Draft Program Approval Rules: Questions for Review

Standards for State Approval: General Provisions – OAR 584-410-0010

- Defining initial and advanced programs for CAEP purposes:
  - The Commission is authorized to define initial and advanced programs for purposes of unit review and national accreditation.
  - In addition, the Commission must determine how programs are reported for the state’s program review process.
  - The draft rules include the Commission definition of advanced and initial programs in Oregon.

DRAFT RULE SECTIONS:

(3) For the purposes of Unit Approval, the Commission has defined initial programs as:
   (a) The Preliminary Teaching License program in the elementary multiple-subjects endorsement area; and
   (b) The Preliminary Teaching License program in the single-subject content areas, including:
       (A) Advanced Mathematics (including Foundational Mathematics)
       (B) Agricultural Science
       (C) Art
       (D) Biology
       (E) Business: Generalist
       (F) Business: Marketing
       (G) Career Trades: Generalist
       (H) Chemistry
       (I) Drama
       (J) English Language Arts (including Foundational English Language Arts)
       (K) Family and Consumer Studies
       (L) Health
       (M) Integrated Science (including Foundational Science)
       (N) Library Media
       (O) Music
       (P) Physical Education
       (Q) Physics
       (R) Social Studies (including Foundational Social Studies)
       (S) Speech (Forensics)
       (T) World Languages

(4) For the purposes of Unit Approval, the Commission has defined advanced programs as:
   (a) Teacher Leader License Programs;
   (b) Professional Teaching License Programs;
   (c) Administrator License Programs;
   (d) School Counselor License Programs;
   (e) School Psychologist License Programs;
   (f) School Social Worker License Programs;
   (g) Endorsement Programs, including:
       (A) English to Speakers of Other Languages (Pre-service and In-service)
       (B) Elementary Multiple-Subjects (In-service only)
(C) Art (In-service only)
(D) Music (In-service only)
(E) Physical Education (In-service only)
(F) Reading Intervention (Preservice and In-service)
(G) Special Education: Generalist (Pre-service and In-service)
(H) Special Education: Early Intervention (Pre-service and In-service)
(I) Special Education: Deaf and Hard of Hearing (Pre-service and In-service)
(J) Special Education: Vision Impaired (Pre-service and In-service)

- **Program Report Requirements**: The Commission is also seeking feedback on a revised list of program reports.
  - Program reviews are based on program reports submitted by the EPPs.
  - EPPs must submit one report for the licensure, endorsements, and specialization programs as listed in the Program Review and Standards Handbook.
  - The agency would like to revise the list of required program reports to:
    - More closely align with CAEP process,
    - More closely align with TSPC past program review process; and
    - Structure the number and size of reports to facilitate the reviewer process.
  - The revised list of program reports would replace the current section in the Handbook.

**Questions:**

- Do EPP members agree with the proposed classifications of advanced and initial programs?
- Should in-service Art, Music and PE programs be considered advanced programs, or should they be initial programs for the purposes of national accreditation/unit review?
- Do EPP members agree with the list of required program reports?
- Do EPP members have suggestions for other ways to divide up program reports?
- Should the proposed classifications of Oregon’s advanced and initial programs remain in rule or should it be moved to the Handbook?

**Standard 6: Cultural Competency and Equity in the Classroom – OAR 584-410-0070**

- **Review of the Current Rule**:
  - Under the current unit standards, the Commission has adopted a state-specific unit standard for Cultural Competency and Equity in the Classroom.
  - The draft rules simply move the current rule into Division 410, maintaining the equity standard as a state-specific unit standard.

**DRAFT RULE:**

(1) The EPP designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn equitably.

(a) Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to cultural competency and equitable student learning.

(b) Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P–12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P–12 schools.

(c) A cohort of candidates and faculty from diverse groups informs the unit’s curriculum, pedagogy, and field experiences in culturally inclusive meaningful ways.
(d) Diverse faculty and peers assist candidates in addressing teaching and learning from multiple perspectives and different life experiences. These experiences provide for different voices in the professional development and work of the education profession.  
(e) The greater range of cultural backgrounds and experiences among faculty and candidates enhances understanding of cultural competency, inclusion and equity for all students in the classroom.  

(2) Areas evaluated under this standard include:
(a) Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences; 
(b) Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty; and 
(c) Experiences working with Diverse Candidates; and  
(d) Experiences working with Diverse Student in the P-12 Schools.

Questions:
- Is the current rule working for EPPs in the area of equity and cultural competency? 
- Do EPP members have suggestions for improving this standard?

