as we do with the residents." She estimates that the UO "easily" admits 85 percent of resident applicants on the basis of the objective criteria alone (Interview with Martha Pitts, Director of Admissions for UO, August 1999).

Students who have not graduated from high school may be considered for admission if they have completed the Test of General Educational Development (GED). Students who graduate from a nonstandard or nonaccredited high school or were home-schooled must complete either the SAT I or ACT and take the SAT II in English, Mathematics I or II, and a third test of the student's choice (The University of Oregon catalog, 1999-2000, p.11).

Either the Admission Director or one of the two Associate Admission Directors reviews all of the files in the "deny admission" category before any student is denied admission (Interview with Martha Pitts, Director of Admissions for UO, August 1999).

The most recent change in admission policies, implemented in 1999, is the essay requirement for students who have below a 3.0 high school GPA. This is different than the one page personal statement discussed previously. Until 1999, the University did not require an essay for any applicant. It does not require essay for students who have above a 3.0. The Admission Director stated that she does not believe "in making students do something that's not going to have an impact on their admissions. And more work for them [means] more work for us. It just doesn't make any sense. Although it would make us appear more selective and probably would have a positive impact on recruitment, it just isn't just – it's not...Oregon residents – we don't use [the essay] in the evaluation – in making the decision, but it can be helpful in placement. It can be helpful in identifying where students might need some more work once they get here. With the non-residents we did use that fairly extensively in making the decisions about who got in this year." She thinks that the addition of the essay has made some students who have below a 3.0 GPA self-select out of the admission pool. She was disappointed with that finding and,

consequently, the Admission Office has been trying to tell all students that the University wants them to apply. It is sending a mailing out to all prospective students in its database who have below a 3.0 GPA outlining what they need to do to apply to the UO (Interview with Martha Pitts, Director of Admissions for UO, August 1999).

In fall 1997, the University of Oregon developed, and began implementing, a Campus Diversity Plan. It stated that, "In recent years, the president has appointed three separate task forces on issues of diversity. The faculty has extended multicultural course requirements for all undergraduate students and initiated a new major in ethnic studies. There is recognition, however, that these steps alone will not suffice. Students from all backgrounds generally agree there is a need to increase the diversity in the student body as well as in the curriculum and faculty. A recent study completed by the Oregon State System of Higher Education (OSSHE, now OUS) shows the majority of students on all OSSHE campuses (87.9 percent) agree that 'diversity is good for my campus and should be pursued' (Valuing Diversity: Student Perceptions of Campus Climate in the Oregon State System of Higher Education, OSSHE, 1997)." The university is seeking "to include and support persons from environmental backgrounds that may have inhibited them from attaining academic skills and knowledge or discouraged them from pursuing higher education (Campus Diversity Plan, University of Oregon, Fall 1997, p. 1).

Its strategies for achieving those goals are:

- Aggressive recruiting efforts in which the Office of Admissions will involve teaching faculty and students;
- Aggressive use of financial incentives, including scholarships and campus-based programs. Priority consideration will be given to students from environmental backgrounds that may have inhibited them from attaining academic skills and knowledge or have discouraged them from pursuing higher education;
 - Annual assessment of effectiveness of programs and services; and
 - Enhanced coordination of existing campus resources and services;
 - Effective coordination among service offices;
 - Effective communication between services offices and academic departments; and
 - Effective communication among service offices, academic departments, and students.

(Campus Diversity Plan, University of Oregon, Fall 1997, p. 2).

To ensure that the size of each community is large enough to achieve the desired educational impact, the University's specific goals for 1997-2002 are:

- Increase the number of African-American students to 500 (from 242).
- Increase the number of Native-American students to 500 (from 184).
- Increase the number of Asian-American students to 2000 (from 1109).
- Increase the number of Hispanic students to 1000 (from 518).
- Increase the number of International students to 2000 (1640).

(Campus Diversity Plan, University of Oregon, Fall 1997, p. 2).

In terms of affirmative action policies, the former Director of Admission and current Vice President of Student Academic Affairs stated that, “Our problem has not been who to select from those who apply, but rather getting them to apply. Again, because the numbers are so small, we have never found ourselves in a situation where we said, ‘we are going to take this student of color instead of this white person or this Asian person...’ This simply is not the case. We’re not there. We came close in the ‘80s when we did have an enrollment cap, but then Measure 5 came along and all that went away...The Office of Civil Rights received a complaint and they have investigated the complaint and we are now in a monitoring agreement with them. We are still able to use race as a factor in awarding scholarships and it can be the predominant factor. It’s one of many factors, but we need to do so in the context of meeting the educational diversity needs of our students” (Interview with Jim Buch, Vice President of Student Academic Affairs and former Director of Admission at UO, February 2000).

The Admission Office and Outreach.

The Admission Office sends out newsletters that have had “periodic success.” The staff believes that the success of the newsletters is limited because counselors are too busy to read everything that comes across their desks. The staff has worked to enlarge and perfect the state’s counselor database. The Director of Admission corresponds with some high school counselors by email (Interview with Martha Pitts, Director of Admissions for UO, August 1999).

Undergraduate Admission Policy Exceptions.

The catalog states that, “Oregon University System policy permits the university to admit a limited number of freshmen who do not meet the minimum requirements. A request for admission as an exception is reviewed by the admissions committee” (The University of Oregon catalog, 1999-2000, p.12). There is a legislated five percent cap on special admits to the University. That came about because, in 1987, course pattern requirements were put into place. As the Admission Director stated, “I believe there was a great deal of concern in the state of Oregon that it would be too competitive, and if there were all of these rules set up that people just wouldn’t come. And so they had these provisions that said you can admit a bunch of exceptions, but no more than this number of exceptions. Because there is a provision for a special admit -- as well as the five percent special, there’s another special admit [category] and there’s no limit on those.” The second special admit category is used for students who, for example, have high SAT scores and a high GPA, but are missing one particular course requirement. Those students are admitted into the undergraduate support program and must be provided with additional academic support. In terms of the five percent special admit category, the Admission Director stated that they’ve “never come close to that” (Interview with Martha Pitts, Director of Admissions, August 1999). In a small number of cases, the University will tell a promising applicant that s/he can take the SAT again or a summer school course and the University will give the student a special admit. The number of special admits has been decreasing over the years.

The University accepts appeals to the admission decision. As the Admission Director stated, “This is Oregon. They can appeal anything.” She said that they want to know, “Is there something we missed? If there is, write us and tell us about it. If there is not, your chances of just writing and appealing to our good-heartedness are not necessarily going to work because our decisions, our charge, is to make the decision that is in your best interest. Our best interest is that

you graduate from here, not that you start here. So we work with students from that premise. We work with them on their appeals. And, yes, we approve a number of appeals every year – some as five percent admits or through the undergraduate support program...it depends on the circumstances” (Interview with Martha Pitts, Director of Admissions for UO, August 1999).

Placement and Advising

Placement and remediation governance and policymaking.

There is a Testing Office, a part of the University Counseling and Testing Center, and an Office of Academic Advising; the two offices have different reporting structures. The Testing Office will interpret placement test scores for students, but is not charged with academic advising. Academic advising is provided by the Office of Academic Advising and by departmental advisors (correspondence with David Espinoza, Coordinator of Testing Services for UO, November 15, 2000). From an institutional perspective, there are two main issues of concern for Testing Office staff involved in the placement program: is the test serving the departments’ needs, and how much does it cost (Interview with David Espinoza, Coordinator of Testing Services for UO, January 2000)?

The role of the Academic Advising Office is to administer the tests – to organize, administer, score, and report. The staff at the Academic Advising Office is not involved in policymaking or “even the discussions within the departments over which tests do you use? How do you use it? [What should be the] cut scores, etc.” (Interview with David Espinoza, Coordinator of Testing Services for UO, January 2000).

Based on the results of the UO Math Placement Test, approximately 30-35 percent of the incoming freshman class fail to place out of Math 095, Intermediate Algebra, a remedial-level course (Interview with UO Official, August 1999).

Using PASS data for placement is being discussed by UO staff, but there are no plans to change current practices.

Current undergraduate course placement and advising policies.

The Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs at the University of Oregon stated that the University of Oregon does not have many students who need remedial education, and, consequently, that “we don’t do very much in the way of remedial courses anymore and students who need that can typically get it at Lane Community College” (Interview with John Moseley, Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs at the University of Oregon, August 1999). Students entering UO who have fewer than 36 hours of collegiate credit are required to submit scores from either the ACT or SAT I; the scores will be used primarily for placement and advising purposes. SAT II subject tests are recommended, but not required. The University of Oregon has several types of support services available to students to help them succeed at the university. They include the Office of Academic Advising and Student Services, Office of Multicultural Affairs, High School Equivalency Program, Office of Orientation, Undergraduate Support Program, and Academic Learning Services/Educational Opportunities Program (The College Guidance Counselor’s Handbook, 1998-1999).

Remedial education is called self-support at the UO. Courses numbered 1-99 are remedial, terminal, semiprofessional, or noncredit courses that do not apply toward degree requirements (The University of Oregon catalog, 1999-2000, p.9). The Admission Director said that, "...there are many on [our faculty] who believe that we should not be teaching courses below the 100 level at the University of Oregon, that by the time a student comes to us they should be able to read and compute at a basic level that would get them into Writing 121 or Math 105, or 111 preferably...I don't believe that's going to happen. There are too many reason – we've got too many students who are good in one are and not in another. We are an access-oriented university...because of the budget crisis, we can't afford to teach a large number of remedial courses or self-support courses so those students actually have to pay extra to take those courses. They're fairly expensive. They are taught as self-support, so we don't get state money to teach those classes. We do work with some of the students who are in that situation [to] take their first term at Lane Community College and then transfer, but right now they are offered the opportunity to take the self-support courses here. There just aren't that many of them here" (Interview with Martha Pitts, Director of Admissions for UO, August 1999). Students pay a fee to take those courses, in addition to the tuition fee, and the credits do not count toward graduation (Interview with David Espinoza, Coordinator of Testing Services for UO, January 2000).

Academic advising is mandatory for all new undergraduate students. All entering first year students must attend the general orientation meeting and a major advising meeting in order to receive their registration access code. In fall 1999, there were major advising meetings for 33 Arts and Sciences major areas, 14 Professional School Majors, and 12 Professional Interest Meetings (e.g., Elementary and Secondary Education, Medicine) (University of Oregon, Schedule of Classes, Fall 1999, p.6).

The Academic Learning Center offers several courses to assist underprepared students. The courses offered are Introduction to University Study (3 credits), Special Studies (1-5 credits), Workshop (1-4 credits), and Supervised Tutoring (1-4 credits). A maximum of 12 credits in ALS courses may be applied to the total credits required for a bachelor's degree (The University of Oregon catalog, 1999-2000, p. 292).

The UO does not collect or analyze much placement or advising-related data. The Coordinator of Testing Services was unaware of any data analysis conducted with placement data. The former Director of Admission and current Vice President of Student Academic Affairs stated that, "When we start looking at placement, we have not done a good job of keeping track of the placement device that was used to get you into the course that you took. Whether it be in writing, or mathematics, or the languages. We now do some, but we don't have enough years of data yet for the math placement. We now have three years of placement data [in math], but won't be able to do the review until next fall when we'll be able to see how those cohorts have done" (Interview with Jim Buch, Vice President of Student Academic Affairs and former Director of Admission, February 2000).

Placement exams are offered in English, mathematics, and foreign languages. Placement examinations must be taken before students meet with their advisors. Most transfer students do not take placement exams, since they have usually met the course requirements ahead of time;

those who do take a placement exams usually take math in order to fulfill a science or other math-focused degree (Interview with David Espinoza, Coordinator of Testing Services for UO, January 2000).

English placement exam policies. In English, students must have one of the following test scores in order to register for WR 121:

- 38 or higher on the TSWE (Test of Standard Written English);
- 400 or higher on the verbal portion of the SAT (taken between March 1994 and April 1995);
- 480 or higher on the verbal portion of the SAT (recentered scale, taken since April 1995); or
- 19 or higher ACT English score.

Without one of those scores on the SAT or ACT, and without a TSWE score, students are required to take the TSWE (University of Oregon, Schedule of Classes, Fall 1999, p.6). Students have until they graduate to pass the English placement test. According to Advising Office staff, students who score around a 470 on the verbal portion of the recentered SAT are quite irate when they learn they need to take a placement exam (Interview with David Espinoza, Coordinator of Testing Services for UO, January 2000).

Mathematics placement exam policies. More placement exams are administered in mathematics than in any other subject. Almost every entering student takes the mathematics placement exam. However, if a student's career goals are such that mathematics is not relevant, that student can opt out of taking mathematics at the UO and, thus, does not need to take a mathematics placement exam. The mathematics test was developed by the math department and is approximately 4 years old (as of 2000) (Interview with David Espinoza, Coordinator of Testing Services for UO, January 2000).

