DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 356 530 EA 024 758

TITLE	Working Designs for Change: Toward Implementation of the Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century (HB 3565). Report to the Oregon Legislative Assembly.
INSTITUTION	Oregon State Dept. of Education, Salem.
PUB DATE	Jan 93
NOTE	48p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; Citizen Participation; Early Childhood Education; *Educational Change; Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Methods; Nongraded Instructional Grouping; *Professional Development; *School Based Management; School Restructuring; Systems Approach; *Systems Development
IDENTIFIERS	*Oregon; *Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century 1991

ABSTRACT

Oregon's Educational Act for the 21st Century is a remarkably comprehensive and systematic approach to school reform. Relying on a broad partnership of business leaders, parents, teachers, and educational professionals, it calls for a shift in public attitudes, a focus on outcome-based evaluations, and efforts to ensure its compatibility with other reform efforts. Early childhood and professional-technical education are pivotal components of the entire reform process. Conditions necessary for implementation are identified as: (1) attaining a critical mass of support; (2) implementing model programs; (3) reforming the entire system of preparation, licensure, and continued development; (4) time and support for collaborative work; (5) changing assessment techniques to include the Certificates of Initial and Advanced Mastery emphasizing foundational and effective living skills; (6) encouraging regional approaches; (7) reforming regulations; and (8) stabilizing and optimizing educational funding. Schools should encourage site-based decision making, nongraded primary education, alternative learning environments, extended school days or years, and the integration of social services. (TEJ)

Toward Implementation of the

Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century

Working Designs for Change

Report of the Oregon State Board of Education
to the
Oregon Legislative Assembly
January 1993

21st CENTURY SCHOOLS Oregon

HB 3565 Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century | Oregon Department of Education
Salem, Oregon

It is the policy of the State Board of Education and a priority of the Oregon Department of Education that there will be no discrimination or harassment on the grounds of race, color, sex, marital status, religion, national origin, age or handicap in any educational programs, activities, or employment. Persons having questions about equal opportunity and nondiscrimination should contact the State Superintendent of Public Instruction at the Oregon Department of Education.

This document was produced by
the Publications and Multimedia Center
Oregon Department of Education.
For additional copies of this report
contact the Documents Clerk
(503) 378-3589.

221598100001993

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
700 PRINGLE PARKWAY SE, SALEM, OREGON 97310-0290 • PHONE (503) 378-8520 • FAX (503) 373-7968

January 1993

Dear Oregonian,

This is the State Board of Education's report to the Sixty-seventh Legislative Assembly. The Board is pleased to present it to the citizens of the state. The report encompasses two years of intensive work on the part of dedicated Oregonians from all walks of life.

Since the passage of the Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century, more than two hundred Oregonians have served on ten task forces, generously donating their time, expertise, energy, and enthusiasm to the educational reform effort. Evident in the body of their work is the belief that Oregon's children deserve the best possible education and the determination that we make this ideal a reality in our state. We must stay the course we have set for ourselves.

The Board's recommendations emerged from the work of the task forces, from ideas offered by interested citizens in innumerable meetings and public hearings, and from the extraordinary research and conceptual work of Superintendent Norma Paulus and the Department of Education staff. It is our belief that we must maintain our unwavering commitment to the Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century and to the restructured educational system we envision. We must remain true to the goals we have set for ourselves: to be "the best educated citizens in the nation by the year 2000 and a work force equal to any in the world by the year 2010."

Thank you for your continued interest and support.

Sincerely,

Jeana Woolley
Chair
State Board of Education

EDUCATION FIRST!

Contents

Introduction 1

Oregon's Educational Reform in Perspective 5

Distinctive Features of the Reform Plan 5

Early Childhood Education as Cornerstone —
Professional Technical Education as Capstone 7

Progress Toward Implementation 9

Necessary Conditions 9

Toward New and Higher Learning Standards 11

- Certificate of Initial Mastery 12
- Certificate of Advanced Mastery 16

Toward Changes in Practice to Meet New Learning Standards 19

- Site-Based Decision Making 19
- Non-Graded Primary Education 21
- Middle Level Education 23
- Alternative Learning Environments 24
- School Choice 26
- Integration of Social Services 28
- Extended School Day/Year 29
- Employment of Minors 30

Pilot Sites 32

A Sample of Accomplishments, 1991-93 33

Priorities and Plans for the 1993-95 Biennium 36

Lessons Learned 38

Timeline for Development/Implementation 41

State Board of Education

700 Pringle Parkway SE
Salem, Oregon 97310-0290
(503) 378-3573

Jeana Woolley, Chair
5006 NE Mallory
Portland, OR 97211
281-6229
Term expires July 1, 1993

Ruth Hewett, Vice Chair
250 Kashmir Ct SE
Salem, OR 97306
363-2609
Term expires July 1, 1994

Anita Decker
PO Box 962
Astoria, OR 97103
861-2670
Term expires July 1, 1994

Donald Kruse
377 Burkhart Rapids Ln
Roseburg, OR 97470
673-8869
Term expires July 1, 1993

Susan Massey
3890 Brussells
North Bend, OR 97459
756-4610
Term expires July 1, 1996

Felipe Veloz
School of Education
Eastern Oregon State College
La Grande, OR 97850
962-3312
Term expires July 1, 1995

G. Dale Weight
Atkinson Graduate School
of Management
Willamette University
Salem, OR 97301
370-6440
Term expires July 1, 1996

INTRODUCTION

In June 1991, the Oregon Legislative Assembly enacted the Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century, a remarkably far-reaching mandate for change. To transform this sweeping mandate into working designs for implementation, the State Board of Education and the Superintendent of Public Instruction launched a statewide planning effort involving citizens, parents, students, education professionals, and members of the business and social service communities. This report illuminates the results of planning.

More specifically, the report is designed to:

- Convey the State Board of Education's perspective on the distinctive and pivotal features of Oregon's blueprint for educational change,
- Convey the Board's positions on key aspects of reform,
- Summarize specific accomplishments on the path toward implementation,
- Highlight the Board's priorities and plans for the 1993-95 biennium, and
- Share lessons the Board has learned about systemwide change.

The primary audience for this report is the 67th Oregon Legislative Assembly.

Background

In July 1991, the State Board of Education and the State Superintendent began the enormous task of preparing for the implementation of reform.

Public Communication

From the outset, the Board and the Superintendent recognized that successful implementation depended on broad public understanding and support. Accordingly, they made an early and abiding commitment to inform the public about reform. This has led to an unprecedented level of public discussion about educational change. Between summer 1991, and December 1992,

Board members, the Superintendent, and staff from the Oregon Department of Education have made well over 300 presentations at community and school meetings across the state, to citizen and professional groups of all kinds. In addition, presentations have been made at national conferences and to groups of policy makers and citizens in other states. The state's effort to inform the public about reform has been wide-ranging and ongoing. This effort will continue.