Standard 8: Consortium – OAR 584-410-0090

- Review of consortium rule that incorporates TSPC standards and CAEP standards.
  - The draft rule combines requirements for TSPC consortium and the new unit Standard 2 for partnerships. 
  - Currently, under the transition rule, the consortium is optional. 
  - The Commission must now decide whether to:
    • Keep the current consortium requirements; 
    • Revise the current consortium requirements so it more closely aligns to Standard 2 partnership standards; or 
    • Repeal the consortium requirement and allow the partnership requirements of Standard 2 to fulfill this function. 

DRAFT RULE:

(1) Purpose: A consortium is an advisory body to the educator preparation provider (EPP). The purpose of the consortium is to advise the EPP on program development (TSPC) evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence for licensure, endorsement and specialization programs (CAEP Standard 5.5) for mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements (CAEP Standard 2). 
(2) The consortium must:
  (a) Have written by-laws that govern its operation; (TSPC) and 
  (b) Meet-regularly, but no less than twice each year. (TSPC) 
(3) The EPP must provide opportunities for the consortium to:
  (a) Evaluate programs for improvements and to identify models of excellence; (TSPC and CAEP Standard 5.5) 
  (b) Provide recommendations on new licensure, endorsement or specialization programs; (TSPC) 
  (c) Review program activities; (TSPC) 
  (d) Review annual reports; (TSPC) 
  (e) Review program modifications; (TSPC)
(f) Establish, maintain, and refine criteria for selection, professional development, performance evaluation, continuous improvement, and retention of clinical educators in all clinical placement settings; \textit{(CAEP Standard 2)} and 
(g) Make recommendations to the EPP based on review of programs and other relevant information. \textit{(TSPC)}

(4) The EPP must provide written responses to all recommendations made to the EPP by the consortium. \textit{(TSPC)}

(5) The EPP must assure that appropriate stakeholders are represented in the consortium, including but not limited to:

\begin{itemize}
  \item (a) School and community partners, \textit{[CAEP Standard 2, CAEP Standard 5.5 and TSPC – TSPC is optional for community members]}
  \item (b) Organizations; \textit{(CAEP Standard 2)}
  \item (c) Employers and businesses; \textit{(CAEP Standard 2 and CAEP Standard 5.5)}
  \item (d) Agencies; \textit{(CAEP Standard 2)}
  \item (e) Districts, and/or EPPs interested in candidate preparation or education; \textit{(CAEP Standard 2)}
  \item (f) Alumni; \textit{(CAEP Standard 5.5)}
  \item (g) Practitioners; \textit{(CAEP Standard 5.5)}
  \item (h) Teachers who are members of their district’s teacher bargaining unit; \textit{(TSPC)}
  \item (i) Public school administrators; \textit{(TSPC)}
  \item (j) Under-represented populations; \textit{(TSPC)}
  \item (k) Faculty from the institution \textit{(TSPC)}; and
  \item (l) Students in the program \textit{(TSPC)}.
\end{itemize}

Questions:

\begin{itemize}
  \item Should the Commission maintain the requirement for a consortium?
  \item If the Commission decides to keep the consortium as a specific state unit standard, what should the requirements of the consortium include?
  \item If the Commission repeals the consortium requirement, how would the Commission assure that under-represented communities and other stakeholders continue to have a voice in the EPP process?
\end{itemize}

\textbf{Purpose of Educator Preparation Providers (EPP) State Approval Processes - OAR 584-400-0010}

\begin{itemize}
  \item Scope of State Review:
    \begin{itemize}
      \item The draft rules incorporate new language related to the scope of state review.
      \item The draft rule language for scope is largely based on Oregon statute.
      \item The draft rule clarifies that the Commission does not have authority over degree requirements.
    \end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

DRAFT RULE SECTION:

\begin{quote}
(2) The scope of the state approval process includes review and approval of programs leading to licensure, including endorsement and specialization programs. Pursuant to ORS 342.147 (4), the scope of the state approval process does not include establishing degree requirements, review of degree programs that do not lead to licensure, or the authority of the institution to grant degrees.
\end{quote}
Questions:
  o Do OCATE members have concerns about this scope section?
  o Do OCATE members have any other suggestions for the scope of state review section?

Transition to National Accreditation – OAR 584-400-0015

• Sunset of Transition Rule:
  o The draft rules include a sunset date of July 1, 2018.
  o After July 1, 2018, EPPs would be subject to the redesigned program rules.

