



CO L O R A D O

**Colorado Commission on
Higher Education**

Department of Higher Education

CCHE AGENDA

April 2, 2021

**Colorado Department of Higher Education
ZOOM Video Conference**

**BUSINESS MEETING
1:00pm – 4:30pm**

1600 Broadway, Suite 2200 • Denver, Colorado 80202 • (303) 862.3001

DR. ANGIE PACCIONE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR



Colorado Commission on Higher Education

April 2, 2021

Colorado Department of Higher Education

ZOOM Teleconference Only

Denver, Colorado

11:30am -12:30pm

COMMISSIONER & ADVISOR WORK SESSION

- CCHE Workplan Update and Discussion – *Chair Vanecia Kerr*
- “Moonshots” for the next two years – *Dr. Angie Paccione*

1:00 – 4:00pm

BUSINESS MEETING

I. Opening Business

- A. Attendance
- B. Approval of the Minutes for the March 5, 2021 Commission Meeting
- C. Reports
 - i. Chair
 - ii. Vice-Chair
 - iii. Commissioners
 - iv. Commission Standing Committees
 - v. Advisors
- D. Executive Director Report
- E. Public Comment

II. Consent Items

- A. Recommend Approval of Middle School Math Endorsement at Metropolitan State University of Denver – *Dr. Brittany Lane*
- B. Degree Authorization Act – Recommendation of Authorization Status Change for University of Maryland Global Campus – *Heather DeLange*

III. Action Items

- A. Recommend Approval of Revised Adams State University Plachy Hall Capital Renewal Budget Request – *Lauren Gilliland*

IV. Discussion Items

- A. Proposed Revisions to CCHE Policy Section IP: Educator Preparation – *Dr. Brittany Lane*



- B. State Advisory Panel for Parent Involvement in Education (SACPIE) annual report – *Leslie Levine, SACPIE Chair, Early Childhood Manager at Cooking Matters Colorado; and Darcy Hutchins, PhD, Director of Family, School, and Community Partnerships at CDE*

- C. Colorado’s Area Technical Colleges (ATCs) – *Randy Johnson, Executive Director, Emily Griffith Technical College; Dr. Teina McConnell, Executive Director, Pickens Technical College; Dr. Allen Golden, Executive Director, Technical College of the Rockies; Ed Bowditch, Lobbyist, Area Technical Colleges*

V. Commission Initiatives

- A. Legislative and Budget Update – *Chloe Figg and Jason Schrock*





**Minutes of the Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) Meeting
Via ZOOM Teleconference
March 5, 2021**

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Vanecia Kerr called the business meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

I. Opening Business

A. Attendance

Commissioners attending: Chair Kerr, Vice Chair Hughes, Commissioners Colon, Kostenbauer, McGimpsey, Meyer, Olena, Stich, Trujillo, Tucker.

Advisors attending: Rep. Van Beber, Sen. Zenzinger, Wayne Artis, Mark Cavanaugh, Brad Baca, David Olguin, Dr. Landon Pirius, Leah Porter, Misti Ruthven

B. Minutes

Commissioner McGimpsey moved to approve the February 5, 2021 meeting minutes. Seconded by Commissioner Tucker, the motion passed unanimously.

C. Chair, Vice-Chair, Commissioners and Advisors Reports

Chair Report – Chair Kerr reported that university presidents have expressed an interest in connecting with the commission in the next few months. They would also like to meet in the summer. There will be further conversations with them about organizing these meetings.

Vice Chair Report – Vice Chair Hughes noted that the meeting with university presidents is also called for in the work plan as part of an ongoing conversation to align revision of the master plan with metrics and issues that the commission should be focused on. The Colorado Trustee Network (CTN) partnered with the Department in hosting the January training and the first learning session. CTN launched their organization on March 3rd, are hosting their first event on the



Colorado funding formula through the lens of equity on March 16th. Registration is on the sign-up page for the Colorado Trustee Network.org. There is a transportation package that's under consideration in the legislature. This package will include new revenue generated through fees on transportation. This could benefit higher ed in the long term via redirected additional funding.