21st Century Schools Advisory Committee

The first step toward creating plans for accomplishing reform was to create a 21st Century Schools Advisory Committee composed of teachers, school administrators, school board members, higher education faculty, classified school employees, parents, and members of the business and labor community. This committee has met regularly to advise the State Board on the reform effort and to review the work of citizen task forces.

Citizen Task Forces

To obtain recommendations on implementing key elements of reform, the State Superintendent appointed ten task forces comprised of educators (elementary, secondary, and higher education), parents, students, business and industry representatives, and other interested community members. A task force was created for each of the following areas:

- Certificate of Initial Mastery
- Certificate of Advanced Mastery
- Site-Based Decision Making
- Non-Graded Primary Education
- Middle Level Education
- Alternative Learning Environments
- School Choice
- Integration of Social Services
- Extended School Day/Year
- Employment of Minors

The task forces on the Certificates of Initial and Advanced Mastery wrestled with the immensely complex task of developing new, different, and higher student learning standards for 21st century schools. The other task forces undertook the no less difficult task of identifying the transformations in school structures and practices needed to reach new and higher learning standards. All told, several hundred Oregonians devoted more than a year and hundreds of hours to service as task force members.

Broad Review of Task Force Recommendations

The task forces prepared preliminary reports in August 1992. Their recommendations were then summarized and distributed to every school and education organization in the state, along with an invitation to comment on the recommendations at one of four public hearings held by the Board in Medford, Salem, Portland, and Pendleton. ***Education First***, the Department of Education's newspaper that is sent to every teacher and school administrator in the state and many other citizens as well, also carried a summary of the recommendations and an invitation to participate in the hearings. More than 100 citizens took advantage of the opportunity; most of the comments were supportive of the recommendations. In addition, each task force report was presented through an interactive teleconference on Oregon's satellite communication network, ED-NET.

The State Board monitored the work of the task forces through monthly reports and held lengthy work sessions in August, October, and December to discuss the task forces' recommendations. In November 1992, the State Board met with the Board of Higher Education to discuss the outcomes proposed for the Certificates of Initial and Advanced Mastery. The members of both boards examined the recommendations and discussed how students would move through the restructured educational system.

In December 1992, each of the task forces presented its final recommendations to the Board. The final report of each task force accompanies this document.

State Board's Response

The State Board has been inspired by the extraordinary level of commitment and care displayed by the task forces. Each fulfilled its charge well, providing research, concepts, and constructive recommendations for furthering reform. Clearly, without the participation and perseverance of task force members, this report would not be possible. The State Board is greatly indebted to all who served on the task forces and all who reviewed and commented on the task forces' recommendations.

The positions set forth in this report reflect the Board's response to the task force reports. In general, the Board supported the task forces' recommendations. The Board had the advantage, however, of viewing the task force reports as a whole. From this perspective, the Board saw common themes cutting across individual reports. For example, the Board observed that many task

forces emphasized the need to change specific elements within Oregon's system for preparing, licensing, and continuing the professional development of education personnel. When board members considered these specific proposals as a whole, they became convinced that a comprehensive review of the entire system of teacher professional preparation and development was needed. Having the benefit of reviewing all the task force reports together, the Board was in a strong position to place individual task force recommendations in a broader context. The section in this report entitled "Necessary Conditions" focuses on broad themes identified by the Board that transcend individual task force reports.

The Board viewed the task forces' recommendations based upon a firm commitment to the principles of outcome-based education. In an outcome-based educational system, the state establishes a core set of expected outcomes or results from schooling, but permits school districts and schools, within reasonable limits, to develop their own ways of reaching those outcomes on the assumption that there is no single best way to educate young people and that local innovation and diversity should be encouraged.

In keeping with outcome-based principles, the State Board exercised caution in prescribing specific educational practices. While board members consistently supported the vision underlying recommendations about new practices, in some cases the Board chose not to accept the task force recommendations in mandating practices. For example, the Board did not wish to prescribe a ratio between teachers and students for primary or middle level educational programs. In general, the Board's positions are consistent with those of the task forces, but less prescriptive about means and methods of schooling.

Finally, the Board's positions represent a distillation of the longer and more detailed sets of recommendations found in individual task force reports. In developing position statements, Board members wished to focus on the essential thrust of task force reports without attempting to duplicate all the specific information and proposals contained in the reports. The Board positions conveyed in this document, while owing much to the task force reports, thus have a focus, format, and style quite their own.

Distinctive Features of the Reform Plan

Oregon's reform effort is historic in scope and intent.

It is comprehensive and systemwide. Many school reform efforts have tinkered with individual pieces of the educational system. Oregon's reform focuses on the system as a whole. It seeks an expansion of early childhood education to assure that all children start school ready to learn. It requires new and higher learning standards for all of our young people, and new and better ways of assessing learning progress and accomplishments. It calls for the integration of health and social services with education to meet the comprehensive needs of children and families. It bridges the historic gap between education and workforce development by restructuring professional technical education and by emphasizing real-world applications of learning throughout the curriculum. It calls for decentralized decision making to guide change at the local level and for a more flexible educational delivery system, with greater options for students and families. It institutes a stronger system of accountability to the public. Oregon's reform plan is perhaps the most wide-ranging in our nation's history.

It calls for a shift in social attitudes toward schools. Educational reforms often have reinforced traditional notions of what schools teach and do. But the world beyond schools has changed dramatically in the past ten years, from changes in the nature of families, to the growing number of children in poverty, to the increasing diversity of our society, to the rising challenges of global economic competition and the accelerating pace of technological innovation. Schools must change fundamentally to accommodate these broader social and economic changes. And this depends on a shift in public attitudes about the roles and responsibilities of schools. A major aspect of Oregon's reform initiative is to engage the public in ongoing dialogue about how schooling must change.

It requires broad-based partnerships. This reform concerns not only what happens within the walls of a school. It concerns what happens between preschool and public school, between school and home, and between school and work and adulthood generally. It emphasizes connections among different segments of the educational system and among schools, families, the business community, and social service and health care organizations. It depends on vigorous cooperative efforts in communities across the state.

It is outcome-based. The mark of student accomplishment in 21st century schools will not be the number of credits accumulated or the hours of time spent in a classroom, but demonstrated attainment of high performance standards. Similarly, educators and the public alike will increasingly define an effective school as one that brings about improvements in student outcomes, not simply one that implements well-intended practices.