DRAFT RULE SECTION:

(9) Applicability: Unless otherwise stated, all requirements and procedures set forth in this rule become effective July 1, 2016. This rule supersedes any provisions contained in OAR Chapter 584, Division 10 and 17 relating to the continuing state approval process and any conflicting rule requirements will be resolved accordingly. This rule and all provisions included therein will sunset on July 1, 2018.

Questions:
  o Do OCATE members have concerns about the sunset date of July 1, 2018 for the transition rule?
  o Does this date give the EPPs enough time to fully implement the new program rules?

• State-specific standards:
  o The draft rules will move many of the current state specific standards to the program rules in Division 420.

Current State Specific Standards for Unit review – Removed from the draft Unit standards

  ❖ **Knowledge of School Law for Licensed Educators** (OAR 584-017-1020);
    o Moving school law requirement to individual program standards. As a result, the school law requirement would be reviewed as a part of program review.

  ❖ **Field or Clinical Experiences** (OAR 584-017-1042);
    o Moving to individual program standards (Division 420) and general provisions (Division 400). The clinical practices standards will be reviewed as a part of individual programs during the program review process.

  ❖ **Student Teaching** (OAR 584-017-1045);
    o Moving to individual program standards (Division 420) and general provisions (Division 400). The clinical practices standards will be reviewed as a part of individual programs during the program review process.

  ❖ **Internship Agreements** (OAR 584-017-1048);
    o Moving to individual program standards (Division 420) and general provisions (Division 400). The clinical practices standards will be reviewed as a part of individual programs during the program review process.

  ❖ **Selection, Recruitment, Admission and Retention of Candidates** (584-017-1028)
    o Moving specific admission requirements to individual program standards. The general admission standards are now in Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment and Selectivity.

  ❖ **Reading Instruction: Program Standards** (584-420-0015);
The Reading Instruction provisions only apply to Elementary Education, Reading Intervention, and SPED programs. The Reading Instruction standards will be reviewed during the program review process.

Dyslexia Instruction: Program Standards (584-420-0016);
- The Dyslexia Instruction provisions only apply to Early Childhood, Elementary Education, Reading Intervention, and SPED programs. The Dyslexia Instruction standards will be reviewed during the program review process.

Request for Waiver of Rules (OAR 584-017-1010)
- Moving to annual report requirements.

Partial Waivers for Field or Clinical Requirements in the Event of School District Closures (OAR 584-017-1040)
- Moving to annual report requirements.

Evidence of Effectiveness for Initial I Teaching License Preparation (OAR 584-017-1030)
- This rule was replaced by the new rule for Teacher Candidate Performance Assessments. The review of teacher candidate performance assessments will take place in the program review for the Preliminary Teaching License program.

Evidence of Effectiveness for Continuing Teaching License Preparation (OAR 584-017-1032)
- This rule will be repealed and the provisions will be added to the program standards for the Professional Teaching License. (584-420-0030)

Question:
- Do OCATE members have concerns about moving any of these state-specific standards to program review?

Definitions – OAR 584-400-0020
- In-service candidates.
  - The agency does not have a definition for “in-service” candidate in rule.
  - In current practice, it seems sometimes “in-service” includes holders of teaching licenses who are completing administrator or personnel license programs and sometimes it does not.
  - For clarity purposes, the agency would like to define “in-service” as a candidate who has completed an initial preparation program in the program area in which they are currently enrolled.

DRAFT RULE SECTION:

(12) “In-service candidate:" A candidate who has completed an initial educator preparation program for the program area in which they have enrolled.
EXAMPLE: An in-service candidate includes a licensed teacher completing a program to add an endorsement to an existing license.
EXAMPLE: An in-service candidate includes a licensed administrator completing a professional administrator program.
EXAMPLE: An in-service candidate does not include a licensed teacher completing a preliminary administrator or personnel program.

Questions:
- Should “in-service candidate” be defined as a candidate who has completed an initial preparation program in the program area in which they are currently enrolled?
- Do EPP members have suggestions for a better definition?

State Approval: New Units – OAR 584-400-0030
• **Pre-conditions (584-400-0030):**
  
  o In the past, Commissioners indicated that they wanted more stringent or broader pre-conditions for new units.
  o For example, the Commissioners expressed an interest in evaluating new EPPs on issues such as financial aid problems, previous lawsuits, etc., which may impact student welfare.
  o The agency is in the process of surveying other states on this issue.
  o At this time, the draft rules have a placeholder for any new pre-conditions.