Students who register for MATH 095, 105, 111, 112, 231, 241, 243, or 251 must present, at the first class meeting, a placement test score or a grade report from an immediately preceding class taken at the UO. Those who are not qualified may be required to drop the course (University of Oregon, Schedule of Classes, Fall 1999, p.6). The Admission Director stated that, "At least one of the advisors I talked to during this year's summer advising program had some concerns about the way that [the mathematics placement exam] was structured because it was structured such that you have to have a certain score in each area. You have to have a certain level of proficiency in each area to be able to test into a particular program. So you might have a student who's really good in all areas but one, and that one area could keep them from getting into a college level math course." She thinks that there are "some kinks" that need to be ironed out in the math exam (Interview with Martha Pitts, Director of Admissions for UO, August 1999).

The drop out rate for College Algebra – the class that provides entre into the math track – is very high, but the Coordinator of Testing Services does not compile data regarding the course dropout rate. When asked if the current placement exams appropriately identifies students' needs and places them accordingly, one high-level UO official stated, "I would say no, they are not – [but] math is most efficient in that sense (Interview with Jim Buch, Vice President of Student Academic Affairs and former Director of Admission at the UO, February 2000).

Foreign languages placement exam policies. As for foreign languages, the University of Oregon, “offers optional placement examinations in French, German, and Spanish, which are intended to assist students in determining readiness for second year language study” (University of Oregon, Schedule of Classes, Fall 1999, p.6). There are also placement exams and oral interviews in Chinese and Japanese that are required for placement into any class above the 101 or first year level. Spanish, French, and German placement tests are advisory; they are to help students decide which level is most appropriate for them. There is also a placement test for students for whom English is a second language (Interview with David Espinoza, Coordinator of Testing Services for UO, January 2000).

Course placement policy exceptions.

High school students with Advanced Placement calculus credit and students with transfer credit for a calculus class are excused from the math placement requirements listed above (University of Oregon, Schedule of Classes, Fall 1999, p.6).

Policy Evolution: Former Admission, Placement, Remediation Policies.

Around 1989, there was a debate in the state about whether or not the University was above its enrollment cap and, consequently, whether the UO should change its admission requirements. At that time, the Admission Office obtained permission to say that the admission requirements were a minimum and that the staff could admit selectively above the requirements. That was the first time the University entered into the selective admission business. It has continued that procedure with non-residents, but not with residents because it is not near its cap. The cap fluctuates and, currently, it is at a relatively higher place. There has not been a waiting list for several years (Interview with Martha Pitts, Director of Admissions for UO, August 1999).

The Admission Director stated that a 30 on the TSWE used to be required, but that was eliminated a few years ago. She believes that that was a better predictor for placement than their current methods (Interview with Martha Pitts, Director of Admissions for UO, August 1999). In terms of previous math placement policies and practices, the previous system was all pencil and paper. There was no recording; nothing was computerized. Students who passed placement tests were given a piece of paper that indicated that they could register for a particular course, but their score was not registered elsewhere (Interview with David Espinoza, Coordinator of Testing Services for OU, January 2000).

In the early 1990's, the UO received a sharp increase in the number of applicants, and enrolling students, from California. Admission staff believe this was due, in part, to a belief that it took 6-8 years to graduate from public university in California. They believe the trend has trailed off a bit because prospective students realized that was a myth and because many students graduating from high school in California are students of color who do not feel comfortable in a predominately White, non-Latino state like Oregon. Also, in the early '90s, while the number of out-of-state enrollees was increasing, the UO increased its out-of-state tuition by 15 percent, 10 percent, and 10 percent over three consecutive years. Consequently, it costs an out-of-state resident approximately \$23,000 a year to attend the UO – far more than the in-state costs for a year at a public university in California, for example.

Anticipated changes to admission, placement, remediation policies.

In terms of admission policy, the Admissions Director stated that the Admissions Office is not planning on changing any admission policies right now because, "...we're not trying to become more selective, and I believe our minimum requirements are fairly good indicators of [students'] minimal ability to succeed (Interview with Martha Pitts, Director of Admissions for UO, August 1999). There was an overall sentiment in the Admission Office that there has been enough policy turmoil regarding admission issues in Oregon and that the UO needs to remain relatively steady with its current policies.

As for the future of the placement programs, the Coordinator of Testing Services hopes the University will adopt some different placement instruments. He would like to see the Academic Advising Office staff to become more involved in policy decisions, and he would like to move toward a more computer-based delivery system. He is interested in learning more about the Accuplacer and Compass tests¹⁰ because, "they are computer adapted [and] they have this whole pool of questions of varying levels of difficulty." Those tests, and others like them, have the potential to be more helpful to the UO in terms of providing data for its retention and school improvement efforts. He stated that, "Being proactive and learning more about your students is a desirable thing and each of those programs has built into it a way that you can gather data about student concerns, student needs, etc." He is unsure as to how placement data are currently used. He noted, however, that there is a lot of reticence on behalf of the mathematics faculty regarding changing its test, since it was developed internally (Interview with David Espinoza, Coordinator of Testing Services for UO, January 2000).

Compatibility of Admission Policies and K-12 Standards.

A challenge for the future is to encourage educators at all levels to think about teaching and learning in a new way. The Director of Enrollment Services and High School Relations in the OUS believes that Oregon's students are used to standards-based learning and proficiency-based assessments and will not have to "unthink" or "relearn" as will educators. He stated that,

Whereas professionals have learned different paradigms and part of the challenge we're going to have with PASS..., whether it's a faculty at the OUS institution, or the administrator, or the counselor, or the high school teacher, is to relearn paradigms, and to cogently think about the process in a new way. That's a challenge, it really is, and that's going to be where our greatest source of resistance is likely to be. It isn't over the validity of the standards, it isn't over the technical parts. It's going to come down to the fact that this is new and I need to work through this, and until I feel comfortable working through it, I'm not going to support it...[OUS is concerned that] there are some individuals who are resistant in general – who believe that the CIM and the CAM have already cost so much in terms of effort, hours, energy, and inertia that now we're adding something on top of that – how dare [we].

Interview with David McDonald, Director, Enrollment Services and High School Relations for the OUS, January 2000

¹⁰ Accuplacer and Compass are computerized placement and diagnostic assessment systems developed by the College Board and ACT, respectively.

The Admission Director at the University of Oregon brought up a similar point regarding educators, stating that, “With PASS I think the other very interesting thing is the emphasis on a different teaching format. The idea that students are much more involved in the learning process and it’s a much more active learning process. Portland State has really made some really good strides in...saying, ‘all right, if these students are going to come to us having learned this way, they’re going to expect us to teach this way.’” She was unsure as to whether teaching styles at the UO would evolve in the same direction as are K-12 teaching styles. She said that,

Many of our faculty members are here because we are the only AAU University in the state of Oregon. They take great pride in that research designation and they take great pride in what it means to be one of the only 31 public AAU universities in the country. Some of our faculty are going to say, ‘We can change how we teach undergraduates.’ Some of our faculty are not. And I think that we have – that is not going to be something that the Admission Office can control. I think we can talk a lot and we will be very involved in talking about what the implications are, but that’s got to come from faculty and from the faculty leadership...Our faculty really have been really involved in a two-year long process for change, evaluation, looking at an emphasis on undergraduate education, on graduate education, on recruitment and retention, looking at our advising processes, really doing some in-depth evaluation, and looking for ways to be more student-centered and more learning-centered. And I think that those are some of same kinds of things that PASS really is dealing with – is being centered on the student and being centered on learning, not teaching. And on the students learning, not teaching the student. And I think there’s a huge difference there. How fast and how far that can go in an institution of this size and academic caliber is a real question, I think.

Martha Pitts, Director of Admissions for UO, August 1999

The Coordinator of Testing Services in the Academic Advising Office discussed the disjuncture between teaching and learning styles in K-12 versus higher education from a placement perspective. He stated that,

the most interesting part of this whole placement process is from my perspective that students move along a path where they assume that there is a logical progression – that they move from one step to the next and that is how they progress through high schools. And there is [sic] really not a lot of obstacles to prevent that progression. And then they come to the university where all of a sudden there is a new standard that is being placed on them and sometimes they kind of fall short of that standard. And there is a lot of cognitive dissonance over. ‘why am I able to not place into College Algebra when I just finished pre-calculus.’ We deal with that all the time. And I think the different constituencies have different attitudes about it. I think that some people feel that the quality of the high school program is not all that great. But I think there is also another way to look at it, too, and that is student learning style – in that you get a lot of kids who move through that progression – let’s see – what is it: Algebra I, Geometry, Algebra II, Pre-Calculus. And so they have gone through Calculus and they get here and they can’t remember Elementary Algebra because it has been so long ago...there’s not a lot of integration that occurs throughout the four years of high school. It’s not building blocks; it’s one unit at a time. Once that unit is learned, it is jettisoned and you move on to the

next. And this is what contributes to that sort of hitting the wall and they get here and I've heard hundreds of time, 'But I got As and Bs' and you name the subject...And then that creates the perception on the part of the students or the parent that there is something wrong with the placement process. So it is difficult not to assume a defensive posture in regard to that. Because to answer the question in all honestly sometimes requires that you read the conclusion that maybe [the student] really don't know this [subject].

Interview with David Espinoza, Coordinator of Testing Services for UO, January 2000

Another major issue has been how to time the development and implementation of reforms across systems. The UO's Vice President of Student Academic Affairs and former Director of Admission believes that the K-12 reforms are lagging behind the PASS-related reforms. Despite efforts to collaborate, the systems continue to operate on their own. He stated that,

Much of the work has been done, really – the involvement has been university teaching faculty working with K-12 teaching faculty and really identifying what are the levels of confidence and the knowledge base that would be expected, then how are you going to go about measuring it. What sorts of indicators are appropriate, which ones are valid, reliable, and how are we going to go about doing that? At the same time PASS is developing, actually, we found ourselves in this state – in a period where PASS was way out ahead of the K-12 folks. And K-12 still hasn't, I think, in terms of the end product, isn't anywhere near as far along as PASS is.

Interview with Jim Buch, Vice President of Student Academic Affairs and former Director of Admission at the UO, February 2000

The Admission Director at the UO believes that the timing issue can have detrimental effects on high school students. She summed up her thoughts by stating,

The question is how will those changes work themselves out and when is the right time to be on the cutting edge of that change, or the bleeding edge of that change. And when is the right time to be in the second wave of people who learn from that front edge and where do you place yourself and how do you position yourself so that you don't sacrifice students...that's where I kind of try to keep focusing...in being enough involved in the leading edge to have an impact on things that I think are important..., but then keeping back enough that we're not always falling over ourselves and waiting for everything else to catch up and then redesigning and redesigning as we find the problems...to provide leadership and support, but not always at the very front.

Interview with Martha Pitts, Director of Admissions for UO, August 1999

Many believe that higher education will have to change its practices more than it has anticipated. The former Director of Admission and the current Vice President of Student Academic Affairs at the UO stated that, "I think there are some that see the two cultures as two trains rushing toward each other. It's like they are on the same track and there will be a collision and I will be retired by then. I don't know – it's really, I think, the folks in higher education who will be the ones to have the rudest awakening and there the demand on them to change and to change rapidly is going to be much greater than the impact on the K-12 people" (interview with Jim Buch, Vice President of Student Academic Affairs and former Director of Admission, February 2000).

The next section parallels this one, but for Portland State University.

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

This section addresses the following research questions: 1) What are the signals and incentives sent by existing higher education admission and placement policies, 2) What are the formal and informal institutional-level K-16 transition policies, and 3) who are the key institutional decisionmakers regarding K-16 transition policies?

General Facts.

Portland State University (PSU) had 10,860 undergraduate and 4,730 graduate students enrolled in the fall of 1998, making PSU the third largest campus in the Oregon University System (OUS). 38 percent of PSU's students attend part-time and many students are commuter students. Within the Oregon University System (OUS), PSU has the highest number of transfers from community colleges. (1998 Oregon University System Fact Book) Although Oregon does not have a tiered university system like other states in this study, PSU's commitment to access, its diverse community, and its urban campus make it an interesting contrast to the UO in terms of policy signaling for the purposes of our research.

PSU has two colleges: the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Urban and Public Affairs, which is nationally recognized. There are also five professional schools: Business Administration; Education; Engineering and Applied Science; Fine and Performing Arts; and Social Work. The university has 65 departments/programs of study and offers multiple master's degrees and eight doctoral degrees. (Portland State University Bulletin, 1999-2000) The University also has a broad School of Extended Studies, which enrolls around 25,000 students a year on four campuses throughout the state. The Extended Studies programs offers a wide range of programs including a bachelor's degree program in social science and minors in administrative justice and business administration (PSU Viewbook, Brochure from School of Extended Studies). PSU's main site is a metropolitan campus integrated into the city of Portland, and the school motto appears on a bridge across a downtown street: Let Knowledge Serve the City.

The PSU mission includes a strong commitment to access, and is the most diverse university in the system in terms of race, age and background. In 1998, 66 percent of all PSU students were White, non-Latino; the average percentage of White, non-Latino students throughout the Oregon University system was 73.5 percent. In 1998, 54.1 percent of PSU undergraduates were women (1998 Oregon University System Fact Book). 29 percent of PSU students were graduate students, and the average age for a PSU student was 29, with nearly 80 percent in the 22 and older category. Relative to the rest of the system, PSU students are older: in 1998, 57.1 percent of undergraduates at PSU fell within the traditional student age range of 18-24. The system average for that age group was 75.9 percent. Students at PSU are primarily Oregonians, but there are students from "almost every state" and from 70 foreign countries. Three-quarters of students work while attending school (PSU Bulletin, 1999-2000).