It dovetails with other major state initiatives. Oregon's educational reform complements other key state developments, such as the work of the Oregon Progress Board in establishing measurable indicators of the state's progress toward widely-accepted goals for Oregon's future, many of which relate closely to education. The Oregon Workforce Quality Council, responsible for setting state policy to build a highly skilled workforce and overseeing the implementation of key education and training programs, is a further example of state efforts that support comprehensive educational reform.

The state's current reform agenda also builds squarely on the state's long-standing commitment to outcome-based schooling, embodied in such reforms as the state's adoption of common curriculum goals and its implementation of a related statewide assessment program. The 1991 reform plan also reflects Oregon's commitment to site-based decision making and building-level school improvement plans, as expressed in HB 2020, enacted by the Oregon Legislature in 1987.

It dovetails with national goals and reform programs. Although Oregon clearly has been a leader in shaping an educational reform agenda, our plan squares well with the nation's goals for education and with President-elect Clinton's stated intention to support educational reform as a way of improving our nation's workforce and economic competitiveness. Oregon also is an active participant in such national reform efforts as the New Standards Project which is developing prototypes for a national student performance assessment system anchored to world-class outcome standards.

Early Childhood Education as Cornerstone — Professional Technical Education as Capstone

Within the comprehensive reach of Oregon's reform plan, two components are pivotal: early childhood education and professional technical education.

The State Board of Education and the Superintendent of Public Instruction have made early childhood education their top priority. The reason is plain: the number one problem facing our education system is that too many children lack the basic social, health care, and educational support they need to begin school ready to learn. Both research and common sense tell us that preventing children's problems is more cost effective and humane than remediating them. Oregon's reform plan thus places a premium on strong early childhood programs that provide for the comprehensive needs of young children and their families.

Improvements in early childhood education and related improvements in primary and middle level education, however, will be undermined if our society continues to maintain a weak system of professional technical education. As a major report recently documented, our nation has the worst system among the industrialized nations for preparing non-college bound youth for careers and for the transition from school to work. *

The State Board of Education and the Superintendent believe that Oregon must confront this major deficiency head on. As the reform act makes clear, we need comprehensive education and training programs that provide for effective transitions from school to work, using work-based learning strategies including mentoring, structured work experiences, work study, apprenticeships, and internships. Building on the strong foundation provided through Certificate of Initial Mastery programs, Oregon's Certificate of Advanced Mastery programs will meet the need for professional technical education while strengthening students' academic skills and enhancing their preparation for life-long learning and participatory citizenship. We need to give more and better help to young people as they prepare for the changing work world and the increasing complexities of adult life. Letting them sink or swim as they enter the workforce and assume the responsibilities of independent living is not the answer.

Finally, we must work to eliminate the prejudice that some educators and citizens continue to harbor that high-quality profes-

* *America's Choice: High Skills or Low Wages*, National Center for Education and the Economy, 1990.

sional technical programs are less worthy of respect than more traditional academic programs. Education that responds directly to the complex challenges of the work world and adult life should not be considered inferior to more traditional academic study.

To be sure, workforce preparation is only one of many important goals of education. But it is a goal that has been sorely neglected in this country. We must right this wrong.

PROGRESS TOWARD IMPLEMENTATION

Necessary Conditions

As the State Board reviewed the task force reports on specific aspects of reform, members found common themes pointing to conditions necessary for effective implementation. These conditions are discussed as a backdrop to the more specific reform elements addressed in the next section.

Critical mass of support. There are many active supporters of Oregon's reform agenda at local levels, but not yet enough. To move ahead with reform, we need to continue to communicate with and enlist the participation of local leaders, change agents, and citizens.

Model programs. Educational systems do not implement ideas; they implement programs and practices that embody ideas. Without good model programs that show how reform might actually be carried out, ideas for change remain just that — ideas. The Oregon State Board and Department of Education have supported model development in key reform areas. Yet more work in this regard is needed.

Professional preparation, licensure, and continued development. If teachers and other education professionals are to function successfully in the restructured schools of the 21st century, their initial preparation and continued professional development must reflect the principles and practices of restructured schools. The same is true for professional licensure. Preparation should reflect the performance requirements associated with the complex roles of professionals in changing schools.

The State Board urges that a review of the entire system for preparing and licensing education professionals and for continuing their professional development be undertaken to align it with Oregon's educational reform plan. The Board believes that the need for change cuts across all levels of schooling — from preprimary education through the Certificate of Advanced Mastery levels — and calls for teachers, counselors, educational administrators, and specialists to assume new and different roles.

Time and support for collaborative work. Many of the task force reports emphasize the importance of time for teachers to plan and solve problems together, to serve as mentors to other teachers, to work in teams with staff from other child and youth-serving organizations, to form partnerships with business, and to reach out more fully to parents and community members. If time

is not explicitly set aside to support such collaboration, it is not likely to occur at the level envisioned by the task forces.

Assessment development. Outcome-based schooling makes special demands on assessment because it focuses unremitting attention on student learning outcomes. In Oregon's 21st century schools, assessment faces the added challenge of having to measure learning in relation to new, substantially different, and higher learning standards. As schooling in general must change, so must the focus and practice of assessment.

Regional approaches to serving students. Schools and other education-concerned organizations will need to establish regional agreements and structures to provide the kind of program choices for students and families called for in the reform act. Educators and representatives from other human service providers will also have to develop regional arrangements to provide for the effective integration and delivery of employment training, health care, and social services in an area.

This general emphasis on regional solutions is consistent with a specific position adopted by the State Board in February 1992 that education service districts be consolidated into broader regional units and that they serve as regional support systems for educational reform.

Policies and rules. State education and local school district policies and administrative rules need to be systematically reviewed and revised to assure that they directly support the reform agenda.

Funding. Statewide implementation of comprehensive educational reform depends on appropriate funding — funding that is adequate, equitable, and stable. Funding issues are dealt with in other documents from the Office of the Superintendent and the State Board of Education and are therefore not discussed in this report. The Board simply wishes to note here that funding clearly is one challenge to be faced when preparing for implementation.

Toward New and Higher Learning Standards

The Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century calls for a transformation in what and how well students learn. Oregon's new learning standards will assure that young people are prepared for an increasingly diverse and complex society and for the high performance work environments of the next century.

The reform act requires that new, much higher learning standards be embodied in the Certificate of Initial Mastery and the Certificate of Advanced Mastery. The Certificate of Initial Mastery will assure that students have attained new, higher standards within a common core of learning. The Certificate of Advanced Mastery will assure that students have attained new, higher standards for entry into further educational programs, the world of work, and other adult roles.