**DRAFT RULE SECTION:**

(1) **Pre-Conditions:** An Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) must meet the following pre-conditions prior to requesting state approval of a new unit. To satisfy the pre-conditions, the EPP must:

  (a) Obtain full regional accreditation from the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities or another appropriate institutional regional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Department of Education;
  (b) Obtain approval by the Oregon Office of Degree Authorization or its equivalent authorizing body. If the requesting Unit is an Oregon public institution, it must obtain approval by the Oregon Higher Education Coordinating Commission or its equivalent authorizing body;
  (c) Submit an institution letter attesting that the institution has granted the EPP the responsibility and authority to prepare licensed educators.
  (d) Have national accreditation or be seeking national accreditation, with the expectation that they will obtain national accreditation by July 1, 2022.
  (e) **Placeholder for other Commissioner ideas about pre-conditions.**
  (f) Submit evidence that a dean, director, or chair has been officially designated as head of the unit and is assigned the authority and responsibility for its overall administration and operation;
  (g) Submit written policies and procedures that will guide unit operations, including, but not limited to, student handbooks, procedures on admission, program waivers, and student appeal rights;
  (h) Provide evidence the Unit has established a conceptual framework that provides a shared vision for the Unit's efforts to prepare educators to work in PreK-12 schools and that provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, leadership, service, and Unit accountability and additional information, as provided in the Program Review and Standards Handbook;
  (i) Provide evidence that the unit regularly monitors and evaluates its operations, the quality of its offerings, the performance of its candidates, and the effectiveness of its graduates; and
  (j) Provide evidence the Unit has published criteria for admission to and exit from all initial teacher preparation and advanced programs and can provide summary reports of candidate performance at exit from the program.

**Question:**

  o Do EPP members have any ideas/suggestions for additional pre-conditions for new units?

• **Commission findings on state approval:**

  o The draft rules revise the Commission findings for new and continuing units to more closely align with findings in the CAEP process.
• See State Approval: Continuing Units (Site Visit Process) for the draft findings and discussion questions.

• **State Approval of New Unit: Terms of Approval**
  - The draft rules revise the length of approval terms to more closely align with terms in the CAEP accreditation process.
  - See State Approval: Continuing Units (Site Visit Process) for the draft terms and discussion questions.

**State Approval: Continuing Units (Site Visit Process) – OAR 584-400-0040**

• **Determining the process for AFIs:**
  - Under the CAEP national accreditation process, the CAEP Accreditation Council assigns AFIs (and stipulations) and determines if standards are met. (The site team only makes recommendations on AFI and stipulations.)

  - The current Oregon process for assigning AFIs is:
    - Site team members reach consensus on assigning AFIs and determining if standards are met. **584-010-0020 (4)(b).**
    - The Executive Director considers the team’s findings and then makes a recommendation to the Commission. **584-010-0025**
    - The Commission is only required to consider the Executive Director’s recommendation, thus maintaining ultimate authority over the assigning of AFIs and determining if standards are met. **584-010-0030**

  - The draft rules continue the current authority of the Commission to accept or reject the findings of the site visit team and/or TSPC Executive Director.
  - The draft rules do NOT require the Commission to wait for the CAEP Accreditation Council’s final determination on AFIs, stipulations of if standards are met.
  - By writing the rules this way, the Commission maintains authority over AFIs, meeting of standards, etc. in the state approval process.

**DRAFT RULE SECTION:**

(4) The Commission may accept or reject the findings, recommendations, areas for improvement and stipulations of:

(a) The site visit report; and/or
(b) The TSPC Executive Director or designee.

**Questions:**

- Under the draft rules, the Commission maintains authority over assigning AFIs and stipulations on the state approval of units.
- Do EPP members agree with this process for assigning conditions, AFIs, etc. and determining state approval? OR
- Do EPP members think the Commission should accept the findings of the CAEP Accreditation Council on AFIs, meeting unit standards etc. and for state approval of the unit?

• **Commission findings on state approval:**
The draft rule is revised to align with CAEP “findings” language, but the draft rule does include the “accreditation with stipulation level.”
The draft rule removes references to “at risk” and “low performing.”

DRAFT RULE SECTION:
(7) By a public vote of its members, the Commission must take one of the following actions for state approval of the Unit:
(a) Unconditional approval;
(b) Approval with conditions. Approval with conditions. All standards met; The Commission approves the unit with conditions, AFIs and/or stipulations. The EPP must meet the requirements for removal of the conditions, AFIs or stipulations, as required by the Commission.
(c) Probationary approval: One or more standards is not met. The Commission approves the unit for a probationary period to enable the EPP to meet the standard(s). The EPP must meet the standards prior to the end of the probationary term, as required by the Commission. If the EPP meets the requirements for removal of the probationary status, the EPP will be granted the remainder of the seven year term of state approval.
(d) Denial of state approval. If the Commission denies Unit approval, the Commission may grant limited continuance of identified programs or grant sufficient time for candidates in a program to complete work that is underway for a reasonable period of time.