Commissioner Reports –

Commissioner Kostenbauer met with Adams State last month. The test optional program was discussed. Also, Adams State is concerned about the name change of Trinidad Junior College to Trinidad State College. The concern is focused on the potential for confusion between the two institutions and if Trinidad is considering a change of mission and scope. Commissioner Kostenbauer also met with the BOLD program which is the diversity program within CU Boulder's engineering college. BOLD reports a significantly high retention rate for their underrepresented minorities – well above the national average.

Fiscal Affairs & Audit Committee – Chair Tucker reported that the committee discussed approval of the capital IT scoring criteria with a slight modification to align with the capital budget revision offered by the working group. There was an initial discussion on the potential reallocation of state aid at different levels. It is currently progressive from freshman year through the senior year and the committee had some initial discussions on possible scenarios if it was different. Steps 1 and 3 of the funding formula were also discussed and will be discussed later today as an agenda item.

Student Success & Academic Affairs Committee – Chair Stich reported that the committee discussed the work-based learning timeline and the convening that was held last week per HB20-1002. This legislation centers around prior learning assessment and work-based learning. The committee also discussed the OER application process. This is also a reminder about the Equity Day of Dialogue scheduled for March 15th from 12:30 to 3:30. There was discussion about what additional things the commission can do to advance our equity goals for the state.

Advisor Reports-

Advisor Cavanaugh reported that there is a ground swell of effort to move to doubling Pell to approximately \$13,000 for the maximum award. ACE, the American Council on Education has a letter that institutions and groups like CCHE can sign in support of this initiative.

Advisor Porter reported that she had attended a meeting with the PTA. She presented on the community college perspective on COVID.

Advisor Artis invited commissioners to join a meeting of the Faculty Advisory Council. Commissioner Hughes will join the meeting on April 9th.

Advisor Baca reported that the overall level of state support Colorado provides to higher education is one of the lowest in the nation. The endowments that the three private institutions on the Work Session panel have is probably well over \$1



billion which puts them at a competitive advantage. Because they are independent, their tuition structures are structured so that they are not relying on state support to fund their operations. These are the types of issues that the CFO group will raise as they explore that kind of expansion of access to funds. Also, the unintended impact of the test optional legislation that is happening at the more prestigious, well-branded institutions is that they are seeing a massive increase in applications to the detriment of the smaller, less recognizable institutions.

Executive Director Report – Dr. Ben Boggs reported for Dr. Angie Paccione due to connectivity issues. On Wednesday, February 24th the Department released its Hunger Free and Healthy Minds campus checklist. Through this initiative we commit as a state to eliminate food insecurity and prioritize mental health needs of our students pursuing the post-secondary education. On Monday, March 15th from 12:30 to 3:30 the Department will convene the first equity day of dialogue with partners across Colorado to highlight the recently published report on equity, educational equity.

Public Comment – There was no public comment.

II. Consent Items

- A. Degree Authorization Act: Recommendation for Authorization of BEE World as a Religious Training Institution/Seminary – *Heather DeLange*

Commissioner McGimpsey moved to approve Consent Item A. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Tucker and passed unanimously.

III. Action Items

- A. Recommended Grants for 2020-21 OER Grant Program – *Spencer Ellis*
Guest Presenters and OER Council Chairs: Ms. Emily Bongiovanni, Colorado School of Mines & Mr. Dustin Fife, Colorado Western University
Spencer Ellis, Director of Educational Innovation, introduced OER grantee recommendations for the final year of grant funds. Staff were joined by the chairs of the OER Council, who reported on the institutional and state impact of the OER program. CCHE unanimously moved to approve the recommended grantees. CCHE also discussed briefly the future of the OER work. Staff closed by suggesting continued support for OER as part of a larger innovation agenda in the refreshed strategic plan in the future.
- B. Recommend Approval of Revised CCHE Capital IT Scoring Criteria – *Lauren Gilliland*
Ms. Lauren Gilliland, Lead Finance Analyst, presented the proposed revised CCHE Capital IT Scoring Criteria. Ms. Gilliland noted that a full review of the IT criteria was not conducted, as they have only been in place for two years. Revisions were only made to criteria shared with the newly revised CCHE Capital Construction/Renewal Criteria for consistency. Ms. Gilliland stated that the Fiscal Affairs and Audit Committee approved of the new CCHE Capital IT criteria at