Table O: PSU Undergraduate Student Racial/ethnic Breakdown, Fall 1998

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
American Indian/AK native	147	1.4
Asian/Pacific Islander	1,100	10.1

Black/African American	324	3.0
Hispanic/Latino	406	3.7
White, non-Latino	7,123	65.6
Nonresident Alien	375	3.5
Unknown	1385	12.8
Total	10,680	100

Table P: PSU Undergraduate Enrollment, by Discipline, 1998

<u><i>Department</i></u>	<u><i>Full-Time Equivalent Undergraduate Students</i></u>
Ag/Forestry/Envir. Studies	16.5
Architecture	69.3
Biological Sciences	334.4
Business	899.1
Communications/Journalism	--
Computer Science	210.1
Education	298.2
Engineering/Eng. Tech.	287.3
Health Sciences	61.5
Humanities/Fine Arts	1729.1
Law	--
Math	480.2
Physical Sciences	501.5
Social Sciences	1736.5
Other	1163.1
Total FTE Undergraduates	8046.2

(1998 Oregon University System Fact Book)

In 1997-98, there were 3,564 degrees awarded: 2,009 bachelor's, 959 master's, 38 doctorates, and 558 certificates, which includes teacher certification. PSU was second to the University of Oregon in the total number of degrees awarded (1998 Oregon University System Factbook).

Data on entering students.

Students are required to have a 2.5 high school GPA to enter PSU (with exceptions noted below). In 1998, the average high school GPA for a student entering PSU was 3.13. The OUS system average for entering GPAs in 1998 was 3.31. Over a ten-year period between 1988 and 1998, average entering GPA increased from 2.99 to 3.13 at PSU. On average, entering women had a higher high school GPA than men did at PSU and throughout the OUS system (1998 Oregon University System Factbook).

In 1998, SAT scores for entering students for PSU were 440-570 Verbal and 450-570 Math (at the 25th and 75th percentiles). The system averages at the same percentiles were 470-590 Verbal and 470-590 Math. On average, men had higher SAT scores than women at PSU and throughout the system. Compared to national averages, Oregon students generally and OUS students specifically have higher SAT scores than their peers nationally, though PSU student scores are more reflective of national averages (1998 Oregon University System Factbook).

Graduation policies.

To graduate with a bachelor's degree, students must earn a minimum number of credits (180) to graduate with a bachelor's degree, as well as meet the requirements of their major. There are additional general education requirements, including writing, health and physical education and diversity requirements. It is notable that there is no math requirement for graduation from PSU. There is a writing requirement, which is discussed further in the placement and advising section below. Specific graduation requirements are in Appendix F.

Student retention/persistence.

Of the entering cohort in the Fall of 1991, 42.2 percent received their bachelor's degree by 1997. Of those who persisted through their first year, 54.1 percent earned their degrees; through the second year, that percentage increased to 69.4. These percentages are lower than the system average in which 54.9 percent graduated in six years. Of those persisting through their first year at an OUS campus, 68.5 percent graduated; through the second year the percentage increased to 79.9 percent. Approximately 35 percent of PSU students complete a bachelor's degree within four years, lower than the system average of 46.5 percent. (1998 Oregon University System Fact Book)

There are resources for academic advising and student support to help students persist and graduate from PSU. The Information and Academic Support Center (IASC) is the umbrella organization that provides advisors to any student and is designed for entering students and students undecided about their major. This advising supplements students' faculty advisers. The Educational Equity Programs and Services Office coordinates the programs and services that increase access for and improve the retention of low-income, ethnic and other disadvantaged groups through advocacy, guidance and advising by a diverse staff. Ethnic Student Services provides ethnic student advisors for students of color.

Student Support Services/Educational Opportunity Program (SSS/EOP) is a comprehensive academic support program charged with increasing the retention and graduation of first generation, low income and/or disabled students. Services include: academic counseling, tutoring, financial aid counseling and referral, computer use and training, skill enrichment courses, advocacy, petition assistance, and graduate school advising. Students are assigned a counselor or peer advisor who works with them until they graduate, transfer or no longer need program services. There are also Veteran's Services, Disability Services for Students, Mentor Program for Returning Women, Student Legal Services, Project Connect Mentors for Students of Color, and, for those who are academically disqualified, the Academic Support Program (1999-2000 Portland State University Campus Resource Guide and Directory; 1999 PSU Viewbook, E18).

Current Admission and Placement Policies

Admissions Governance and Policymaking.

Formal policy changes must be approved by the OUS and the State Board of Higher Education. The PSU faculty also plays a role in shaping university policy. As PSU's Vice Provost for Enrollment explains, "The admission standards...are established by the academic requirements

committee (ARC), which is a committee of the faculty senate, so it is within the purview of the faculty. Then, we make recommendations based on the faculty's actions in the ARC. We make recommendations to the Board of Higher Education. The Board of Higher Education ultimately approves or does not approve our admission standards....So you really have two levels of governance structure working here. One is the traditional faculty governance structure and the other has to do with statewide policies that deal with the articulation of the various systems" (Interview with Janine Allen, Vice Provost and Dean for Enrollment and Student Services for PSU, August 1999). While setting requirements that preserve the academic standards of each university within the system, the policies must also account for the fact that each of the universities in the state system has capacity for larger enrollments.

Basic application procedures and current undergraduate admissions policies. Applications for admission are sent directly to PSU, where they are processed and reviewed by a staff of seven professional evaluators and seven admission counselors (Interview with Agnes Hoffman, Director of Admissions and Records for PSU, August 1999). Deadlines are based on the state date for each term (June 1 for fall term; October 1 for winter term; February 1 for spring term; May 1 for summer session; March 1 for international students for fall term). Each year approximately 70 percent of applicants are accepted from both high schools and community colleges, as well as other four-year institutions (1998 Oregon University System Factbook; Interview with Agnes Hoffman, Director of Admissions and Records for PSU, August 1999).

Beyond the general OUS GPA/course guidelines, PSU sets its own policies regarding admission. Applicants must have a 2.5 GPA coming out of high school. Students are also required to submit their SAT or ACT scores. No minimum score is required unless the student does not meet minimum GPA (1999 PSU Viewbook). Students below 2.5 GPA must score at least 1000 combined on the SAT or get a score of 21 on the ACT. Students are also expected to complete 14 units of college preparatory work within approved courses. The requirements are below:

- 4 years/units English
- 3 years/units math to include algebra 2
- 3 years/units social science
- 2 years/units science
- 2 years/units of, or demonstrated proficiency in, a second language

There are alternatives for students who don't meet the above requirements. Students must score over 1000 on the SAT or 21 on the ACT; they must take the SAT IIs and "earn an overall minimum score of 1410 and a minimum of 470 on each subject test" (including English Composition, Math Level I or II, and a third test) (1999 PSU Viewbook).

There are other requirements for GED earners and transfer students. GED earners must have a minimum overall score average of 46, and a minimum score of 40 on each of five subtests. Students are considered transfers if they already have 30 or more transferable units from accredited institutions. If they have less than thirty, they must apply as first year students. Those with transfer status must have a minimum GPA of 2.0 in all college work attempted and are not required to take the SAT or ACT.

With the application, students are required to submit official transcripts and test scores. No essay is required. Applications are reviewed first by the admission evaluators who make admission decisions based on the objective criteria. If students fall clearly into the admit or deny category based on those criteria, the evaluators are authorized to make the decision. As the Director of Admission states, “there’s nothing subjective about it.” She continues by explaining that not all students fall into that category, “If the student doesn’t meet all the objective criteria required for admission then that file is sent to an admissions counselor for evaluation. The admission counselor may then call the student” to talk about other options, like retaking the SAT I or repeating a math course. If the student can improve on the designated criteria, they [sic] can be admitted” (Interview with Agnes Hoffman, Director of Admissions and Records for PSU, August 1999).

In some cases, students will appeal an admission decision, which they are allowed to do. In those cases, “It’s only the students who file an appeal because [they were] not admissible on the objective criteria. . .and if they are denied we offer each of them an opportunity to file an appeal. The appeal requires an essay, requires two letters of reference, and if there are special considerations like health or whatever we ask that they provide proof of that in addition. And then that file, together with an interview done by an admissions counselor, is presented to the faculty [committee] and they decide on that” (Interview with Agnes Hoffman, Director of Admissions and Records for PSU, August 1999).

Admission office and outreach/special programs.

The advising and retention services described above are supplemented by PSU programs that are designed to increase access, preparation and opportunities for different learning experiences. The programs are listed below.

Co-Admission Program. PSU has a partnership with two area community colleges – Clackamas Community College and Mt. Hood Community College – that is a co-admission program for students who are not quite ready for the full four-year experience. In the admission process certain students are identified as having potential but are either underprepared academically or need alternatives to traditional four-year experiences. The Director of Admissions explains, “The students that we counsel, we always tell them about the co-admit programs. . .[And] they’ll choose the co-admit program because it connects them to our university and provides on-site advising at the community college so that there’s a seamless transition, or as near seamless as we can make it. It really is a nice program. They love it, and we love it because there are no surprises, and that’s really important for a transfer student because you don’t want to go through the process of transferring only to find out that the courses that you understood to transfer and count toward your degree program don’t” (Interview with Agnes Hoffman, Director of Admissions and Records for PSU, August 1999). PSU faculty and staff provide counseling and instruction at the partner community college, including the freshman inquiry program, which is part of the lower division requirement at PSU.

Freshman Inquiry. Several years ago, the PSU faculty designed a program for first year students within the overall University Studies program that provides an opportunity for more intensive writing and skill building in a seminar setting. (See also Appendix F with University Requirements for additional description.) The Freshman Inquiry is a program that “serves as an

introduction to college life and a way of becoming part of the community. It also introduces you [the student] to community-based learning and teaches computer skills that will help in all your courses.” Examples of Freshman Inquiry themes include “Einstein’s Universe,” “City Life” or “Values in Conflict.” Following the Freshman Inquiry, the University Studies program continues through the Sophomore Inquiry and culminates in a Senior Capstone project in the community. (1999 PSU Viewbook, p. B8) There is also an upper-class student who serves as a peer mentor who meets with smaller groups outside of class.

PSU faculty created the University Studies Program to develop student skills, and in some ways it resembles some of the statewide reform movements. The freshman inquiry program concentrates on “having students demonstrate skills rather than regurgitate information, so I think we are coming closer with university studies to complementing school reform. That was not the primary focus on university studies, but it has been a nice complement or a nice outcome of it” (Interview with Janine Allen, Vice Provost and Dean for Enrollment and Student Services for PSU, August 1999). All first-year students are required to enroll in the Freshman Inquiry/University Studies sequence.

Honors Program. There is an Honors College for a select group of students who take honors courses in addition to their other university requirements. The University Honors College is intended for students who plan to attend graduate or professional school after PSU. Combining rigorous coursework, an internship experience in Washington, DC, and the opportunity to write a baccalaureate thesis, the program allows students to pursue a BA or BS degree in any departmental major through a highly individualized program developed with advisers. Honors students must complete major departmental and program requirements, but they meet their general University requirements through the program's own course offerings. Any entering freshman, current PSU student, or transfer student who has earned fewer than approximately 60 credits may apply to the program, which accommodates approximately 200 students (1999 PSU Directory and Resource Guide, p. 16; PSU Viewbook, p. B11).

Undergraduate admissions policy exceptions.

PSU policy allows up to 5 percent of its incoming class to be admitted by exception, that is, not having met admission requirements. The director of admissions says, “There is a way to bypass. But it has to be a student who has other strengths, and all those go by me...It is really important to us that we are fair and consistent in all our evaluations.” In the case of admission exceptions, “then almost always there are contingencies that must be met. There are terms that are established and the student is given those terms in writing. They are assigned an advisor and then [check in] at the conclusion of every term for whatever period of time those conditions are in place” (Interview with Agnes Hoffman, Director of Admissions and Records for PSU, August 1999).

PSU’s commitment to access has meant that admission by exception is an attractive option, though there are potentially problematic consequences. The Vice Provost for Enrollment explains, “We have the lowest admission standards in the state [system] because of that commitment to access, and [several years ago] we were making exception rates that were nearly 25 percent of our freshman class. We are down now to somewhere around 5 percent, I think...What I found is predictable – you make exceptions for those admission standards and you

do not provide the remediation or the support, and guess what? They are not retained. And the other thing is, a large, a disproportionate number of them were minority students, so it was this kind of commitment to access and commitment to diversity that actually was hurting students because we were inviting them in the front door and not supporting them. They were not succeeding and we were creating a failure experience for them.” One of the responses to this concern was to develop the co-admission program with the community college system for students who are desirable university candidates, but who need additional support to be fully prepared.

Placement and remediation governance and policymaking.