Questions:

Our current program approval process currently only includes AFIs. The draft rules include stipulations as a type of condition, but do not have an “accreditation with stipulation” finding, as the CAEP process does.

- Should the Commission adopt the CAEP “stipulation” process for state program and unit review?

Under CAEP, stipulations are publically noticed and must be removed within two years. The process for removal is through an interim EPP report and site visitor (document, not on-site) review. The draft rules do not include these requirements.

- If the Commission decides to include a stipulation process, should the Commission require stipulations to be made public and removed within two years?

• Terms of State Approval of Continuing Unit:
- The draft rules revise the length of term provisions to align with the CAEP process.

DRAFT RULE SECTION:
(9) Unless otherwise determined by a vote of the Commission, the term of the state approval of a unit is:
(a) Seven years for full state approval
(b) Five years if the EPP was previously issued a two year probationary state approval.
(c) Two years for a probationary state approval.

Question:
- Do EPP members agree with the length of terms for state approval of the unit?
• Field Audits:
  - Current rule (OAR 584-010-0090) requires the Commission to schedule biennial field operation audits of the program completion process for each unit.
  - Actual field audit practice is to perform the audit in conjunction with site visits.
  - The draft rule has been written to match the practice of doing these at unit reviews.
  - The requirements for the actual audit process (percentage of files, what information is reviewed, etc.) will be outlined in the Program Review and Standards Handbook.

DRAFT RULE SECTION:

(11) Field Operations Audit: The Commission will conduct field audit of student records for verification of candidate recommendations for each Unit in conjunction with their site visit, as provided in the Program Review and Standards Handbook.

Questions:
- Do EPP members have any comments/input on the field audit process?
- Do EPP members agree with changing field audit rules from biennial to in conjunction with site visits?
- Are there ways to improve the Field Audit process?

• Specializations: Program Review
  - In recent history, specializations have been reviewed during the program review process.
  - Specializations are relatively new, so the program review requirement is not in current rule.
  - The draft rules require specialization programs during the program review process.

DRAFT RULE SECTION:

584-400-0070 State Recognition: Continuing Programs (Program Review Process)

(1) An Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) must receive continuing state recognition of programs in order to:
  (a) Submit a request to the Commission for continued approval of the Unit; and
  (b) Continue recommending program completers for licenses, endorsements, or specializations.

Questions:
- Should Specializations be reviewed as part of the program review process; or
- Once specializations are approved as a new program, should the Commission no longer review these programs?

Unit or Program Modifications – OAR 584-400-0080:

Major modifications:
- The draft rule revises major modification provision to align more closely with CAEP requirements.
- The draft rules include a note stating that the Handbook will include information to help EPPs determine if a program change is a new program or major modification.

DRAFT RULE SECTIONS:

(2) A major modification is a change that substantively alters the Unit or program, as approved by the Commission.
(3) Major modifications include, but are not limited to, substantive changes to the:
(a) Unit's mission and goals;
(b) The degree level of the program, as approved by the Commission during the previous state recognition process.
(c) The legal status, form of control or ownership of the EPP;
(d) Unit's administration, if the change is a result of the Unit head's termination by the institution;
(e) Offering of academic programs for credit through contractual relationships with external organizations;
(f) Clinical practices requirements;
(g) Delivery of program(s), such as an addition of an off-campus, online, hybrid, distance learning, or any other alternate route program;
(h) Offering of single-subject (content) area endorsements within an existing Preliminary Teaching License program, such as additions of mathematics, health, world language, etc. endorsement areas; and/or
(i) Structure or content of a unit or a program that results in the EPP no longer meeting Oregon statutes or administrative rules

**NOTE:** Program-required endorsement areas (Elementary – Multiple Subjects, ESOL, Reading, Music, Art, PE, and Special Education) may be considered new programs and subject to OAR 584-400-0060 - State Recognition: New Programs. Please refer to the Program Review and Standards Handbook for information on the differences between new program and modifications.

Questions:

- Should an addition of a single subject area to the Preliminary Teaching License be considered a major modification?
- Are there any circumstances when an addition of a single-subject area would be considered a new program? What about Art, Music and PE?
- Do we need additional language around substantive curriculum changes?
- How should the Commission determine if the curriculum change is a major modification or new program?