their February meeting. Advisor Brad Baca expressed his approval of the revision. Commissioners voted unanimously to approve the new criteria.

IV. Discussion Items

A. Degree Authorization Act: Recommendation for Provisional Authorization of the University of Maryland, Global Campus – *Heather DeLange*

Ms. Heather DeLange, Director of the Office of Private Postsecondary Education, reported on the outcome of the evaluation for the University of Maryland Global Campus. Ms. DeLange provided the Commission with the background and reasoning for the University’s application to operate in Colorado on the Fort Carson Army Base.

Ms. DeLange explained the remaining requirement for the University is to secure a surety bond. Upon procurement of the bond, Ms. DeLange will return to the Commission recommending Full Authorization.

Ms. DeLange noted that staff would support the move from a Discussion Item to an Action item if the Commission so desired. The motion was made, seconded and the item passed unanimously.

B. CCHE Use of Steps 1 and 3 of Funding Formula – *Jason Schrock*

Mr. Jason Schrock, Chief Financial Officer, discussed the structure of the new funding formula that allocates state funding to governing boards established by HB 20-1366. He discussed the three components, or “steps,” of the formula. State statute gives the commission authority to make funding recommendations using the formula, including through steps 1 and 3.

Mr. Schrock discussed the document distributed to the commission outlining the process the CCHE would use to make funding recommendations. Essentially, the commission would annually establish a policy goal or priority in collaboration with the department and governing boards. The Commission would then recommend funding be allocated in step 1 and/or 3 to governing boards to meet the goal. This could include allocating to select governing boards based on an application process. Advisor Brad Baca discussed the process for the use of steps 1 and 3, including feedback from other governing boards on the use of the steps.

Mr. Schrock discussed the next steps for the process, including asking governing boards to recommend policy goals for step 1 or 3 for the commission to consider. The commission will utilize its committees to help vet recommendations for policy goals. Mr. Tucker discussed his interest in seeing reporting mechanisms to ensure there is accountability tied to the funding allocated through steps 1 and 3.



C. Impacts of the Pandemic -*Dr. Kim Poast, Mr. Todd Saliman, Dr. Bill Niemi, Dr. Bill Henry, Dr. Kurt Haas, Dr. Rick Miranda, Dr. Kent Buchanan*

Representatives of the state's 4-year institutions discussed the impact of the pandemic on enrollment, retention, and student success, and how these institutions are navigating and changing in this new environment.

V. Commission Initiatives

A. Legislative Update – *Chloe Figg*

Chloe Figg, Legislative Liaison for the Department and Alexia Chaparro, Legislative Intern and CLLARO fellow, presented an update to the Commission which covered newly introduced legislation impacting higher education policy.

The meeting adjourned at 3:40pm.



TOPIC: RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF MIDDLE SCHOOL MATH ENDORSEMENT AT METROPOLITAN STATE UNIVERSITY OF DENVER

PREPARED BY: DR. BRITTANY LANE, DIRECTOR FOR EDUCATOR PREPARATION

I. SUMMARY

This consent item recommends approval to offer the Middle School Math Endorsement at Metropolitan State University of Denver.

II. BACKGROUND

Pursuant to C.R.S. §23-1-121, the Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) considers approval of all educator preparation programs at public and private institutions of higher education after receiving an affirmative recommendation from the Colorado State Board of Education (SBE).