PSU’s commitment to access can create concerns with entering students’ skill levels. As a senior administrator explains, “We make our admission standards lower than the other state system schools because of the commitment to access, and part of that commitment to access, I feel, needs to be to provide the remediation that students need. And I do not think we do a good job at that...By state policy we cannot provide remedial courses.¹¹ We cannot teach remedial courses because that is the community college responsibility, and we have developed partnerships with some of the metropolitan community colleges” (Interview with Janine Allen, Vice Provost and Dean for Enrollment and Student Services for PSU, August 1999). Although PSU has a co-admission program with some area community colleges, it does not have a formal remedial program in which students who have not passed placement exams take remedial courses at the community colleges while enrolled at the university. However, remedial courses are available from the community colleges. As PSU's Community College Liaison says, “I know the community colleges do a lot of remedial work, which is great because, well, we don’t. I mean the universities just don’t offer it, so that’s a great place” (Interview with Joan Seely, Coordinator of Community College Relations for PSU, August 1999).

Although there are no formal remediation programs, PSU does offer academic support, including: tutors from the department of mathematical sciences, the English as a Second Language Program, Student Support Services – Educational Opportunity Program, Tutorial and Learning Skills Program, and the Writing Lab (1999-2000 Portland State University Campus Resource Guide and Directory).

Current undergraduate course placement and advising procedures.

PSU does not require students to take placement exams. They had been offered in the past, but logistical and fiscal considerations ended the practice. According to PSU's Vice Provost for Enrollment, “We’re not longer doing placement exams and part of that has to do with the fiscal constraints. Because in order to do placement exams you’ve got to be able to provide the classes” (Interview with Janine Allen, Vice Provost and Dean for Enrollment and Student Services for PSU, August 1999). The freshman inquiry program, with its smaller class size and intensive writing, is one way to ensure that new students get instructional attention. However, supporting “companion” classes cannot be offered.

There is a writing diagnostic test at PSU because of the writing requirement for graduation. “A diagnostic writing assignment will be given during the first class session of WR 121. If a

¹¹ OUS policy prohibits awarding degree credit for remedial courses – that is, courses numbered 99 or lower.

student's writing ability is not at the appropriate level for the course, he or she will be dropped from the class and advised to take one of the preparatory courses.” (PSU Fall '99 Bulletin, p. 50) Courses numbered 0-99 are considered remedial or preparatory courses, but no writing courses below Writing 115 are listed in the PSU Bulletin.

Although there is no math requirement and no math placement exam offered university-wide, there are remedial math courses listed in the PSU Bulletin. Math 70 – Elementary Algebra, and Math 95 – Intermediate Algebra are offered, though, again, students enrolled in these courses do not receive degree credit. (PSU Fall '99 Bulletin) It is not clear whether students self-select for these courses or if there are class-specific math placement exams offered by individual faculty members that would recommend enrollment in these preparatory courses.

Policy Evolution: Former Admissions, Placement and Remediation Policies.

The establishment of the University Studies program in 1984 represented a significant shift what PSU believed was important for students to know and be able to do. The Vice Provost for Enrollment explains, “We have moved away from the distribution model for general education and have more of an interdisciplinary model where we try to teach skill within a specific context, but it is not a smorgasbord of disconnected classes.” She continues, “It was developed and it just happened...It was just one of those series of events that came into place that just all kind or work. And [the faculty] began to focus on students' success. And once they had the focus on students' success rather than focus on content, things started happening much differently than your traditional distribution requirements” (Interview with Janine Allen, Vice Provost and Dean for Enrollment and Student Services for PSU, August 1999).

At that time, the institutions throughout the OUS experienced changes in admissions. The Vice Provost for Enrollment remembers, “In 1984 we went through a major revision of our admission requirements. And at that time we identified a prescribed high school curriculum that we expected students to come with” (Interview with Janine Allen, Vice Provost and Dean for Enrollment and Student Services for PSU, August 1999).

These shifts in standards initially had a somewhat chilling effect on admissions at PSU. As the Director of Admissions describes, “I don't know whether that [understanding that there is capacity] percolates to the high school student level or the parent level because there was a time in the state system when we were asked to scale back on our admissions and be more selective; all the campuses were. And I think that that was an issue and I think that we saw a trend... in out-of-state migration for higher ed. And I think it's been a long time to reverse that kind of thinking, and I think parents who grew up under that timeframe, or have older children who did, are still thinking it's going to be tough to get my student into a state system school” (Interview with Agnes Hoffman, Director of Admissions and Records for PSU, August 1999).

The admission by exception rule has been reduced significantly – from around 25 percent to less than 5 percent. Although this reduction has not completely eliminated the admission of underprepared students, PSU has discontinued its placement program for cost and logistical reasons. As the Director of Admissions further explains, “The other problem was that it was difficult to put teeth in that. It was difficult to say, ‘You must take this level writing class or English class, and you may not take these other ones.’ It's very difficult to police. So, we have

postponed them because of the inability to implement it, but we would like to” (Interview with Agnes Hoffman, Director of Admissions and Records for PSU, August 1999).

Anticipated changes to Admissions, Placement and Remediation Policies.

Although there are ongoing discussions about student placement, it is not clear whether PSU will re-institute a placement program in the near future. However, there will be greater partnership with the area community colleges in an effort to make sure students are in the appropriate academic setting, given their needs, interests, and level of academic preparation. Aside from current partnerships with Clackamas and Mt. Hood Community Colleges, the Director of Admissions expects additional co-admission programs. “We have another small, community college closer to Salem that is very interested, and our hope is that we would bring it on next. [We also hope to work with] Portland Community College – that’s the biggest feeder school. The majority of our transfer students come from PCC” (Interview with Agnes Hoffman, Director of Admissions and Records for PSU, August 1999).

The current K-12 reforms will also change how PSU evaluates a student’s academic readiness. The Director of Admissions believes, “We’ll have more information about what the student’s educational background is composed of. You can go several layers... We know considerably more about what a student does or doesn’t know. And what remediation is required. So that’s, I think, an important aspect in success and in college to understand that and provide directions and advising for how to beef up those areas of deficiency” (Interview with Agnes Hoffman, Director of Admissions and Records for PSU, August 1999). Not only will students be evaluated differently for admission, the new, proficiency-based high school programs may be helpful in placing students more appropriately, whether or not there is a formal placement program in existence.

Because the K-12 reforms affect, to some degree, how admission officers evaluate applicants, it will be necessary for admission offices to disseminate those changes. As the Director of Admissions speculates,

I would suspect that we would have to do workshops and will have to do much more outreach from the higher education component to talk about what the transition means for students of high school level. And I think that we have to go deeper than that and talk to members of the community to engage parents and high schools students to help them understand what their CIM and CAM, how is that translated in terms of PASS, and what they need to know to become admitted. Because it is very clear now what they need to know: a GPA is a well-understood concept and so is an SAT or ACT [score]. Those two things are the most basic, simplistic methods of determining admissions, and they all understand it. And when you get to the new level of complexity, I think that we are going to have to go to the community and we are going to have to have forums and sessions and workshops to explain them. Otherwise, I think the people will not come to us. They will go to the community colleges or they will go elsewhere.

(Interview with Agnes Hoffman, Director of Admissions and Records for PSU, August 1999). As this statement suggests, not only is there a concern about admission process, but there is also an educational process that all parties will need to engage in until the new standards are understood as clearly as the old.

Beyond admission, there may be effects felt in other areas of the universities that are similarly to those discussed in the UO section. If the reforms have the intended effect, the Vice Provost for Enrollment believes,

Once the school reform efforts are fully implemented, we are going to have students coming to higher education who have been educated and have expectations and have been evaluated under a system much different than what higher education currently delivers. So I think that we may have a situation where K-12 may actually be influencing higher education. Because the students are going into a system that involved seat time and credits and grades, and you know they are going to present portfolios and the faculty members are going to go, 'What is this portfolio?'

Interview with Janine Allen, Vice Provost and Dean for Enrollment and Student Services for PSU, August 1999

In issues of compatibility of policy and flow of influence between educational systems, higher education is generally considered more influential on K-12 in many cases. A stronger influence from K-12 would be a significant shift.

Compatibility of Admission Policies and K-12 Standards.

As described above, it will likely be necessary for universities to alter how they communicate with schools and students once the reforms are fully implemented. Currently, it is unclear exactly how the reforms will impact the relationship between K-12 and higher education, or how higher education will respond. As the Director of Admissions describes,

[PASS] is what we are focused on, and there is a wait and see because the implementation time for CIM and CAM has not been met in the speed that they wanted to; there have been delays and postponements. We keep abreast of that as a state system through the office in Eugene, that office has orchestrated the collaboration between CIM and CAM in the past....None of us are jumping to conclusions. Actually, there was this hurry up phase. About three years ago we were in this push to become aware and prepare, but then there was hurry up and wait because of the delays. And now everyone is waiting to see what happens.

Interview with Agnes Hoffman, Director of Admissions and Records for PSU, August 1999

Higher education has a strong effect on K-12 policy, or at least on high school policy. The Vice Provost for Enrollment explains,

Right after the state legislation that mandated the CIM and the CAM there was a lot of concern about what was happening within the system, within education because you had the CIM and the CAM that were on one track, and all of a sudden you have PASS, which was coming up from behind and exceeded. And one of my concerns, and it continues to be my concern, is when we in higher education identify a prescribed high school curriculum we want students to come with, it felt like we were prescribing the high school curriculum for the high schools....And I think there was resistance on the

part of the K-12 people to say, whoa, wait a minute, we are not going to adopt your proficiencies, we need to develop our own. And on the other hand there was the haughtiness of higher education that always seems to get in our way and we are continuing to look at the possibility of two separate tracks that are not coordinated.

Interview with Janine Allen, Vice Provost and Dean for Enrollment and Student Services for PSU, August 1999

The final section of the Phase I portion of this report is the analysis of the information gathered on the state agency and public higher education system in Oregon and how these institutions affect K-16 education issues.

ANALYSIS OF OREGON'S K-16 TRANSITION POLICIES AND REFORMS

Oregon's educational policy environment has changed dramatically in the past ten years with the development and implementation of the CIM, CAM, and PASS. Oregon reforms are not yet at a point where they can be deemed a success or failure; it will take several more years to appreciate the full impact of the reforms. At this stage of reform, Oregon provides important "lessons learned" regarding broad issues such as policy alignment, innovative approaches to K-16 reform, building consensus and buy-in, and negotiating around issues of territoriality. From a more technical perspective, it is one of the first states to develop a proficiency-based higher education admission system that utilizes student work samples, to employ wide-scale teacher scoring and verification of student proficiencies, and to offer certificates of mastery for high school students to earn.

To understand, better, how the systems and processes described in this report respond to these changes, this concluding section offers analysis that addresses several areas:

- **The "state of the state" regarding K-16 related educational reform in Oregon.** This section addresses the evolution and flux of reform efforts, the continuing presence of legislated reform, the role of individuals in reform efforts, and why Oregon's efforts matter in a larger context of educational reform. It also addresses questions such as, Why develop and implement these reforms? Oregon students score highly on the SAT when compared to their national counterparts, and there is capacity in all the OUS institutions. What was the impetus behind each of the reforms? What is the role of each system (K-12 and higher education) in implementing these reforms?
- **Placement and higher education requirements.** University placement policies are traditionally under the purview of individual institutions of higher education. Consequently, placement requirements rarely enter into K-16 reform conversations. This section discusses how higher education placement and university exit requirements affect K-16 reform.
- **Collaboration and policy coherence.** Is there an institutional center for K-16 reform? Who "owns" these new joint efforts? How are people and systems working together? What is driving collaborative efforts? What are the incentives for collaboration?
- **Capacity.** What is the capacity of K-12 and higher education to implement these reforms? How have policymakers worked to grow the capacity of K-12 and higher education staff to implement these reforms?
- **Summary and future issues.** What are some of the effects of the reforms on higher education and the ODE (issues of development, implementation, and cultural shifts)? What has changed? What do stakeholders believe is working or not working? The effect of the reforms on K-12 stakeholders is discussed in the Phase II chapter of this report.

The State of the State

Given the multiple reform efforts in Oregon, and the changes being made to those reforms, the research team expected to find educators, researchers, and other practitioners in a state of relative confusion and frustration regarding the new reforms. Asking educators and administrators to change the way they teach and assess students can create confusion and frustration. As one ODE official remarked, "We can't ask [teachers] to do anything that doesn't make sense. And they're not hesitant about saying, 'this doesn't make sense' " (Interview with Dawn Billings, Coordinator, ODE Office of Curriculum and Field Services, August, 1999). Responding in part to practitioners' needs and concerns, the creators of CIM, CAM and PASS have continually modified the content, the assessments, the requirements and the procedures. Much of this evolution has been anticipated and was even built into the design and implementation timelines. By phasing in approximately one subject per year, policymakers have worked to develop plausible implementation timeframes.

The 1995 amendment to the original 1991 Educational Act modified the CIM and CAM's implementation schedule and reduced the number of work samples. It has been challenging for schools to adopt and implement the new standards and assessments, particularly given the many changes and modifications to the systems.

Despite these challenges, however, a distinguishing characteristic of the Oregon educational reforms to this point is their longevity. The original legislation that mandated the statewide assessments – including CIM and CAM – is almost ten years old. PASS began seven years ago. Although they are somewhat different than their original incarnations, the reforms have, to some degree, been institutionalized. The ODE and PASS have departments and staff responsible for the reforms, and, in PASS' case, there has been a shift from referring to the reform as the "PASS Project" to just "PASS" because of concerns that "project" implied a shorter longevity.