**Candidate Recommendations – OAR 584-400-0130**

- **Pre-Service Candidate Recommendations:**
  - The draft rules require EPPs to recommend all endorsements and specializations in order for a pre-service candidate to add on to their initial licensure;
  - Because the Bilingual Specialization does not require completion of a program, pre-service candidate will not submit an EPP recommendation for the bilingual specialization. Pre-service candidates will submit evidence of a passing score on the language proficiency test to add the Bilingual Specialization to their first license.

**DRAFT RULE SECTION:**

(c) Pre-service candidates must receive an EPP recommendation in order to be issued an endorsement or specialization on their initial Preliminary Teaching License.

(A) The EPP recommendation must be verified on a Program Completion Form;
(B) Notwithstanding this subsection, a pre-service candidate may be issued a Bilingual Specialization on their Preliminary Teaching License without an EPP recommendation, as this specialization does not require completion of a program.
Questions:
  o Do programs have actual bilingual specialization programs, with bilingual curriculum and not just, a requirement to demonstrate language proficiency?

NOTE: The commission no longer has an ESOL/Bilingual endorsement. The Commission also does not have ESOL/Bilingual program standards. It only has approved program standards for the ESOL endorsement.

Clinical Practices – OAR 584-400-0140

  o Pre-service candidates:
    o The draft rules maintain the current requirement for 15 weeks of student teaching, but the rule newly specifies that the student teaching must occur in their endorsement area.
    o The draft rules add more specific language about requirements for evaluations and/or observations.

DRAFT RULE SECTION:

(5) Pre-service Candidates: Except as provided in subsection (6) and (7), pre-service candidates must complete at least 15 weeks of clinical practice in their designated endorsement area within the Preliminary Teaching License program.

(a) Clinical practices must be at least nine consecutive weeks that are full-time in schools, during which the candidate assumes the full range of responsibilities of a classroom teacher for the purpose of developing and demonstrating the competencies required for initial licensure.

(b) During the remaining six weeks, the six-week requirement may be met either through full-time or the equivalent part-time experience.

(c) The assignment of responsibilities may be incremental in keeping with the objectives of the experience.

(d) Clinical practices must be supervised by a Cooperating Teacher, as provided in OAR 584-400-0145, Cooperating Teachers.

(e) The EPP must require the cooperating teachers and/or the EPPs’ supervising faculty to conduct at least six evaluations and/or observations of each pre-service candidate during their 15-week clinical practice. At least four of the six meetings must include observations of the candidate.

Questions:
  o Should the Commission continue to require 15 weeks of clinical practices?
  o Should the 15 weeks be in the designated endorsement area?
  o Should the Commission require six evaluations/observations, four of which must be observations of the candidate?

  o Dual enrolled pre-service candidates:
    o The draft rules add a section for dual enrolled pre-service candidates.
    o The draft rule includes:
      ▪ Single subject (content area)/ Single subject (content area): Dual Enrollment
      ▪ Program required/Program required: Dual Enrollment
      ▪ Single Subject/Program required: Dual Enrollment

DRAFT RULE SECTIONS:

(6) Dual-Enrolled Pre-service Candidates: Pre-service candidates enrolled in two endorsement areas must complete clinical practices as follows:
(a) If both endorsement areas require a program, the candidate must complete the clinical practice requirements of each approved program;
(b) If both endorsement areas are single-subject, content areas, the candidate must complete at least 90 hours of clinical practice in each single-subject, content area.
(c) If one endorsement area is a single-subject content area and the other is a program-required area, the candidate must complete:
   (A) 90 hours of clinical practice in the single-subject, content area; and
   (B) The clinical practices requirements for the approved program.
(d) If the Commission has approved the program as a combined program of two endorsement areas, the candidate must complete the clinical practices requirements as approved by the Commission during the previous state recognition process.

**NOTE:** If the candidate is enrolled in more than two endorsement areas, the EPP should consult the agency for guidance on the clinical practice requirements.

Questions:
- Do EPP members agree with this process for Dual Enrolled pre-service candidates?
- Do EPP members have any suggestions for improving the requirements for dual enrolled candidates?

**Pre-service Candidates with Restricted Teaching Licenses:**
- The draft rule adds a provision related to pre-service candidates with Restricted Teaching Licenses and clinical practice requirements.
- The draft rule allows EPPs to develop a plan for clinical practices for candidates working in a school district with a Restricted Teaching License holders;
- The plan would replace the regular clinical practices requirements.
- The plan must be submitted to the Commission for approval, as provided in the TSPC Program Review and Standards Handbook.