Most students will earn a Certificate of Initial Mastery about age 16, approximately grade 10, and a Certificate of Advanced Mastery within the next two years, although some students will need more time to reach the standards, others less time.

Certificate of Initial Mastery

The State Board endorses the set of outcomes proposed by the Certificate of Initial Mastery Task Force, presented on this and the next page.

The outcomes emphasize useful knowledge and complex performance, matched to real-world demands.

The outcomes are relatively few in number. In the past, many states and school districts have identified long lists of specific outcomes only to find that students, parents, teachers, and policy makers became bogged down in detail. By contrast, the proposed Certificate of Initial Mastery outcomes provide a focused, uncluttered set of targets for learning.

The Oregon Department of Education has begun to define these outcomes and to give them operational meaning through actual performance standards and assessment procedures.

Certificate of Initial Mastery Outcomes

To attain the Certificate of Initial Mastery, a student will demonstrate the ability to:

Foundation Skills	**Think**	critically, creatively and reflectively in making decisions and solving problems.
	Self-Direct Learning	direct his or her own learning, including planning and carrying out complex projects.
	Communicate	communicate through reading, writing, speaking, and listening, and through an integrated use of visual forms such as symbols and graphic images.
	Use Technology	use current technology, including computers, to process information and produce high-quality products.
	Quantify	recognize, process, and communicate quantitative relationships.
	Collaborate	participate as a member of a team, including providing leadership for achieving goals and working well with others from diverse backgrounds.
Core Applications for Living	**Deliberate on Public Issues**	deliberate on public issues which arise in our representative democracy and in the world by applying perspectives from the social sciences.
	Understand Diversity	understand human diversity and communicate in a second language, applying appropriate cultural norms.
	Interpret Human Experience	interpret human experience through literature and the fine and performing arts.
	Apply Science and Math	apply science and math concepts and processes, showing an understanding of how they affect our world.
	Understand Positive Health Habits	understand positive health habits and behaviors that establish and maintain healthy interpersonal relationships.

The State Board has adopted the following positions on the Certificate of Initial Mastery:

1. The State Board must set uniform, statewide performance standards for the Certificate of Initial Mastery, while maximizing local district freedom to design programs that prepare students to meet the standards.

2. There should be one Certificate of Initial Mastery standard for all students throughout the state. Local districts should not be permitted to add or lower requirements for achieving the certificate in order to assure that students who move from one school or program to another will not be penalized.

3. While there will be one standard for all students, the school system owes extra support to special populations to assure that they have equal opportunities to reach the standard. In some cases, assessment may be modified to allow an alternative way for special-needs students to demonstrate mastery.

4. The Certificate of Initial Mastery should be awarded based on a student's cumulative accomplishments over several years, not on a single test.

5. In the State Board's view, state assessments should be administered at grades 4, 6, 8, and 10, as opposed to the current schedule of grades 3, 5, 8, and 11, to reflect current research and program design for 21st century schools. The statewide assessment is primarily a program evaluation tool, not a measure of an individual student's achievement in relation to the Certificate of Initial Mastery. Therefore, while results from state assessments may be included as one part of a broader portfolio of students learning accomplishments, state test scores alone may not determine a student's eligibility for the Certificate of Initial Mastery.

6. Ability to communicate in a second language should be a required outcome, as called for in the Certificate of Initial Mastery Task Force Report; for native speakers of a language other than English, English may be the second language.

7. Students who fail to achieve all Certificate of Initial Mastery outcomes should nonetheless be given opportunity to begin working toward a Certificate of Advanced Mastery, so long as they continue to study and receive assistance toward meeting the initial mastery standards in areas in which they are deficient.

8. Outcome requirements should be systematically phased in. The reform act specifies that by the end of the 1996-97 school year, every student should have the opportunity by age 16 or upon completion of grade 10 to obtain a Certificate of Initial Mastery. By the end of 1996-97, however, it will be inappropriate to require that all grade 10 students meet a world-class level of proficiency in all the designated outcomes. School districts will not have had enough time by then to implement completely the additions and changes in instructional programs called for by the full set of outcomes and the high performance standards that soon will accompany them.

9. The educational system is unaccustomed to "certifying" individual students' outcome attainment on the basis of multiple lines of evidence assembled over time. There are no fully-developed models anywhere in the world to guide this effort. The state must therefore support further design and development work.

Certificate of Advanced Mastery

The State Board endorses the direction for program design set forth in the Certificate of Advanced Mastery Task Force report. The central premise of this report is that programs leading to the Certificate of Advanced Mastery will give all students much greater opportunities than they currently have for connecting learning to the real-world, especially the world of work, and to adult roles generally.

The State Board further embraces the task force's recommendation that programs leading to the Certificate of Advanced Mastery be organized according to six occupation-related focus areas: Arts and Communication, Business and Management, Health Services, Human Resources, Industrial and Engineering Systems, and Natural Resource Systems. A brief description of each of these areas is presented on the following page.

In all Certificate of Advanced Mastery programs students will deepen their understanding of academic content, increase their capacity to apply academic content to real-life problems and extend their skills as learners, thinkers, and citizens. These programs will represent a new synthesis among academic study, professional technical application, and citizenship development, bringing each together in a more rigorous, yet more personally meaningful way than traditional high school study.

Work on outcome specifications for the Certificate of Advanced Mastery is in progress. The advanced mastery task force took preliminary steps toward outcome-specification. Now that the initial mastery outcomes have been established, the construction of advanced mastery outcomes that build squarely upon them is moving ahead.

The State Board holds the following positions on the Certificate of Advanced Mastery:

1. To earn a Certificate of Advanced Mastery, students must meet high-performance outcome standards that emphasize the application of knowledge and skills in varied, realistic environments. These standards may also include requirements for a project that embodies a values/citizenship component.

2. The term "endorsement" should refer to the program focus area(s) a student has chosen and in which he/she has demonstrated mastery. In preparing for an endorsement, a student will have opportunity to meet requirements for entry to col-

lege, professional technical education programs, or for direct entry to the workforce.

3. All students in the state must be assured access to high-quality Certificate of Advanced Mastery programs in each of the six program focus areas. To achieve such access, educators, policy makers, business and labor leaders, and community members should pursue a variety of regional, collaborative arrangements, including:

   - regional consortiums, in which high schools share students, personnel, and resources
   - distance learning programs supported by telecommunications technology
   - tuition to community colleges paid by the school district in which a student resides
   - opportunities for community college faculty to teach on high school campuses

4. The primary educational responsibility for students pursuing a Certificate of Advanced Mastery will remain with the district where the student resides. However, to ensure fulfillment of advanced mastery requirements, high schools may refer students who have earned a Certificate of Initial Mastery to community colleges for specific classes, or a student may choose to take some coursework leading to the Certificate of Advanced Mastery at a community college once he or she has attained the Certificate of Initial Mastery.