Several respondents stated that developing and implementing education reforms in Oregon is easier than it is in other states because all of the major education “players” can convene in one room. It is clear that to some extent individuals’ personalities and efforts have shaped how the reforms are received. As will be discussed a bit below, this strong association with individuals may also affect collaborative efforts and ownership issues in both positive and negative ways.

Placement and higher education requirements

As in most states, there is little uniformity in the public university placement testing process in Oregon. Portland State no longer offers placement tests university-wide for budget and logistical reasons. PSU officials are concerned, too, that it may not be able to meet, appropriately, the needs revealed by the tests, due to the fact that PSU doesn't offer recognized remedial coursework. The University of Oregon does require its students to take placement tests for math and writing. Since placement policies are determined on a department-by-department basis, there is little discussion, either in the university system or on the campuses, about the effect of a high stakes test given one time under conditions that may be confusing, with little or no preparation possible by the test-takers.

Another issue that is rarely discussed in policy arenas is how placement exams relate to university entrance and graduation requirements. The connection between college admissions, placement, and college graduation is not always a clear one for students. Neither the UO or PSU requires math for graduation, but, based on subject area and level requirements, both institutions expect that prospective students have a certain level of proficiency in math.

Collaboration and Policy Coherence

Since the two major concurrent reform efforts in the state originated from separate systems -- the state-mandated certificates of mastery from the Oregon Department of Education and PASS from the Oregon University System, all interviewees viewed collaboration across systems as crucial. There is some degree of collaboration between the systems; each reform plan includes steps targeted at working with the other. For example, the CAM development team is trying to determine how to learn from, and align to, PASS (CAM Development Timeline Document, ODE, August, 2000). And the OUS recognized that not all applicants to the university system will have the opportunity to demonstrate PASS proficiencies; consequently, it is refining its standards and working to align with ODE's standards so that if students earn a CIM, they will automatically meet some of the PASS proficiencies.

Stereotypes about agencies and institutions created some initial barriers to effective collaboration. State Departments of Education are generally viewed as bureaucratic entities that are usually not responsive or innovative – two characteristics that have been needed during Oregon's decade of reform. Universities are usually seen as ivory towers that are interested in K-12 students insofar as they will benefit the university. Traditionally, there are not K-16 governing or policymaking boards, so collaboration must occur across historically entrenched separations. Interviewees consistently stated that stereotypes exist, but need to be disregarded in order to succeed with the current reform agendas.

PASS documents and interviews with PASS staff suggest that they have worked to align the PASS proficiencies to the state benchmarks to ensure that students will not have to master two separate sets of skills. PASS staff often stated that they are trying to drive alignment, since ODE often functions at a slower pace than does the PASS office; however, they are aware of the need to negotiate through the changing K-12 reforms, while developing a solid plan for PASS.

At the same time, state department staff has been under the pressure of a state mandate. Consequently, their energies have been focused primarily on trying to follow their own timeline for the standards and assessments according to the requirements of the Education Act. Their examples of collaboration focused more on working with teachers and school staff, as well as experts in the field, to develop the standards and assessments. Interviewees in ODE and in OUS expressed the view that they were always waiting to see if the other system's reform was going to take hold before solidifying collaborative efforts. For the most part, any collaboration between the systems has occurred because individuals have recognized that two systems running on parallel tracks will create confusion for schools and students. Although there is a Joint Board of Education that provides a forum for the systems to work together, that group has not served as the impetus for K-16 collaboration in Oregon. Its purview has been more focused on community

colleges, it is understaffed, and it is not viewed as having the representation needed to push new ideas forth (Interview with PASS staff, August 1999).

OUS developed PASS to improve students' academic preparation for higher education even there are no capacity problems in Oregon's higher education institutions, students score highly on the SAT and other assessments as compared to states across the country, and there are not data on remediation for the OUS or individual institutions. Rather, it was concerned about the effect of the CIM and the CAM on student achievement and learning. In other states, the issue of remediation of underprepared college students has been a driving force for collaboration. This issue, while important, is not as strong a force in Oregon – probably because there is little public information about remediation needs and about the efficacy of remedial programs. Few entities in the state collect, track, and publicize remediation statistics (Interviews with Jim Arnold, Director, Community College Articulation, OUS, July 2000; David Espinoza, Coordinator for Testing Services, UO, February, 2000).

When the Oregon legislature mandated new standards and assessments, leading to the CIM and CAM, the higher education community began to think about what those certificates meant in terms of college readiness. Several OUS stakeholders stated that, when the legislation was passed, there was concern regarding the quality of the proposed CIM and CAM. OUS wanted to lead the way in terms of the development of K-16 transition policy development. While ODE was creating its standards, the OUS drafted its own version of what it expected college-ready students to know and be able to do. After the initial stages of development, when they began to get feedback from those affected by the reforms, the systems began to work together to align their expectations and policies.

Since PASS is not a legislatively mandated reform, it might not take hold; therefore, if it aligns with the CIM, it could gain more visibility and staying power. The flipside of that is if the CIM disappears under the weight of its political and logistical problems, PASS staff does not want to be tied to it too tightly. The main incentive for collaboration for K-12– or at least those at the high school level – is to make sure their students are eligible to be admitted to OUS institutions. There is also a widespread feeling, discussed by most interviewees, that Oregonians like being on the forefront of innovative reform. At the same time, the legislature is concerned about the cost of reform and education in general. The Governor is more globally-focused than the legislature, which has helped garner support for the development of K-16 reforms. Education governance and policy control have shifted to the Governor and the legislature over the past decade, which also sets the stage for more K-16 policymaking.

Cross-system collaboration is unusual, since, in most states, higher education does not enter into K-16 reform in such a large-scale fashion. Higher education systems traditionally are reluctant to step into the political fray created by the more frequently changing K-12 reforms. K-12 agendas change when governors and education commissioners change; higher education tends to be more stable and, consequently, is fearful of becoming tethered to K-12.

Oregon now faces several additional collaboration-related issues. The interviews at PSU and UO illuminated the need for a state-level K-16 data system, and one is being developed. Practitioners and researchers at both institutions, and at the ODE and OUS, do not have a clear

sense of students' success as they transverse through the K-16 pipeline. K-12 student data are not connected with student-level data from community colleges and four-year institutions of higher education. The educational entities in Oregon cannot track student success at any level (individual; disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, and so forth; or aggregated) going from high school to community college, from community college to four-year institutions, and from high school through graduating from college. The state also does not have data tying together teacher preparation programs with consequent teacher and student success in the classroom. Such data could be used for such purposes as college placement, to design new outreach programs, to evaluate existing outreach programs, or to refine existing assessments and curricula. It could also be used in a K-16 accountability system and where outcomes would be tied to incentives.

Capacity-building

Higher Education. Administrators at both the UO and PSU are aware that it is necessary for them and their staffs to evaluate, appropriately, the standards and assessment results from both CIM and PASS. Because the Admissions Director at UO helped design the PASS transcript and Admissions Directors at both institutions participated in development and training for PASS, they have some sense of what to expect, though they have had very few PASS applicants. Because the CIM has undergone some change, it is still not clear how the certificate and assessment results will be used in higher education admission and placement processes. Both Admission Directors have gone through phases of "hurry up and wait" in determining what will be required of them to evaluate transcripts with CIM assessments. The CAM does not seem to be a concern for higher education at this point; this is partially because it is still in development, and in part because most applicant apply in the fall of the senior year will not have completed CAM requirements by that point in time.

K-12. PASS requires a large shift in teaching, and in teachers' involvement in assessment. PASS teachers (2-3) per school seems to receive appropriate training from PASS staff; however, it is not clear how widely that information and training is disseminating on school sites by PASS teachers. At the same time, teachers have had to copy with new standards and assessments related to the CIM. ODE staff are available to answer questions from local school staff, and the ODE created sample assessments, materials and scoring guides for teachers. Many high schools have appointed a CIM point person or team to address concerns and needs for the school. It is not clear, however, if schools and teachers are expected to do their own on-site training or if there are statewide professional development opportunities on the standards and assessments. Phase II reports more deeply on teacher exposure to, and opportunities for, training for both PASS and the CIM.

Summary

It is difficult to predict the effects Oregon's reform efforts will have on the structure of schools, teaching, and learning – and on educators within the schools. This study occurred at a time of great policy flux, and a time in which governance and policy are transitioning from local control to a greater level of state oversight.

The legal mandates behind CIM and CAM suggest that they will affect more students than PASS, but it is not clear yet whether they will become embedded in school culture and will truly change teaching and learning. Since PASS implementation began in the 2000-2001 year, it is too early to gauge its statewide effects. Up until 2000, the PASS focus has been on the mission, vision, and technical aspects, rather than on implementation. To date, PASS is in sixty-five schools in the state and affects approximately 2-4 classrooms in each of those schools. Consequently, the PASS proficiencies are not yet deeply embedded in school culture across the state. PASS cannot be considered high stakes because it is not yet fully implemented and the stakes have not been determined. At one point a PASS transcript was going to be required of Oregon applicants, but now it is recommended. Those applying to the university system will encounter some PASS information, but, because it is not required for admission, a non-PASS background will not prevent students from being admissible to Oregon public universities.

PASS' staff has worked to ensure that OUS and admission offices across the state are supportive of the mission, vision, and logistics involved in the reform. Its mission and vision have not included changing higher education instruction. Many interviewees expressed concern that students who are used to demonstrating their abilities in holistic ways based on explicit rubrics and standards may not respond well to a lecture course with several hundred people and multiple choice exams. The Associate Vice President for Student Affairs and former Dean of Admissions at UO shared an anecdote about a town hall meeting in which UO students were upset about the lecture style of the teaching, and professors were concerned that their students could not learn. If these current reforms succeed in changing the style and content of K-12 teaching and learning, higher education might be faced with new challenges.

From the K-12 perspective, currently, neither the CIM nor the CAM is required for graduation from any high school in Oregon.¹² Neither is required for entry into an OUS institution or a community college. Although the standards and assessments are legally required, the stakes for students are not high. Several high schools have, however, developed their own CIMs that are aligned with the state CIM. That approach will be discussed more in the Phase II section of this report. There are, however, higher stakes for schools and districts. Their success, according to state-issued Report Cards, includes some measure of how students perform on the state-mandated assessments in grades 3, 5, 8 and 10 (CIM).

Although CIM, and the standards and assessments leading up to it, has survived for almost a decade, it is possible that the enduring legacy of the reform may be a single, regularly administered assessment. The ODE has already reduced the required number of work samples, and most of the interviewees focused more on the assessments than on any other aspect of the CIM. It is not clear what the ramifications would be for this kind of system. If the assessment is authentic and students are taught and learn in a different way, perhaps the reform has met the stated mission. While no one is actively talking about a single certificate with different levels of achievement that would represent the full range of student achievement (from basic CIM skills to highest PASS proficiency), it is not unreasonable to consider that as a way to bring together the reforms.

¹² One high school did institute a CIM requirement for graduation, but the requirement was dropped a year later.

As the implementation efforts gain momentum, Oregon will continue to be an important case study for other states proposing large-scale education reforms. Despite multiple efforts that sometimes seem at crossed purposes, and despite concerns of overextended schools and staffs, Oregon education does look different than it did a generation ago. The effects of these reforms on K-12 stakeholders from four Oregon high schools in the greater Portland metropolitan area are discussed in a forthcoming report. It covers the findings and analysis from the second phase of the field research – an investigation of how K-12 stakeholders receive, interpret, and act upon K-16 transition policies.

APPENDIX A: IHE AND STATE AGENCY PROTOCOLS

IHE Protocol

Section One: Initial Information

Date:

Names and titles of respondents:

Number of beginning freshmen students in entering fall, 1998/1999 class (specify unit, e.g., campus, system):

Number of students in entering 1998/1999 class who came directly from K-12 institutions:

Ethnic/racial breakdown of students in entering 1998/1999 class (percentage or numbers):

Of entering freshmen, how many are required to be tested for placement? Of this number, how many will be tested by the beginning of fall classes, 1998/1999?

Of financial aid packages offered, what percentage were merit based?

Are there any particular characteristics about this IHE that set it apart from others in the system (e.g., the strength/focus on specific subject, different requirements, etc.)?

List of primary feeder high schools, particularly within region of study.

Section Two: Description of Institution's Current Admission and Placement Policies

General Information about Policies:

Governance and policymaking:

Please describe the general procedure through which university admission and placement policies are established and modified - in terms of who is involved, how often are the policies are revised, etc.

What is the governance structure like from the System perspective? How much autonomy do you have within the system?

Basic application procedures:

Obtain information on the following: where applications are sent and filtered (e.g., institution-level, campus-level, department-level)?

Time frames for applications (admission and merit aid)?

How or if admission and merit aid applications work together or separately; student notification of acceptance and upcoming placement procedures

Decision-making time frames: Are they decided right away? Are deferrals made? How often are incoming applications reviewed? Does admission stay open until the application deadline, or does it close earlier due to high competition?

Basic placement procedures: Describe any formal procedures for placing students into classes? When are advising/placement decisions made?