The process for initial approval of new educator preparation programs is as follows:

- The Colorado Department of Higher Education (DHE) reviews an application, through the parameters of the Degree Authorization Act, for operational compliance. If the program meets the requirements, DHE provides a recommendation to the Colorado Commission on Higher Education for “provisional authorization”.
- The Colorado Department of Education (CDE) conducts a review of the endorsement program, to ensure its content is designed and implemented in a manner that will enable a candidate to meet the requirements for licensure in Colorado (C.R.S. §22-60.5).
- Following that review, CDE provides a recommendation to the State Board of Education for its consideration.
- If the SBE approves the application, the approval is forwarded to DHE.
- Upon receiving an approval from SBE, DHE reviews the proposed program for the following statutory performance criteria [C.R.S. §23-1-121(2)]:
 - a comprehensive admission system;
 - ongoing advising and screening of candidates; integration of theory and practice in coursework and field-based training;
 - supervised field-based experience; and,
 - assessment of candidates’ subject matter and professional knowledge and ability to apply the professional knowledge base.
- DHE would then forward a recommendation for approval or denial to CCHE for action.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

SBE approved the addition of a middle school math endorsement in June 2018. The new endorsement allows those interested in teaching middle school math the ability to do so without having to demonstrate proficiency on the PRAXIS exam necessary to teach higher level high

school math. The SBE approved the content of the Metropolitan State University Denver Middle School Math endorsement program at its meeting on February 10, 2021 and CDE staff transmitted its affirmative recommendation to the Department.

Department staff has analyzed the proposed program according to the statutory performance criteria set forth in C.R.S. §23-1-121(2) and confirmed it is comparable to the IHEs already approved secondary math program and, therefore, meets statutory performance criteria.

Pursuant to Colorado Revised Statutes §23-5-129(6)(b), department staff finds the proposed degree is consistent with the institution's statutory role and mission and meets the educator preparation requirements in §23-1-121, C.R.S. The degree complies with GT Pathways requirements and the 120 credit cap.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the Middle School Math educator preparation program at Metropolitan State University of Denver.

III. STATUTORY AUTHORITY

C.R.S. §23-1-12(2) -Commission directive - approval of educator preparation programs – review

TOPIC: DEGREE AUTHORIZATION ACT: RECOMMENDATION OF AUTHORIZATION STATUS CHANGE FOR UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND GLOBAL CAMPUS

PREPARED BY: HEATHER DELANGE, OFFICE OF PRIVATE POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

I. SUMMARY

This consent item addresses the authorization status change for the University of Maryland, Global Campus. Staff recommends a change from Provisional to Full Authorization for the University of Maryland Global Campus to operate as an authorized private, degree-granting institution in Colorado pursuant to the Degree Authorization Act (§23-2-101 et seq.).

II. BACKGROUND

The Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) has statutory responsibility for administration of Title 23, Article 2 of the Colorado Revised Statutes, commonly referred to as the Degree Authorization Act (DAA). The Act specifies the terms by which the Commission may authorize accredited private colleges and universities, out-of-state public colleges and universities, and seminaries and bible colleges to operate in Colorado.

The DAA defines the Department's jurisdiction over private or out-of-state public education programs available to residents of Colorado. The DAA establishes standards to (1) prevent misrepresentation, fraud, and collusion in offering educational programs to the public and (2) protect, preserve, foster, and encourage the educational programs offered by private educational institutions, which meet generally recognized criteria of quality and effectiveness as determined through voluntary accreditation.

Provisional authorization is the initial level for institutions, new or new to Colorado, which have been evaluated by department staff under Commission procedures and authorized by the Commission to enroll students, offer instruction, graduate students and award degrees under the condition that the institution is continuously seeking and making satisfactory progress toward accreditation at the local site. Institutions with provisional authorization are required to renew annually and must receive accreditation at the Colorado site within three years of initial authorization.