Focus Areas for Certificate of Advanced Mastery Programs

Arts and Communications: Programs related to the humanities and to the performing, visual, literary and media arts. These may include, but need not be limited to, architecture, creative writing, film and cinema studies, fine arts, graphic design and production, journalism, foreign languages, radio and television broadcasting, advertising, and public relations.

Business and Management: Programs related to the business environment. These may include, but need not be limited to, entrepreneurship, sales, marketing, hospitality and tourism, computer/information systems, finance, accounting, personnel, economics, and management.

Health Services: Programs related to the promotion of health as well as the treatment of injuries, conditions, and disease. These may include, but need not be limited to, medicine, dentistry, nursing, therapy and rehabilitation, nutrition, fitness, and hygiene.

Human Resources: Programs related to economic, political, and social systems. These may include, but need not be limited to, education, law and legal studies, law enforcement, public administration, child and family services, religion, and social services.

Industrial and Engineering Systems: Programs related to the technologies necessary to design, develop, install, or maintain physical systems. These may include, but need not be limited to, engineering and related technologies, mechanics and repair, manufacturing technology, precision production, and construction.

Natural Resource Systems: Programs related to the environment and natural resources. These may include, but need not be limited to, agriculture, earth sciences, environmental sciences, fisheries management, forestry, horticulture, and wildlife management.

Toward Changes in Practice to Meet New Learning Standards

This section summarizes the State Board's positions on changes needed in school practice to achieve new learning standards.

Site-Based Decision Making

The Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century, reconfirming the previous commitments of the Legislative Assembly to school reform, calls for the delegation of school decision making to site committees that are established at the school building level. This legislation is based on the belief that:

- those most closely affected by decisions ought to play a major role in making those decisions, and
- schools are most likely to succeed in reaching new and higher student learning standards if those who work most closely with students play a major role in guiding change.

In the reform act, site-based decision-making bodies are called 21st Century Schools Councils. These councils are comprised of teachers, classified district employees, administrators, parents, and others.

The State Board endorses the following positions on 21st Century Schools Councils:

1. Only one school-based 21st Century Schools Council is necessary to meet the site council requirements of the different school reform laws that refer to site-based decision-making bodies: HB 2020, HB 2002, and HB 3565.
2. District councils, as distinct from individual building councils, should be optional, but may be established to assist with the coordination of reform.
3. Education service districts should not be required to establish site councils unless applying for grants or waivers.
4. If a teaching staff is too small in number to accommodate the representation specified in the law, the composition of the council shall be determined by the State Board of Education.
5. "Site-based management" should be termed "site-based decision making."

6. A collective effort must be made by site councils, parent groups, local school boards, and the State Board and Department of Education to explore new ways of involving and supporting parents in the work of site councils.

7. Preservice professional programs and inservice/staff development programs must be developed to prepare school personnel to work effectively in school-based decision-making teams.

20

Non-Graded Primary Education

A non-graded primary program is one in which children of different ages and ability levels are taught in the same classroom, without dividing them or the curriculum into steps labeled by grade-level designations. Children progress from easier to more difficult material at their own varying rates of speed, making continuous progress rather than being promoted once a year. *

Most educators view non-graded arrangements, sometimes referred to as multiaged groupings, as a logical outgrowth of developmentally appropriate practices — practices that reflect research on how children learn at different stages of development. At the primary level, developmentally appropriate practices emphasize active, hands-on learning, supported by a wide variety of learning resources, flexible grouping of students for specific instructional purposes, and child-centered arrangements of facilities and furnishings.

The State Board has taken the following positions on non-graded primary programs:

1. Schools should be encouraged to implement developmentally appropriate practices generally. Non-graded arrangements should be viewed as one aspect of developmentally appropriate practice.

2. Schools should provide staff development programs to support the effective implementation of developmentally appropriate practices. These programs should provide time for educators to plan and solve problems together.

3. Trained classified staff, special services staff, and other support personnel should be involved in the child's primary classroom setting, as appropriate.

4. Schools should emphasize the early prevention of children's problems. A multidisciplinary team should determine an individual student's need for specific preventive services.

5. Supported by state and regional plans, schools should form collaborative agreements with social service agencies to:

* Joan Gaustad, *Non Age-Graded Primary Schools.* Oregon School Reform Series, Policy Brief 2. Center For Urban Research in Education (CURE), School of Education, Portland State University, Portland, Oregon, September 1992.

- assure that comprehensive educational, social, and health care services are provided to children and families at or near the school site,

- assure that after-school child care is available to all who need it, and

- provide appropriate parent education programs.

6. Schools should be encouraged to provide programs in which the ratio between students and teachers and other trained classroom staff reflect research on early childhood education.

7. The Oregon Department of Education should collaborate with school districts to find ways of using developmentally appropriate assessment practices to measure the effectiveness of non-graded primary programs in fostering student learning.

Middle Level Education

In the context of Oregon's reform, middle level education refers to the period between the end of primary programs and the Certificate of Initial Mastery level, or approximately between grades 4 and 10.

Students at this level are in varying states of transition from childhood to adolescence. Among the typical characteristics of individuals during this period are a growing capacity for abstract thinking, an intense loyalty to peer groups, an experience of inner conflict over issues of security versus independence, and a sense of self-consciousness and self-doubt.

To further the development of school structures and practices that match the unique needs of middle level students, the State Board endorses the following positions,* which relate closely to positions adopted for non-graded primary education:

1. Schools should be encouraged to establish small, caring communities for learning that provide an adult advisor for each student, flexible student grouping for specific instructional purposes, and support for interdisciplinary instructional teams.

2. Schools should be encouraged to provide a curriculum that enables students to see connections across subject areas, to relate learning to real-life situations, to engage in community service, and, at the upper levels, to become familiar with the occupation-related focus areas of the Certificate of Advanced Mastery programs. To match the curriculum, assessments should include applied performance measures.

3. Schools should provide staff development to further the implementation of developmentally appropriate practices at the middle education level.

4. Supported by state and regional plans, schools should form collaborative arrangements with social service agencies to provide for the comprehensive needs of students and families.

5. Schools should be encouraged to provide middle level programs in which the ratio between students and staff reflects research on effective middle level education.

* These positions reflect recommendations made in *Turning Points: Preparing American Youth for the 21st Century*, Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, Washington D.C., Carnegie Corporation, 1989.