Current Undergraduate Admission Policies:

What are the current undergraduate admission policies at your university? How are your admissions policies different from those of other System campuses?

What type of local campus or departmental/college discretion is allowed? Can students be admitted into a different program if they are denied admission to the applied-for program? How is the application transferred to a different program? Who makes these decisions?

Do these policies vary by department, school, or other sub-unit within the university?

How do university and department/college admissions relate? (e.g., how do the offices work together? How is a paper trail established? How much does the Admissions Office pre-screen for the colleges? What percentage of the admission decisions are made without college involvement -- "automatic" or "obvious" acceptances/denials?)

Obtain specific information on the use of the following - how much does each of these count in the admissions process? Are these required or supplemental information?

- (a) High school graduation;
- (b) Test scores (specify which tests; what cut-offs if any; if applicable, specify use of conversion charts, created by whom? What,s the highest score used if multiple tests?);
- (c) High school GPA (how are grade inflation and differences in grading scales handled? when is this computed?);
- (d) High school class rank (specify how and when this is calculated, including treatment of AP and honors courses; what are the procedures for handling applicants from a high school does not rank its students?);
- (e) Required coursework (be specific);
- (f) Recommendation letters
- (g) Personal statements
- (h) State residency
- (i) Status of sending high school

other criteria?

In the future, what role will PASS/CIM/CAM play?

What types of other admission guidelines are used? (e.g., course catalogue "strongly encourages" ___)

Specifically, please describe any "index" or scale that is used for admissions decisions.

In consideration of the application, is there a "checklist" of things to look for or a method for normalizing individual rankings? (e.g., extra consideration if math SAT/ACT exceeds ___ and person applied to a math program; high school class under 100; applicant from a low-sending region)

Who makes the final admission decision? (e.g., admission office, committee -- specify, Dean). What about for borderline cases?

Does this institution have a policy regarding:

- Limits on the number of students that may be admitted who do not meet stated admission requirements?
- A minimum level for conditional admission, below which no student may be admitted?

Who or what group makes admissions policies? Describe group and process.

Current Undergraduate Course Placement Policies:

In terms of placement, is there a university placement exam(s)? If there, s a university exam(s), please describe -- what subjects, who developed it, etc.?

What types of remediation needs do freshmen students matriculating directly from the K-12 system typically have?

What is the current percentage of students requiring remediation at your institution? (if by course subject or department, specify) Has this figure been constant, decreasing, or increasing over the past ten years? (be as specific as possible)

Who collects, maintains, and monitors these data?

What types of data are maintained regarding tracking/follow-up of students receiving remediation? If such data are maintained, how are they used?

Can remediation affect a student, s financial aid package? Could admission be postponed or reassessed if remedial needs are severe?

In your opinion, what causes the need for remediation?

Are the results of placement tests reported back to high schools?

- When do results get reported?
- How detailed are the results? (e.g., broken down by race/ethnicity, gender, class, grade, individual)
- Who receives these results and how are results used for improvement?

How do high school teachers learn about the contents of and consequences associated with IHE placement tests?

Policy Exceptions:

What are the exceptions made to these policies -- or, in what situations do you deviate from the written policies? (Prompts and examples: what if student has not met high school course unit

specification for entrance; what about talented student athletes? legacies?). Who makes these decisions?

In your opinion, what impact have these admission requirements had on improving student success in the freshman year of college?

Specifically, what impact have they had on:

- Increasing the number of freshmen who exceed minimal admission requirements?
- Reducing the number of freshmen needing remediation?
- Increasing the number of freshmen from underrepresented groups?
- Improving the academic preparation of freshmen from underrepresented groups?
- Improving student retention?
- What types of data are maintained to track this type of information?

In what year were these policies updated?

- Who or what entity has responsibility for updating policies?
- Under what circumstances are changes made?

Section Three: Policy Evolution--Former Policies and Possible Changes to Existing Policies

Former Policies:

What were your institution's prior policies (e.g., past ten years) regarding: (a) admission, (b) placement, and (c) remediation?

Describe the historical evolution of the policies:

- How have the policies changed over the past ten years?
- In general, why have the policies changed?
- Who/what initiated the changes? Whose approval had to be sought? Can anyone initiate policy changes?
- What was the route the proposal followed?
- How often are policies reviewed?
- What effects have the policy changes had? Were these effects intended or anticipated?

What factors led up to the policy change(s)?

Have the new policies affected the institution's national or state rankings?

Anticipated Changes to Policies:

Are there currently discussions about changing university admission, advising/placement, and/or remediation, policies in the future? If yes...

- Why?
- What are the proposed changes and why are they being proposed?
- Who or what entities have been the primary initiator(s) of these changes?
- Who (e.g., institution, level) would implement these proposed changes?
- What autonomy does this campus institution have in making these changes?

Have specific targets or goals been established or proposed that are relevant for admission, placement, remediation, and/or merit aid policies at your institution? If yes...

- Why?
- What are the proposed goals?
- Who or what entities have proposed/established the goals/targets?
- Who would be required to make necessary changes to enable these goals/targets to be met?

What types of changes (if any) are being considered/have been implemented (department, campus, state--specify which unit) in the wake of the 1996 Hopwood decision?

Section Four: Compatibility of Admission Policies and K-12 Standards

What kind of involvement does the university have in terms of being aware of the CIM/CAM/PASS (involvement in high schools in general re: K-12 standards)?

Are there regularly scheduled meetings, joint task forces: Who attends? Who sponsors? How is the information used and by whom?

Please describe any process that is followed to ensure that K-12 state officials are aware of state university admission policies and placement exam contents.

Are there regularly scheduled meetings, joint task forces: Who attends? Who sponsors? How is the information used and by whom?

What opportunities are there in the state for multiple uses of standards and assessments? (e.g., do state IHEs use the results of any end of high school exam for placement?) In your opinion, would this type of sharing be possible or useful for the state?

How does the university inform high school teachers, counselors, administrators, parents, students, and community members about the following:

- Admission policies
- Content of, and consequences associated with, any IHE placement tests
- Remediation policies

Please describe the process through which your institution informs these individuals and groups about any new changes in policy.

In an ideal world, what would be the connections, or linkages, between K-12 and higher education?

Closing: Ask respondents if they are available for follow-up questions in the future.

Documents to Request:

- Mission statement of IHE--system and campus, if appropriate
- Official IHE policies regarding: admission, remediation, placement
- If applicable coordinating board policies re: IHE policies/missions
- Relevant institutional statistics
- Admission and advising/placement test/procedures packets, and/or college publications for prospective students and/or counselors
- Relevant internal documents, e.g. Faculty Senate guidelines, checklist of factors, formula charts, Special Admit guidelines
- IHE statement of competencies or expectations of incoming students

- Copies of IHE placement exams
- State legislation regarding IHE policies and/or mission(s)
- Official K-12 policies regarding: assessment, content and performance standards, curriculum frameworks

Interview Protocol for State Agencies

What was the impetus for each of the current reform efforts (besides the legislation)?

What is the role of the higher ed board? What is its role in PASS? Where is the institutional center for this set of reforms? ODE? If so, why? If so, will it be successful - does it have what is needed to institutionalize the reform efforts? What is the ODE's capacity right now with regard to overseeing the CIM, CAM, and PASS?

Is CAM necessary? Can students go from CIM to PASS?

How inter-connected are CIM and PASS right now? How inter-connected will they be (down the road)?

Can PASS be used as a statewide higher education placement tool?

Please describe the current assessments used with relation to the CIM. CAM? PASS? Please describe the teacher scoring system - development, teacher selection, process, and training. How have teachers responded to this? What kind of content matching analysis is being done?

Please describe the current political environment (e.g., a relatively conservative legislature and liberal governor) and any anticipated impact(s) it might have on the ed reforms.

Please describe the general procedure through which the CIM/CAM/PASS were established and modified - in terms of the motivating forces, who was involved, how often have policies been revised, etc.

What is the governance structure like in ODE (e.g., who "runs" CIM and the CAM and how did that evolve?)?

How do the ODE and the Legislature interact – please describe the relationship between the two entities (currently and historically)?

Please describe the current political environment in the state regarding OR's educational reform movement (prompt: What role has the Legislature had in the development of the CIM and the CAM?...what has been the legislature's - and key committee staff's - role...)

Could you describe a brief history of the evolution of the PASS/CIM/CAM? Any anticipated changes to the PASS/CIM/CAM?

How does the System Office/ODE inform districts and high schools about new PASS/CAM/CIM changes (how do high schools -- and universities -- learn about changes to the PASS/CAM)? What are the dissemination strategies? Who is responsible for getting the information out? (e.g., is there someone's name on it?)

How do high schools learn how to help students prepare for the PASS?

What happens to students who don't pass the CIM/CAM/PASS? What resources are available to help them pass?

How does the intent and content of the current CIM/CAM/PASS compare to their original intent and content?

Can you compare (content, objectives, specifications) the exit-level CIM/CAM/PASS?

Accountability: How are schools and districts held accountable for implementing CIM/CAM/PASS? How has the accountability structure evolved and why has it evolved the way it has? How will they be held accountable in the future – any changes in the accountability structure planned for the future and if so, why?

Are remediation data collected by the system, the individual universities, or by a state agency? If so, what tests are used to gauge remediation needs? If not, how have policymakers been able to ensure that PASS proficiencies will reduce remediation needs?

If there are data collected: have university remediation needs across the state been increasing or decreasing over time?

Do you talk with university officials about any campus-level remediation/placement exams that are used? Is it common for a campus to use its own remediation/placement test?

Do you think the current use and content of the CIM/CAM/PASS are appropriate/on target? If not, what would you change?

What kind of involvement does the [agency/department/division] have in the development of CIM/CAM/PASS (whichever is not directly an agency/department/division responsibility)?

Are there regularly scheduled meetings, joint task forces for the CIM/CAM/PASS? Who attends? Who sponsors? How is the information used and by whom?

Please describe any process that is followed to ensure that K-12 state educators are aware of state university admission policies and placement exam contents.

What opportunities are there in the state for multiple uses of standards and assessments? (e.g., do state IHEs use the results of any end of high school exam for placement?) In your opinion, would this type of sharing be possible or useful for the state?

How does the [agency] inform high school teachers, counselors, administrators, parents, students, and community members about status, and changes in, the CIM, CAM, and PASS?

Please describe the process through which your [agency] informs these individuals and groups about any new changes in policy.

In an ideal world, what would be the connections, or linkages, between K-12 and higher education?

APPENDIX B: PHASE I INTERVIEWS

The following interviews have been conducted for Phase I of the Oregon case study:

May 17-May 19, 1999:

Dave Conley, Ph.D., Executive Director, PASS, Oregon University System and Associate Professor, University of Oregon

Shirley Clark, Ph.D., Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Oregon University System

Martha Pitts, Admission Director, University of Oregon

Lynde Paule, Ph.D., researcher and evaluator, PASS Office, University of Oregon System

Colleen Mileham, Ph.D., Coordinator, Curriculum and Instruction, Professional Technical Education, Oregon Dept of Education

Joanne Flint, Associate Superintendent of the Office of Curriculum and Field Services, Oregon Department of Education

Tom Chenoweth, Ph.D., Professor of Education, Portland State University

Agnes A. Hoffman, Director, Admissions and Records, Portland State University

August 13-August 20, 1999:

Janine Allen, Ph.D., Vice Provost and Dean for Enrollment and Student Services, Portland State University

Shirley Clark, Ph.D., Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Oregon University System

Dalton Miller-Jones, Ph.D., Professor, Psychology and Development, Education and Work, Portland State University

Agnes A. Hoffman, Director, Admissions and Records, Portland State University

Martha Pitts, Admission Director, University of Oregon

Holly K. Zenville, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Oregon University System

Dawn Billings, Coordinator, Office of Curriculum and Field Services, Oregon Dept of Education

Bob Olson, Assessment Development, PASS Office, Oregon University System and Oregon Department of Education

John Moseley, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, University of Oregon

Colleen Mileham, Ph.D., Coordinator, Curriculum and Instruction, Professional Technical Education, Oregon Dept of Education

Joyce Benjamin, Assoc. Superintendent Federal Programs, Oregon Dept of Education

Dave Conley, Ph.D., Executive Director, PASS, Oregon University System and Associate Professor, University of Oregon

January 31, 2000 – February 4, 2000

David McDonald, Director, Enrollment Services and High School Relations for the OUS, Oregon University System

David Espinoza, Coordinator of Testing Services, University of Oregon

Jim Buch, Associate Vice President for Student Academic Affairs, University of Oregon

Dalton Miller Jones, Professor, Psychology and Development, Education, and Work, Portland State University

Joan Seely, Coordinator of Community College Relations, Portland State University

Tina Criswell, Transition Advisor, Clackamas Community College

July 12, 2000

Christine Tell, Ph.D., Director of Implementation, PASS, Oregon University System

Jim Arnold, Ph.D., Director, Community College Articulation, Oregon University System