**DRAFT RULE SECTION:**

**Pre-service Candidates with Restricted Teaching Licenses:** If a school district has employed a pre-service candidate as a teacher under the provisions of the Restricted Teaching License, the EPP and employing school district must develop a plan to address the clinical practices requirements. The plan must be submitted to the Commission for approval, as provided in the TSPC Program Review and Standards Handbook.

Questions:
- Does this rule language meet the needs of EPPs, candidates and school districts who are employing candidates with Restricted Teaching Licenses?
- Do EPP members have any suggestions for improving this process?

**In-service candidates:**
- The draft rules adds a requirement for in-service candidates to complete at least two semester or three quarter hours of clinical practice.
- It also adds a requirement of four evaluations/and or observations.

**DRAFT RULE SECTION:**

**In-service Candidates:** In-service candidates completing programs for endorsements or specializations must complete at least two semester or three quarter hours of clinical practices.
(a) The EPP must require supervisory faculty, mentor, or cooperating teacher to conduct at least four evaluations and/or observations of the in-service candidate during the clinical practice. At least two of the four meetings must include observations of the candidate;

(b) This subsection does not apply to supervised practicums for adding subject-matter (content area) endorsements to existing licenses, as provided in OAR 584, Division 220.

Questions:
- Should the Commission require at least two semester or three quarter hours of clinical practice for in-service candidates adding program-required endorsements to existing licenses?
- Should the Commission require at least two semester or three quarters hours of clinical practice for in-service candidates adding specializations to existing licenses?
- Should the Commission require the four evaluation/observations?

Administrator candidates:
- The draft rules adds a requirement of four evaluations/and or observations for candidates for administrator licenses.

DRAFT RULE SECTION:

(8)(a) **Administrator Candidates**: The EPP must require supervisor faculty and/or mentors to conduct at least four evaluations and/or observations of the administrator candidate during the clinical practice. At least two of the four meetings must include observations of the candidate; and

Questions:
- Should the Commission require the four evaluations/observations for administrator candidates? The current rule requires two visits.
- Should the Commission put all provisions related to clinical practices requirements for administrator candidates in this rule – or should we cross-reference to the administrator program requirements in Division 18/420? Note: Under redesign, the new admin program standards will be located in Division 420.

Personnel services candidates:
- The draft rules adds a requirement adds a requirement of four evaluations/and or observations for candidates for administrator licenses.

DRAFT RULE SECTION:

(9)(a) **Personnel Service Candidates**: The EPP must require supervisor faculty and/or mentors to conduct at least four evaluations and/or observations of the personnel service candidate during the clinical practice. At least two of the four meetings must include observations of the candidate;

Questions:
- Should the Commission require the four evaluations/observations for personnel candidates? The current rule requires two visits for most personnel service license programs.
o Should the Commission put all provisions related to clinical practices requirements for personnel service candidates in this rule—or should we cross-reference to the personnel service program requirements in Division 18? For example, current school counselor program standards require:

584-018-0305 Initial School Counselor License: Competency Standards

(12) Field Experience: The Initial School Counselor Preparation Program shall provide practica in public and/or private school settings for purposes of instruction, assessment of competency, and integration of field work with academic study.

(a) Prospective school counselor candidates who have two years of teaching experience in Oregon schools or out-of-state public or regionally accredited private schools upon completion of an initial school counselor preparation program must:

(A) Complete a practicum consisting of 200 clock hours of supervised counseling in a public school setting; and

(B) Assemble a portfolio or work sample to demonstrate the candidate’s ability to meet the expectations of the public school’s counseling program.

(b) Prospective school counselor candidates who do not have two years of teaching experience in any public or regionally accredited private schools upon completion of an initial school counselor preparation program:

(A) Complete a supervised practicum consisting of a minimum of 200 clock hours in a regular classroom in a public school, to include a minimum of 75 clock hours of full responsibility for directing learning;

(B) Complete a minimum of 600 clock hours of supervised counseling experience in a public school;

(C) Assemble and analyze one work sample to illustrate his/her ability to foster student learning; and

(D) Assemble a portfolio or work sample to demonstrate the candidate’s ability to meet the expectations of the public school’s counseling program. The Initial School Counselor Preparation Program shall:

(i) Determine jointly with the practicum site supervising counselor that the candidate has demonstrated the skills and competencies required for licensure in the practicum.

(ii) Establish and implement policies on supervision of practicum candidates that state the responsibilities of unit supervisors and practicum site supervisors and administrators, including the frequency of observations and conferences with the candidates.