Alternative Learning Environments

Alternative learning environments provide additional or different forms of instructional support for students who are not benefiting from conventional instructional programs. In the context of Oregon's reform act, alternative learning environments provide new opportunities for students who are not making satisfactory progress toward the Certificate of Initial Mastery or the Certificate of Advanced Mastery.

Initially, learning centers will serve students who have left school without attaining the Certificate of Initial Mastery. As school reform proceeds, the concept of alternative learning environments will have much broader application.

The State Board has adopted the following positions on alternative learning environments:

1. Alternative learning environments are for all students, not only those with attendance or behavior problems. Such environments are a way of accommodating a student's individual learning needs, not a means to lower teaching or learning standards.

2. A learning center can be a concept, a facility, or both.

3. Alternative learning environments foster active parent participation.

4. Regional planning for alternative learning environments, possibly coordinated by education service districts, should assist local school districts and schools in developing alternative learning services.

5. School districts, with assistance from other education agencies such as education service districts, should provide staff development programs for personnel who work in or with alternative learning environments.

6. Earlier legislation regarding Alternative Education Programs (ORS 339.240 and OAR 581-22-317) should be amended to reflect the intent of the Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century.

7. Local school board policies on alternative education programs should reflect the intent of alternative learning environments in the reform act.

8. The Office of Community Colleges should conduct a study of the General Education Diploma to determine its relationship to the Certificates of Initial and Advanced Mastery.

School Choice

In Oregon's reform effort, choice is one of several strategies that can potentially enhance the quality of public schools and increase the flexibility and responsiveness of the educational system.

The reform act provides for two forms of choice within public schools. One is a second-chance program for students who are not making satisfactory progress toward the Certificate of Initial Mastery or the Certificate of Advanced Mastery, even after receiving one year of special assistance. Students who meet this criterion will have the option of transferring to another school within the district, or to another district that agrees to accept the student.

The second option provides program choice for students pursuing the Certificate of Advanced Mastery. This gives public high school students who have attained the Certificate of Initial Mastery the option to earn an advanced mastery endorsement through any public education program in the state that meets requirements set by the State Board of Education.

Within this two-option framework, the State Board adopts the following positions:

1. All programs of choice must provide for equal educational opportunity. No choice program may permit segregation on the basis of race, gender, capability, or disability conditions. All families must have an equal opportunity for choice based upon complete information provided by schools.

2. Local school boards must set policy to guide the design of school choice programs. Program design strategies should emphasize collaboration among parents, students, school staff, the community, and representatives from other education, social service, and business organizations, as appropriate.

3. Regional planning to foster school and program choice will be necessary. For example, school districts, community colleges, education service districts, regional workforce quality committees, and representatives from the business community should develop coordinated plans for serving students in programs leading to the Certificate of Advanced Mastery. The competitiveness likely to be engendered by choice should not reduce cooperation among schools, districts, and other youth-serving agencies.

4. The State Board encourages innovative solutions to transportation problems. The educational system should find transportation options for students exercising school choice, such as an urban school district's use of city bus services to transport students to programs outside their neighborhoods. The Board recognizes that time will be needed for state, regional, and local education agencies to explore a full range of options on this issue.

Integration of Social Services

Integrated social and educational services are those in which schools, community agencies, and families work together as full partners in providing for the needs of children. Such collaboration is essential to assure that each child has an equal opportunity to reach high standards for learning and development.

The State Board has taken the following position on the integration of social and educational services.

1. Social and health care services should be delivered at or near the school site. The reason for this is clear: schools are the most common gathering place for children in our society and are easily accessible neighborhood centers for families.

2. State and regional policies and plans should be developed to support service integration at the local level. Education service districts may play an important role in regional planning.

3. Multiple models for service integration should be developed to accommodate the diverse and unique needs of individual communities.

4. Schools and other human service agencies should collaborate to develop common policies and procedures in areas of shared responsibility and to address issues that cut across different organizations, such as how best to assure confidentiality of information about children and families and how best to develop referral and case management procedures in integrated service programs.

5. Roles and responsibilities of all those collaborating in integrated service programs should be clarified. Teachers, health care specialists, and social workers, for example, all will have complementary though distinct roles in integrated service programs.

6. New strategies for communicating with parents and guardians will be needed to assure that families know how to gain access to integrated services.

7. Statewide coordination to further the implementation of integrated service programs is needed. This approach might include such components as state-supported demonstration sites, a statewide resource center, and a capacity to provide or arrange for appropriate staff development programs at the local level.

Extended School Day/Year

To meet the educational objectives of reform, the Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century calls for lengthening the school year by hours equivalent to 185 days by 1996, 200 days by the year 2000, and 220 days by 2010.

The State Board has adopted the following positions on extending the school day/year.

1. The Board endorses the extensions specified in the reform act, but emphasizes that the use of educational time must change. Otherwise, even with additional time, the school system may be unable to reach new, higher learning standards or to strengthen the connections between schools and families and communities.

2. To meet new, higher learning standards, schools should be encouraged to explore different ways of using time, including:

   - Independent study within and beyond the walls of the classroom,
   - Use of tools and technologies that enhance learning,
   - Career awareness and planning, exploration, and preparation in the community,
   - Business, industry, or community-based learning,
   - Supervised work experience as a laboratory for learning about work, and
   - Restructured counseling and guidance programs.

3. The school day or year should be restructured for teachers to guide as well as to instruct, to serve as mentors to other teachers, and to collaborate to improve teaching quality.

4. The school day or year should be restructured to meet a variety of program needs and should be shaped to the culture of the school and community.

Employment of Minors

Minors are students who are under 18 years of age. The Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century states that the policy of the state of Oregon is to encourage students to remain in school and earn Certificates of Initial and Advanced Mastery. The Act calls for the State Board of Education to propose rules applicable to the continuation of education of minors who have not obtained the Certificate of Initial or Advanced Mastery and who seek to be employed during the school year.

The State Board appreciates the need to protect minors from losing educational ground because of employment. At the same time, the Board recognizes the potential that work can offer in enhancing learning. To help assure that school and work are mutually supportive for students, the Board proposes the following framework for an Oregon Administrative Rule on minors who choose to work.

1. It is the policy of the state of Oregon and the Oregon State Board of Education to encourage students to remain in school and to earn their Certificate of Initial Mastery before seeking employment during the regular school year.

2. The State Board of Education values work and believes that employment will enhance learning if the employment is compatible with a student's education.

3. A student who is working towards a Certificate of Initial Mastery and is not yet 18 years of age may be employed up to 18 hours per week during the regular school year.