APPENDIX C: TIMELINE OF STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT

March - August 1995	Teams of parents, teachers, business and community representatives develop the first draft of academic content standards for kindergarten through grade 10 in English, mathematics, science, the social sciences (history, civics, geography, economics), the arts and second languages. The Oregon Department of Education seeks public feedback on the first draft and receives more than 1,000 written comments.
Sept. – Dec. 1995	The Department works with groups of parents, teachers and others to revise the first draft to reflect the comments received and produce a second draft.
January 1996	The Department holds 29 public meetings around the state to gather public comments on the second draft. In addition to oral comments at the meetings, the Department receives more than 1,000 additional written comments.
Feb. – March 1996	The Department works with groups of parents, teachers and others to revise the second draft to reflect the comments received and produce a third draft. Public comment is sought and the third draft is revised to reflect comments received.
April 1996	The State Board of Education gives initial approval to the academic content standards for kindergarten through grade 10 in English, mathematics, science, the social sciences (history, civics, geography, economics), the arts and second languages and the performance standards in English and mathematics. This is the first step toward formally adopting the standards.
May – June 1996	With help from parents, teachers and others, the Department produces its first draft of grade 12 standards. The Department holds 24 public meetings around the state to gather feedback on the grade 12 standards.
July 1996	A panel of national experts reviews Oregon’s proposed content and performance standards. The panel issues a report, commending Oregon for being the first state to request scrutiny of its proposed standards by an outside team of experts. The report describes Oregon’s standards as rigorous and highlights the state’s testing system as a powerful tool to hold students accountable for achieving the standards.
August 1996	The Department holds a public meeting in Salem to gather additional comments on the proposed kindergarten through grade 10 academic content and performance standards. About 45 people attend the hearing. The Department revises the proposed standards based on oral and written comments received.
Sept.	The State Board of Education adopts the proposed kindergarten through grade

1996	10 academic content and performance standards. This is the final step in the adoption process.
Dec. 1996	The State Board of Education adopts the proposed grade 12 academic content and career-related learning standards.
School year 1998-99	Students in grade 10 in 1998-99 will be in the first class to be held accountable for achieving the new standards. Students who meet the grade 10 standards in English and mathematics will receive a Certificate of Initial Mastery, certifying their achievement of high academic standards.

(<http://www.ode.state.or.us/cimcam/howstandards.htm>)

APPENDIX D: TRANSFER POLICIES FOR TRANSFER BETWEEN OREGON COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND OUS

AA/OT Guidelines

Any student who holds an Oregon community college AAOT degree that conforms to the guidelines set forth below and who transfers to any institution in the Oregon University System will have met the lower division general education requirements of that institution's baccalaureate degree programs. Course, class standing, or GPA requirements for specific majors, departments or schools are not necessarily satisfied by an Associate of Arts degree. Students transferring under this agreement will have junior standing for registration purposes.

Each Oregon community college offers an AAOT degree that meets these broad guidelines. A minimum of 90 credits will be required for the degree, and of these, at least 58 will conform to the general education and distribution requirements listed below. (All credit references are based on quarter credits.)

General Requirements

- **Writing:** Nine credits of writing courses, with a grade of C- or better in each course. WR 121, 122, and 123 or 127.
- **Mathematics:** Four credits of college-level mathematics, for which at least Intermediate Algebra is a prerequisite, with a grade of C- or better.
- **Oral Communication/Rhetoric:** Three credits of a fundamentals of speech or communication course with a grade of C- or better.

Distribution Requirements:

- **Arts and Letters:** A minimum of twelve credits, chosen from at least two disciplines, with no more than nine credits from one discipline.
- **Social Sciences:** A minimum of fifteen credits, chosen from at least two disciplines, with no more than nine credits from one discipline.
- **Science/math/Computer Science:** A minimum of fifteen credits (including at least twelve credits in biological or physical sciences with laboratories), chosen from at least two disciplines.

Electives

Electives will comprise about thirty-two credits, depending on the student's selection of courses to meet the requirements above. Effective fall term 1998, WR 115 may be included in the AAOT degree as an elective – providing that the WR 115 course at the community college has been approved by the Department of Community Colleges and Workforce Development.

Effective fall term 1998, community colleges may grant AAOT degrees that include up to 12 professional-technical credits as electives. Community colleges shall identify and publicize those professional-technical credits available on its campus that are appropriate for inclusion in the AAOT degree.

Principles for Practice: Transfer Student Admission and the Proficiency-Based Admission Standards System

The OUS affirms that:

- PASS was developed primarily in response to K-12 school reform efforts in the State of Oregon and has always been intended to guide admission of the first-time freshmen coming to the OUS from the state's public (as well as private) secondary schools.
- First-time freshmen applicants to OUS institutions are evaluated on the basis of their high school academic work.
- The public baccalaureate-granting institutions have a long-standing policy of accepting and encouraging applicants to pursue transfer routes. Through this mechanism of admission, an applicant who has completed a minimum number of college credits is evaluated on the basis of his/her already-completed college-level course work.
- Given the historical distinctions between first-time freshmen admission and transfer admission, a comparable approach to transfer student admission under PASS seems reasonable.
- As the OUS works toward full implementation of PASS by Fall 2005 and beyond, distinctions will continue to be made between first-time freshmen admission and transfer admission.

Admission of First-time Freshmen

First-time freshmen applicants, for which PASS proficiencies are applicable, should come from the pool of recent Oregon high-school graduates. Admissions decisions on these students will be made on the basis of the knowledge and skills attained in high school as compared to a set of proficiency standards. PASS proficiencies will become the preferred mode of admission for those entering in the fall 2005. High schools will be expected to determine how both the student's high school and college course work (completed as part of their high school studies, such as dual credit) will map to proficiencies required for PASS.

Admission of Transfer Students

Transfer student applicants, for which PASS proficiencies are not applicable, should come from the pool of students already engaged in college-level work and who have accumulated the 24-36 credit hours required by the receiving OUS institution (in line with current policy).

Admission of First-time Freshmen with Transfer Credits

Many students will apply to OUS institutions for which the following is true:

- Attended/graduated from an Oregon high school, and
- Attended an Oregon (or other) community college, and
- Earned fewer than the 24-36 credit hours needed to be considered for transfer admission.

These students, in line with current practice, will be evaluated on the basis of their high school record and admitted as first-time freshmen even though they will bring with them some record of college-level work.

For some time, each student case will need to be considered unique as OUS admission staff, OUS and community college faculty, and PASS (in conjunction with Oregon high school teachers), can gather enough information by map or correlate community college course work with PASS proficiencies.

(JBAC Website, July 31, 2000)

APPENDIX E: PASS STANDARDS

PASS English Proficiency Standards, Required and Recommended, for OUS Admissions, 2000

	Required	Strongly Recommended
A. Read from a variety of literary genres and periods		X
B. Interpret literary works	X	
C. Analyze relationships of the Humanities and human/social experience		X
D. Conduct inquiry and research	X	
E. Communicate in oral, visual, and written forms		X
F. Write for varied purposes*	X	

*May be met by CIM

Required = minimum for admission to OUS institutions.

Strongly Recommended = for scholarship consideration, advanced placement, and university credit.

(“An Introductory Guide to PASS for Secondary School Administrators,” prepared by The Confederation of Oregon School Administrators, The OASSA Issues Forum, and PASS, 2000, p. 4).

Example PASS Proficiency Standards and Criteria for English, 2000¹³

Proficiency Standard What students must be able to do:	Criteria What students should demonstrate:
<p>A: Read from a variety of literary genres and periods Read and respond to a broad selection of literature from a variety of historical periods, cultures, literary perspectives, and genres, including poetry, novels, short stories, essays, and drama; understand the characteristics of literary genres, periods, and movements.</p>	<p>A1: Breadth and depth of literary experience: Read and respond to works of recognized literary merit from a variety of historical periods, cultures, and genres.</p>
<p>B: Interpret literary works Analyze literary forms, elements, devices, and themes to interpret and critique literary texts, performances, and media.</p>	<p>B1: Analysis of literary elements and devices Recognize, examine, and understand the uses and effects of literary elements, rhetorical devices, and</p>

¹³ Proficiency standards and related criteria for A-C are provided as examples. D-F are not included.

	<p>themes within and among literary works.</p> <p>B2: Interpretation and use of textual evidence: Use textual evidence to develop and support an interpretation of a literary work</p> <p>B3: Criticism: Use introductory ideas and approaches of literary criticism in analyzing and critiquing a literary work.</p>
<p>C: Analyze relationships of the Humanities and human/social experience Explain how literature and the humanities reflect, influence, and comment upon human experiences and societal assumptions, traditions, structures, and changes.</p>	<p>C1: Understanding of contextual and biographical influences: Explain how works from the humanities are influenced by historical, social, cultural, political, literary or creative contexts and by individual experiences.</p> <p>C2: Understanding of Social/Cultural Representations: Examine how works from the humanities characterize individuals, groups, and cultures.</p> <p>C3: Understanding of Social/Cultural Commentary: Explain social/cultural perspectives, themes, and commentary, and examine techniques used to promote or critique social change in works from the humanities.</p>

(“An Introductory Guide to PASS for Secondary School Administrators,” prepared by The Confederation of Oregon School Administrators, The OASSA Issues Forum, and PASS, 2000, p.5).

English Assessment Guidelines for PASS, June 2000

PASS Standard	ASSESSMENT METHODS AND PERFORMANCE LEVELS			
	Assessment Method (one method required per standard)	Rating Required to Equal:		
		Meets Proficiency	High-level mastery	Exemplary
A: Read from a variety of literary genres and periods	PASS Teacher Verification	M	H	E
B: Interpret literary works	PASS Teacher Verification	M	H	E
	SAT II Comparative Literature	520	690	750
	AP/English Literature/Composition	3	4	5
	IB ENGLISH A1	3*	NA	NA
C: Analyze relationships of the humanities and human/social experience	PASS Teacher Verification	M	H	E
D: Conduct inquiry and research	PASS Teacher Verification	M	H	E
E: Communicate in oral, visual, written forms	PASS Teacher Verification	M	H	E
	IB ENGLISH A1	3*	NA	NA
F: Write for varied purposes	PASS Teacher Verification (may include CIM samples)	M	H	E
	SAT II Writing	520	700	760

*A score of 3 or higher on any level of IB exam. Studies are underway to determine the IB scores required for PASS levels E and H.

(“An Introductory Guide to PASS for Secondary School Administrators,” prepared by The Confederation of Oregon School Administrators, The OASSA Issues Forum, and PASS, 2000, p15)

APPENDIX F: PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS

<p>General University Requirements for All Baccalaureate Degrees (abridged) To earn a baccalaureate degree a student must complete (1) University requirements, (2) general education requirements, (3) specific requirements for the Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Music, or Bachelor of Science Degree, and (4) requirements for a major.</p>
<p>University Requirement: Minimum number of credits (lower plus upper division): 180 Minimum number of upper division credits: 72.</p>
<p>2a. University Studies (General Education Requirement) The purpose of the general education requirement at PSU is to facilitate students in acquiring and developing the knowledge, abilities, and attitudes which form a foundation for lifelong learning. This foundation includes the capacity and the propensity to engage in inquiry and critical thinking, to use various forms of communication for learning and expression, to gain an awareness of the broader human experience and its environment, and appreciate the responsibilities of persons to themselves, to each other, and to community. To accomplish this purpose, all freshman entering with less than 30 prior university credits are required to complete the following program: Freshman Inquiry, Sophomore Inquiry, Upper-Division Cluster, Senior Capstone</p>
<p>2b. General Education Requirements A student must earn a minimum of 4 and a maximum of 12 credits in each of only two departments in each of the three academic distribution areas (arts and letters, science, social science). In each of the three academic distribution areas the total credits earned in the two departments must be a minimum of 16 credits. The general education requirement must be met by courses which are outside the student's major department and which are not on the general education exclusion list. A student majoring in a foreign language may use credits in a second language toward the arts and letters part of the general education requirement.</p> <p>English Composition Writing 121 and Writing 323 English Composition.</p> <p>Health and Physical Education PHE 295 Health and Fitness for Life</p> <p>The Upper Division Requirement in the Academic Distribution Areas A total of 16 upper-division credits must be earned in the academic distribution areas with no more than 12 credits in one department.</p> <p>Diversity Requirement Students graduating with the general education distribution requirements...must meet the University diversity requirement which requires students to successfully complete two courses of diversity coursework from the approved list.</p>

(PSU Catalog, 1999)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bishop, J. H. (1996a). "Nerd harassment, incentives, school priorities and learning," Boston, MA: Paper presented at the Conference on meritocracy and Inequality, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. Prepared in connection with the Consortium for Policy Research in Education, the Cornell Youth and Work Program, and the Center for Advanced Human Resource Studies, September.
- _____. (1996b). Signaling, Incentives, and School Organization in France, the Netherlands, Britain, and the United States. In *Improving America's Schools*. Edited by Eric A. Hanushek and Dale W. Jorgenson, Washington, District of Columbia: National Academy Press: 111-145.
- Carter, Steven and Scott Learn, "History tests stir talk of revolt" in *Oregonian*, January 12, 2000.
- Daniels, Lisa, "School reform focus a blank slate" in *Oregonian*, March 28, 1999.
- Daniels, Lisa, "Truth about consequences" in *Oregonian*, April 11, 1999.
- Daniels, Lisa and Steven Carter, "State urges slowdown in reform" in *Oregonian*, March 19, 1999.
- Daniels, Lisa and Steven Carter, "Bell rings, but test results are tardy" in *Oregonian*, June 13, 1999.
- Hammond, Betsy, "Portland school officials dispute report cards" in *Oregonian*, February 2, 2000.
- Jaquiss, Nigel, "Who still thinks Oregon's school reform is working?" in *Willamette Week*, May 5, 2000.
- Kirst, Michael W. (1997). Exam Confusion: Admissions and Placement Tests Lack Standardization. In *Crosstalk*, a publication of The California Higher Education Policy Center, vol. 5, no. 1, San Jose, California: Author, winter.
- Marshall, Ray and Marc Tucker (1992). *Thinking for a Living: Education and the Wealth of Nations*, New York: Basic Books.
- Powell, A. G. (1996). Motivating Students to Learn: An American Dilemma. In *Rewards and Reform: Creating Educational Incentives that Work*, edited by Susan H. Fuhrman and Jennifer A. O'Day, San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass Publishers: 19-59.
- Oregon Public Schools Network, "K-12 School District Financing,"
<http://www.open.org/~lwvor/k-12.htm>.
- Oregon Business Council K-12 Task Force, *An Assessment of Oregon's K-12 Education Reform*, June 2000.