(iii) Make a minimum of four supportive/evaluative visits during the practicum. At least twice during the practicum, the unit’s supervisors meets with the candidate and the practicum site supervisor in joint conferences to discuss performance and evaluation.

o Timing of Background Clearance:

o The draft rules clarify that the background clearance for pre-service candidates must be completed prior to contact with pre-k-12 students.

DRAFT RULE SECTION:

(10) Background clearance prior to student contact: Prior to candidate contact with PK-12 students, as part of their program, an EPP must verify the candidate has completed a background clearance through the Commission.
(a) EPPs may require candidates to obtain background clearance through the Commission any time after the candidates’ admission into the program.
(b) Prior to admitting candidates into an initial administrator or personnel service licensure program, the EPP must document the candidate has completed a background clearance through the Commission.

Questions:
- Should the Commission require background check prior to any student contact?
- Is the rule language clear enough to determine when the background clearance must be completed?

Timing of Civil Rights Test:
- The draft rules clarify that the civil rights exam is required prior to a candidate placement in the formal clinical practice.

DRAFT RULE SECTION:

(11) **Knowledge of Civil Rights Prior to Formal Clinical Practice:** Prior to placement in the candidate’s formal clinical practice, an EPP must verify the candidate has demonstrated knowledge of civil rights and ethics, as provided in the Program Review and Standards Handbook.

Questions:
- Should the Commission require the Civil Rights exam prior to placement in the formal clinical practice?
- Should the Commission specifically define “formal clinical practice” or does simply using this term provide enough clarity for programs?

**Cooperating Teachers – OAR 584-400-0145**

- Internship Agreements:
  - The draft rule updates the internship provisions to match current practice.
  - The draft rule states that the CT standards do not apply if the pre-service candidate is completing an internship, in accordance with 584-400-0150 Internship Agreements.

DRAFT RULE SECTION:

(1) **The Cooperating Teacher standards are established pursuant to Sections 3 and 4, chapter 279, Oregon Laws 2015 (Enrolled SB 83).**
(a) The Cooperating Teacher standards apply to pre-service candidates enrolled in a Preliminary Teaching License program who are completing clinical practice requirements, as provided in 584-400-0140 Clinical Practices.
(b) The Cooperating Teacher standards do not apply to per-service candidates who are completing an internship in accordance with 584-400-0150 Internship Agreements.

Questions:
- Should the CT standards apply to internship agreements?
Do EPP members have any concerns with the internship agreement rule? (The internship rule was revised to reflect current practice.)

**Program Completion (Fast Track) – OAR 584-400-0160**

**Fast Track Expansion:**
- Fast-Track moves Oregon completers to the front of the line ahead of out-of-state applicants.
- With eLicensing, the backlog has been reduced to a point where this currently does not offer much of an advantage; however, this doesn’t guarantee we can maintain the current staffing level and EPPs appreciate Fast Track.
- Under current agency practice, Fast Track is offered for initial Oregon teacher completers only.
- Under the draft rules, Fast Track is continued and expanded to completion of all Oregon licensure programs (teaching, admin, personnel services).
- At this time, the agency hopes to be able to continue to do FAST TRACK under the next implementation of our online application system. If this is the case, Fast Track could remain and be expanded to all licensure areas.

**DRAFT RULE SECTION:**

**(1) Oregon EPPs are eligible for an expedited process or “fast-track” option for completers of their Commission-approved licensure program. The fast-track option applies to completers of teaching, administrator and personnel service license programs.**

**NOTE:** The Fast-Track option is not available to licensed candidates completing an advanced endorsement program.

**Question:**
- Do EPP members agree with keeping and expanding the Fast-Track process, if possible?

**Waivers – OAR 584-400-0180 Waiver of Program Requirements**

**Reporting of Waivers in Annual Report:**
- Currently, reporting of waivers is only required as a state-specific requirement (part of the unit review).
- The agency would like to move the reporting of waivers to the annual report.
- Reporting waivers in the annual report would also help the Commission determine if a rule change is needed. For example, if programs are all waiving the same requirement repeatedly, perhaps the requirement needs to be reviewed.

**DRAFT RULE LANGUAGE:**

**(8) EPPs must report waivers of program requirements in the Oregon EPP annual reports, as provided in the Program Review and Standards Handbook.**

**Questions:**
- Do EPP members have concerns about reporting waivers in the annual reports?
If the Commission decides to include waivers in the annual report, what information on waivers of program requirements should programs be required to submit?

**Library media:**

- Currently, only one EPP (PSU) offers a Library Media program.
- Library Media is a program-required area so even licensed educators who wish to add this as an endorsement must complete a program.
- **Question:**
  - Should Library Media be allowed to not require a program for completion?