4. A student who has earned a Certificate of Initial Mastery and is not yet 18 years of age may be employed up to 30 hours per week during the regular school year. *

5. Students working towards either a Certificate of Initial Mastery or Certificate of Advanced Mastery may be employed during their regularly scheduled school hours if the employment is part of an approved education plan for the student and the student is enrolled in a school-sponsored work program.

* Current law allows 16- and 17-year-olds to work up to 44 hours per week, but limits work hours for 14- and 15-year-olds to 18 hours per week during the school year.

6. School officials, parents, and employers should cooperate to prevent a student's employment from interfering with the student's school performance.

The State Board further recommends that the Board and the Department of Education collaborate with other public agencies, including the Wage and Hour Commission and the Bureau of Labor and Industries, with other youth-serving organizations, and with the business community to set specific guidelines regarding what hours of the day students may work, how many hours per day, and other working-hour issues.

Pilot Sites

Through several grant programs, the Department of Education is assisting groups of innovating schools to develop and pilot new programs and practices related to key reform priorities. Models developed and lessons learned from the pilot sites will help state, regional, and local educators to gain a better understanding of the implications of reform and how best to implement reform.

Non-graded primary programs. Nine elementary schools received grants to pilot developmentally appropriate practices in a nongraded primary model. Each of these schools has been progressing individually, depending on the school's prior experience with developmentally appropriate practices and student, community, and staff needs.

Student performance assessment network. Supported by grants and technical assistance from the Oregon Department of Education, seven schools around the state have formed a network to develop and pilot student assessment models related to the Certificate of Initial Mastery. Among the practices these schools are piloting are new ways of measuring and evaluating high-performance student outcomes and new strategies for creating and managing portfolios of students' work. Schools also are identifying the implications of new assessment practices for instruction, program design, and staff development.

Workforce 2000 II secondary developmental sites. Grants totaling over $500,000 have been awarded to six Oregon high schools to plan, develop, and implement components of reform related to workforce preparation. The grant sites are piloting designs for programs leading to the Certificate of Advanced Mastery in one or more of the occupation-related program focus areas. Schools in the project are making program changes at grades 9 and 10 to assure that students working toward the Certificate of Initial Mastery are well prepared to enter Certificate of Advanced Mastery programs.

The work of the secondary developmental sites is wide-ranging, including restructuring curriculum, developing career counseling centers, and designing work-based learning programs. Business and industry are full partners in the pilot sites' program design and development efforts. The Oregon Department of Education and the Bureau of Labor and Industries are working together on these projects in areas of common interest and responsibility.

A Sample of Accomplishments, 1991-93

Oregon report card. In September 1992, State Superintendent Paulus issued Oregon's first annual report card to the citizens of the state. Required by the reform act, the report card described the condition and performance levels of Oregon's school system and statewide progress toward educational reform.

Distinguished Oregon educators. In keeping with the provisions of the reform act, the Department of Education selected six distinguished educators to work with the Department during the 1992-93 school year on the school reform program. The distinguished educators assist school site councils and provide a wide range of technical assistance. The six — who come from Salem, White City, West Linn, Corvallis, and John Day — were selected from 90 who were nominated.

20/20 school improvement grants. The School Improvement/ Professional Development program was created by the 1987 Legislature. In 1991-93, 140 schools were awarded competitive grants enabling schools to advance school reform at the building level.

21st Century Schools Program. Established by the 1989 Legislature through House Bill 2001, this program furthers the goals of school improvement and professional development by authorizing school districts to apply for waivers of certain statutes and rules that interfere with the districts' implementation of reform. Currently, 18 school districts are participating in the 21st Century Schools Program.

Oregon Professional Development Center. Supported with a $240,000 grant from the Department of Education, this newly established center is a statewide, multi-agency consortium directed by the Linn-Benton and Lane education service districts. The Center connects schools to training, technical assistance, and related services that further school reform. Currently, a major goal of the Center is to build the capacities of 21st Century Schools Councils to operate as effective, student-focused decision-making groups.

Joint Boards. In response to an executive order from Governor Roberts, the State Board of Education and the State Board of Higher Education began an examination of a number of educational issues, including governance of education. The Joint Boards have established an effective working relationship to

address the many concerns that transcend the boundaries which have traditionally separated elementary and secondary education from community colleges and higher education. The Joint Boards Working Group — board members and staff from each part of the educational system — meet monthly; Joint Board Bylaws require at least three meetings of both boards each year. The Joint Boards have established two advisory groups, one to address the complex issue of developing a long-range strategy to improve mathematics, science, and technology education, and another to address intersector policy issues of student access and transfer.

Technical preparation associate degree. In fiscal year 1992, Oregon received $711,261 from the Carl Perkins Act to fund Technical Preparation Associate Degree programs. The funds were awarded to the 18 professional technical education consortiums in the state with grants ranging from $15,000 to $140,418.

Applied academics. The Carl Perkins Act requires that all professional technical program areas supported by federal funds fully integrate academic and professional technical education. Each grant recipient is required to have full implementation in place by June, 1994. In Oregon, applied academics courses are a major method for integrating academic and professional technical education. Last year, approximately 2,500 secondary students were enrolled in applied academics courses. With the encouragement of the Joint Boards, Oregon colleges and universities increasingly recognize that many of these courses meet academic requirements for college admission. The Joint Boards have established the Joint Articulation Commission to continue cooperation and collaboration among the sectors.

State Board positions on community colleges, education service districts and the governance of elementary and secondary education. Following passage of Ballot Measure 5, the State Board established a commission to develop recommendations on community college governance. In response to an executive order from Governor Roberts, the State Board appointed a broadly-representative task force on education service districts and another on the governance of elementary and secondary education to review critical issues. Following public hearings the Board adopted recommendations of both task forces and the commission.

The Board endorsed consolidating existing education service districts into broader regional units and aligning their functions more closely with the reform agenda. In the case of educational governance, the Board affirmed the value of local school boards,

but proposed a redefinition of leadership and policy making responsibilities in light of outcome-based school reform, site-based decision making, and the move toward integrated educational and social services. The Board adopted the Commission's recommendations to maintain a separate agency for community college services under the State Board and to maintain the present system of local, elected boards for community colleges.

PRIORITIES AND PLANS FOR THE 1993-95 BIENNIUM

Early childhood education. The State Board and the Superintendent of Public Instruction seek a major expansion of Oregon's prekindergarten program, which serves low income three- and four-year-old children and their families and is coordinated with the federal Head Start program. According to the reform law, by 1996 funding shall be available for 50 percent of the children eligible for Oregon prekindergarten programs, and by 1998, full funding shall be available for all eligible children (HB 3565, sec. 18). Currently, only about 38 percent of eligible children in Oregon are served by state and federal programs combined.