Oregon Department of Education

1999 Oregon Statewide Assessment Results, Oregon Department of Education.

“Board Approves Reform Changes, Hears Support for Uncoupling CIM,” Oregon Department of Education News Release, Salem, OR, June 15, 2000

“CAM Implementation Criteria and Scoring Guide,” Oregon Department of Education, Office of Professional Technical Education, Salem, OR, 1999.

“Certificate of Initial Mastery Timeline,” Oregon Public Education Network, <http://www.open.k12.or.us/os2000/certific.html>, 2000.

“Facts and Figures about Oregon Public Schools,” Oregon Department of Education, <http://www.ode.state.or.us/stats/statis.htm>, 1998.

“General Information on New Century Schools,” Oregon Department of Education, Office of Professional Technical Education, Salem, OR, 1999.

“How the Oregon Academic Standards Were Developed,” Oregon Department of Education Website, <http://www.ode.state.or.us/cimcam/howstandards.htm>.

“New Century Schools,” Oregon Department of Education, Office of Professional Technical Education, Salem, OR, 1999.

“Oregon Goals 2000 State Plan – January 25, 1995, Criterion II,” Oregon Department of Education, <http://ww.ode.state.or.us/images/crit2a.html>, Salem, OR, 1995.

Oregon Goals 2000 State Plan, Oregon Department of Education, Salem, OR, November 1994.

Oregon Goals 2000: An Annotated State Plan, Oregon Department of Education, Salem, OR, January 25, 2000.

Oregon Report Card: An Annual Report to the Legislature on Oregon Public Schools: 1997-98. Oregon Department of Education, Salem, OR, 1998.

“Oregon School Improvement: A Brief History,” Oregon Department of Education Website, <http://www.ode.state.or.us/cimcam/Legislation/history.htm>, 2000.

Oregon State Legislature, House Bill 2991, March 1995.

Seeds of Change: The Oregon Schools Initiative (An Administrator’s Handbook). Oregon Department of Education, Salem, OR, no date.

The Oregon School Improvement Plan, Oregon Goals 2000 State Plan. Oregon Department of Education, Salem, OR, January 1997

“State Test Scores Increase on 9 of 13 Tests,” Oregon Department of Education News Release, Salem, OR, June 29, 2000.

“Summary and Recommendations of Oregon’s Educational Act Survey,” Oregon Department of Education Website, <http://www.ode.state.or.us/cimcam/oredactrecomsurveyinstr.htm>.

The Superintendent’s Pipeline, Extra, Oregon Department of Education, Salem, OR, May 16, 2000.

The Superintendent’s Pipeline, Oregon Department of Education, Salem, OR, June 2000.

The Superintendent’s Pipeline, Extra, Oregon Department of Education, Salem, OR, June 16, 2000.

Oregon University System

Oregon Early Options Study prepared for the Joint Boards of Education by the Office of Academic Affairs, Oregon University System, in cooperation with the Oregon Department of Education Office of Community College Services, January 20, 1999.

Performance Measures and Indicators: 1998 Baseline Performance Reports for Institutions, Oregon University System, Office of Academic Affairs. Prepared for the Oregon State Board of Higher Education, Eugene, OR, June 19, 1999.

Shared Perspectives Project: Creating Dialog on Standards for the Education in Oregon under the program 21st Century Education Innovations, Final Report. Project Director Martin, Gary M. Oregon University Systems, Eugene, OR, January 1993.

PASS

Conley, David T. *Oregon University Systems, Eugene, Oregon. PASS Abstract, Discussion Draft.* March 5, 1998.

Assessment Oregon Department of Education, <http://www.ode.state.or.us/asmt/index.htm>, April 27, 1999.

PASS Documents and Resources, http://pass-osshe.uoregon.edu/info/docs_resources.html, Eugene, OR, April 27, 1999.

PASS Project Alignment of CIM and CAM Content Standards and Benchmarks with the PASS Proficiency Standards Content Area: Mathematics. Eugene, OR, March 19, 1998.

PASS Project Alignment of CIM and CAM Content Standards and Benchmarks with the PASS Proficiency Standards Content Area: Science. Eugene, OR, March 19, 1998

PASS Project Alignment of CIM and CAM Content Standards and Benchmarks with the PASS Proficiency Standards Content Area: Social Sciences. Eugene, OR, March 19, 1998

PASS A Brief Overview of the PASS System. http://pass-osshe.uoregon.edu/info/about_pass.html, Eugene, OR, April 27, 1999.

PASS Project English Proficiency Standards, PASS Project pamphlet, Eugene, OR, 1998.

Paul, Lynde *PASS Project Evaluation of the Oregon University System Proficiency-Based Admission Standards System (PASS) Student Section* Evaluation Coordinator, Eugene, OR, December 1997.

Facts and Figures about Oregon Public Schools, <http://www.ode.state.or.us/stats/statist.html>, April 27, 1999.

The Impact of The Oregon University System Proficiency-Based Admission Standards System (PASS) On Teachers, by Lynde Paule, Ph.D. Evaluation Coordinator Proficiency-based Admission Standards System. December 31, 1999.

PASS: An Introductory Guide to PASS for Secondary School Administrators, prepared by the Confederation of Oregon School Administrators Issues Forum for the Oregon University System/PASS, Eugene, OR, DATE.

*PASS Oregon's Aligned Standards. The Alignment of CIM and CAM Content Standards with PASS *Proficiency Standards*, http://pass-osshe.uoregon.edu/info/aligned_standards.html, Eugene, OR, April 27, 1999.

Oregon Schools on the Web. <http://www.open.k12.or.us/opencshl.html>, April 27, 1999.

PASS Overview of Changes in OUS College Admission Expectations. <http://pass-osshe.uoregon.edu/info/admission/changes.html>, Eugene, OR, April 27, 1999.

Overview of Changes in College Admission Expectations. PASS Project publication, Oregon University System. Eugene, OR, November 6, 1997.

PASS Project Goals for 1997-1998. PASS Project publication, Oregon University System, DATE.

Proficiency Standards, Summary Charts of Criteria for All Contents Areas. PASS Project publication, Oregon University System, Eugene, OR, 1997-1998.

PASS Proficiency Transcript Report. Oregon University System, Eugene, OR, 1998.

Projected PASS Implementation in OUS, Phased-in Sequence with CIM/CAM for Applicants from Oregon Public Schools, 1999-2000 to 2005-2006, PASS Project publication, Oregon University System, PASS Project publication, Oregon University System, 1999-2000 to 2005-2006 February 1999.

PASS Project Student Survey. Oregon University System, Eugene, OR, 1999.

PASS Project Teacher Survey. Oregon University System, Eugene, OR, 1999.

Touchstones for Teacher Education. Oregon University System, Eugene, OR, DATE.

PASS Visual & Performing Arts Proficiency Standards. Oregon University System Eugene, OR, 1998.

PASS Working Document English Guide to Teaching and Assessing Proficiency for University Admission. Oregon University System, Eugene, OR, 1999-2000.

PASS Working Document An Introduction to the Proficiency-based Admission Standards System (PASS). Oregon University System, Eugene, OR, 1999-2000.

PASS Admission Officers Head Back to School, Oregon University System, DATE.

PASS Exploring Issues in the Proficiency-based Admission, Implementing the PASS System: How Students Perceive Its Effects on Their Learning. PASS Newsletter, Fall 1998.

PASS Reports Issues in the Proficiency-based Admission Standards System, PASS pamphlet. University of Oregon System, Eugene, OR, Spring 1999.

The PASS 20001 Schools. PASS University of Oregon System, DATE.

Seeds of Change, Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century, <http://www.ode.state.or.us/edact/>, Salem, OR, April 27, 1999.

Transition to the Proficiency-based Admission Standards System (PASS). <http://pass-osshe.uoregon.edu/info/admission/transition.html>, Eugene, OR, April 27, 1999.

Portland State University

1999-2000 Admission Viewbook and Application. Portland State University, Portland, OR, 1999.

1999-2000 Bulletin. Portland State University, Portland, OR, 1999.

1999-2000 Portland State University Campus Resource Guide and Directory. Portland State University, Portland, OR, 1999.

College Handbook 1999-2000. Oregon University System Office of School Relations, Eugene, OR, 1999.

“Degree Completion” Pamphlet, School of Extended Studies, Portland State University, Portland, OR, no date.

Fact Book 1998. Oregon University System Office of Institutional Research, Salem, OR, 1998.

“New Freshman Profile 1998.” Portland State University, Portland, OR, 1998.

Portland State University Website, <http://www.pdx.edu>.

University of Oregon

Community College/Oregon University System Articulation Efforts Joint Board Articulation Commission, Oregon University System, Eugene, OR, DATE.

Guidelines for the Associate of Arts/Oregon Transfer (AA/OT) Degree, Oregon University System website, <http://www.ous.edu/aca/transferdeg.html>, July 31, 2000.

Joint Boards Articulation Agreement website, <http://www.ous.edu/aca/agreement.html>, July 31, 2000

Joint Boards Articulation Commission Meeting Minutes from JBAC meeting on January 19, 2000, website, <http://www/ous.edu/aca/html>, July 31, 2000.

Joint Boards Articulation Commission Meeting Minutes from JBAC meeting on, April 19, 2000, website, <http://www.ous.edu/aca/html>, July 31, 2000.

Joint Boards Articulation Commission Meeting Minutes from JBAC meeting on November 19, 1999 website, <http://www/ous.edu/aca/html>, July 31, 2000.

Joint Boards Articulation Commission Annual Report, 1997-1998, JBAC website, <http://www.ous.edu/aca/98-99annrpt.html>, July 31, 2000.

Joint Boards Articulation Commission Membership List, JBAC website, <http://www.ous.edu/aca/jbacmen.html>, July 31, 2000.

Joint Boards Articulation Commission Work Plan 1999-2000. JBAC website
<http://www.ous.edu/aca/99-00workplan.html>, July 31, 2000.

Oregon Public Education Network: Linn Benton Lincoln ESD, pamphlet. Albany, OR. No date.

Oregon's Public Universities: Freshman and Transfer Admission Information 2000-2001,
Eugene, OR, University of Oregon, 2000.

*A Plan for Course and Credit Transfer Between Oregon Community Colleges and Oregon
University Systems Institutions Oregon University System website,*
<http://www.ous.edu/aca/transferplan.html>, July 31, 2000.

*Principles for Practice: Transfer Student Admission and the Proficiency-based Admission
Standards System, Oregon University System website,* <http://www.ous.edu/aca/PASS-transfer.html>.

University of Oregon, Army ROTC, pamphlet. Eugene, OR, DATE.

U-Lane-O Scholarship Application, Partners in the Community Partners in Education.
University of Oregon, Eugene, OR, 1999.

University of Oregon: Campus Diversity Plan 1997, Eugene, Oregon, University of Oregon,
Eugene, OR, 1997.

University of Oregon: Campus Profile Fall 1998, Eugene, OR: University of Oregon,
University of Oregon Home Page. <http://www.uoregon.edu/>, July 15, 1998

University of Oregon Catalog, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR, 1999-2000.

University of Oregon Freshman Admission, Applying to the U of O,
<http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/-admit/application/FreshRequire.html>. July 15, 1998.

University of Oregon Information for Parents of New UO Students, University of Oregon
Eugene, OR, 1999-2000.

University of Oregon: Schedule of Classes Fall 1999, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR:
University of Oregon Fall 1999.

University of Oregon Scholarship Application, Eugene, OR, 1998-1999.

University of Oregon Scholarship Application, Faculty Recommendation for Scholarships,
University of Oregon, Eugene, OR, 1998-99.

University of Oregon, Undergraduate Admission and Scholarship Applications, pamphlet,
University of Oregon, Eugene, OR, 1998-99.

University of Oregon, First-Time Freshman Enrollment Fall 1997 Compared to Fall 1996,
OSSHE/Office of Academic Affairs, University of Oregon, November 12, 1997.