A statewide system for delivering staff development programs. The Department of Education considers staff development to be absolutely essential to the success of Oregon's reform effort. The Department will deliver staff development programs in high-priority areas such as site-based decision making and will act as a leader, supporter, and broker of other high-quality programs. The Department will continue its support of statewide professional development organizations and expand its work with regional education agencies to assure that schools have available assistance to move ahead with reform.

Professional technical education. Priority will be given to increasing the percentage of students enrolled in professional technical preparation programs and to developing and implementing effective school-to-work transition strategies, including work-based learning. To this end, the State Department of Education will focus on the development of Certificate of Advanced Mastery programs that effectively integrate academic and professional technical education. The Department will emphasize the development of business partnerships and will work closely with regional workforce quality committees to prepare citizen leaders across the state to act as catalysts for change in workplace, educational institutions, and public agencies. The Department will continue to work with the Workforce 2000 II Secondary Development Sites to design and pilot programs related to Certificate of Advanced Mastery programs. A task force on school-to-work transitions has been appointed and will begin work in January 1993.

Certificates of Initial and Advanced Mastery. The Department of Education is moving forward aggressively to delineate at a more specific level the outcomes established for the Certificate of Initial Mastery. Drawing upon the outcomes suggested by the Certificate of Advanced Mastery Task Force, the Department is developing advanced mastery outcomes that will be articulated with the Certificate of Initial Mastery outcomes. Performance standards and assessment procedures for both the initial and

advanced mastery certificates will be developed in the next biennium.

Review of state policies and rules. The State Board of Education will review and revise policies and administrative rules to align them with the reform agenda. The Joint Boards of Education (State Board of Education and Board of Higher Education) will conduct a similar review.

Teacher preparation, licensure, and continued professional development. The Joint Boards have begun a review of Oregon's system for professional preparation, continued development, and licensure. Participants include the Department of Education, the State System of Higher Education, the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission, representatives from institutions of teacher preparation, and others.

Ongoing communication and participation. Providing all educational constituencies with timely and accurate information about the progress of reform will continue to be a high priority, as will involving a broad base of citizens and professionals in policy and program development. The Department will continue to publish progress reports on the reform effort and will increase the use of teleconferences.

Accountability. The State Board, the State Superintendent, and the Department of Education are committed to continuing and improving Oregon's statewide assessment program, to producing and disseminating Oregon's annual educational report card, and to maintaining responsibility and accountability to the public.

LESSONS LEARNED

In the course of this remarkable planning venture, the State Board of Education and the Oregon Department of Education have learned several abiding lessons about the work of reform.

Keeping a long-term perspective. The extraordinary changes called for in Oregon's reform act will take a decade or more to institutionalize. As we move forward with all deliberate speed, we must be patient, taking one step at a time. Oregon has a long-standing commitment to improving education. In our reform effort, we should be eager and energetic, but guard against quick-fixes or solutions that appear easy, immediate, or expedient, but may prove ineffective.

Balancing challenge and support. New ideas, energy, and challenge accompany change, but so do uncertainty, anxiety, and a sense of loss. As we stretch beyond familiar boundaries, we must develop support for those taking the risk of change. Without support, change can be alienating. We need to couple plans for restructured schools and classrooms with plans for a restructured support system for those who are grappling with the uncertainties of change.

Balancing parts with the whole. We need to keep the broad vision of reform in focus while taking individual steps, just as we need to sharpen our conception of the whole as we gain experience with the parts. We must balance general concepts and specific actions, sustaining an ongoing dialogue between the two as we implement the reform.

Acknowledging and learning from our failures as well as our successes. In pursuing reform, we need to be candid about what works and what does not. We recognize that there can be no movement forward without some false starts and some mistakes.

Reaching out and pulling in national and international resources. Oregon is a leader in reform, but we are not alone. Many other states are actively pursing reform, and national and international reform efforts are moving ahead. Oregon needs to scan the broader environment continually for useful ideas and resources, taking advantage of the best the nation and the world have to offer. In turn, Oregon can contribute ideas and programs to the broader educational reform community.

Staying the course. Thanks to the extraordinary commitment of citizens and professionals throughout the state, Oregon has made impressive strides toward a new educational order. To be sure,

complex issues abound, and much work remains ahead. Yet our experience during the past year and a half has deepened our faith in the rightness of Oregon's reform blueprint. Oregonians are poised to revolutionize the world of schooling. On behalf of our children and our society, we must stay the course.

TIMELINE

ODE Development/Implementation of HB 3565

8/1/91	12/31/91	7/1/92	9/1/92	9/92	1/93	1/94	9/94	1/95	9/95	1/96	6/97	7/1/97	1998	2000	2010
Appt. 21st Century School State Adv. Comm.	Adopt rules for Early Childhood Improv. Program	Development of School Choice Guidelines	Issue 1st OR Report Card	One school council in each district with more than one building	Report on feasibility of districts implementing non-graded primary programs	Curr. & standards identified to achieve prof/tech use endorsements in 6 categ.	All school dist. shall have at least one school site with a 21st Cent. Sch. Council	Each dist. submits plan to insure its curr. meets the req. of the CIM & CAM	Every school site shall have a 21st Century Schools Council	Funding avail. for 50% of children eligible for Head Start	Begin CIM for every student	CIM students can attend any public education institution w/tuition paid by dist. to achieve CAM	Full funding for all children eligible for Head Start	Best educated citizens in the nation	Work-force equal to any in the world
		1st review of CCGs & ELSs	Models for nongraded primary program developed		State Bd. of Higher Ed will develop programs & tch. prep related to this Act	State Bd. establish criteria for CIM & CAM		Plan to establish alt. learning environ. including learning centers		School year lengthened to 185 days	School dist. shall institute programs leading to CAM			School year lengthened to 200 days	School year lengthened to 220 days
		Approve applications for Early Childhood Improv. Program	Hire 6 Disting. OR Ed.		Report on all plans for implementation & rules to Leg. Assembly including proposed rules for employment of minors					On-site school visits every 3 yrs.					
										1% of State School Fund for Sch. Impr. Programs					

*CIM = Certificate of Initial Mastery

*CAM = Certificate of Advanced Mastery

*CCGs = Common Curriculum Goals

*ELSs = Essential Learning Skills

12/30/92

Norma Paulus
State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Oregon Department of Education
700 Pringle Parkway SE
Salem, Oregon 97310-0290

21st CENTURY SCHOOLS
Oregon