The University of Maryland, Global Campus (UMGC) is a Maryland public, not-for-profit institution of higher education and one of 12 degree-granting institutions in the University System of Maryland. UMGC was formerly named University of Maryland University College and in 2019, the institution's name was changed to University of Maryland Global Campus to better reflect its global presence and ongoing mission of serving the education needs of working adults and military students around the world.

UMGC now serves more than 90,000 students worldwide with 20+ locations in Maryland, D.C. and Virginia, 80+ locations across the United States, and 170+ worldwide locations – including military bases in more than 20 countries and territories.

University of Maryland Global Campus received Provisional Authorization by the Commission at the March 2021 business meeting. The Provisional Authorization remains the authorization level for new institutions until accreditation is approved by the accreditor and for any outstanding requirements are met. In this case, UMGC’s regional accreditor has approved the additional “other instructional site” for UMGC’s activity on the Fort Carson Army Base. Additionally, staff has received the required surety bond as is required for all institutions seeking authorization.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

University of Maryland, Global Campus applied for and received provisional authorization from the Commission in March 2021. As is required for all institutions, UMGC procured a surety bond and received approval from its accreditor to operate the local site.

UMGC has demonstrated compliance accreditation and bonding requirements, therefore, it has met the standards for Full Authorization. Institutions with Full Authorization will renew authorization in concert with the accreditation renewal cycle which for UMGC will be 2024-2025.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends approval of authorization level change from Provisional to Full Authorization for University of Maryland, Global Campus.

STATUTORY AUTHORITY

C.R.S. §23-2-103.3 Authorization to operate in Colorado – renewal

(1) (a) To operate in Colorado, a private college or university shall apply for and receive authorization from the commission. A private college or university shall obtain a separate authorization for each campus, branch, or site that is separately accredited. A private, nonprofit college or university shall submit with its application verification of nonprofit status, including a copy of the institution's tax-exempt certificate issued by the Colorado department of revenue.

(b) After receiving an application, the department shall review the application to determine whether the private college or university is institutionally accredited by a regional or national accrediting body recognized by the United States department of education. The department shall not recommend and the commission shall not approve an application from a private college or university that, in the two years preceding submission of the application, has had its accreditation suspended or withdrawn or has been prohibited from operating in another state or that has substantially the same owners, governing board, or principal officers as a private college or university that, in the two years preceding submission of the application, has had its accreditation suspended or withdrawn or has been prohibited from operating in another state.

(2) To operate in Colorado, a private college or university shall be institutionally accredited on the basis of an on-site review by a regional or national accrediting body recognized by the United States department of education; except that a private college or university may operate for an initial period without accreditation if the commission determines, in accordance with standards established by the commission, that the private college or university is likely to become accredited in a reasonable period of time or is making progress toward accreditation in accordance with the accrediting body's policies. The commission may grant a provisional authorization to a private college or university to operate for an initial period without accreditation. The private college or university shall annually renew its provisional authorization and report annually to the commission concerning the institution's progress in obtaining accreditation.

**Agenda Item III A will be
provided at the meeting.**

III. Action Item

- A. Recommend Approval of Revised Adams State University
Plachy Hall Capital Renewal Budget Request –
Lauren Gilliland

TOPIC: PROPOSED REVISIONS TO CCHE POLICY I, PART P: EDUCATOR PREPARATION

PREPARED BY: DR. BRITTANY LANE, DIRECTOR, EDUCATOR PREPARATION

I. SUMMARY

This discussion item presents recommended revisions to the CCHE educator preparation policy. The policy has not been formally revised since 2011. Changes – largely as a result of SB20-158 (Concerning Measures Related to Professional Training for Educators) include 1) Changes to the performance-based measures for authorization and reauthorization of programs; 2) a new “conditional” outcome for reauthorization; and 3) supports for new units of educator preparation.

II. BACKGROUND

On May 10, 2019 Governor Polis signed [SB19-190](#) (Growing Great Teachers Act) into law. Among other things, the act directed the Department to work with the Colorado Department of Education to review research on best practices used in educator preparation and write a report. The resulting report [Best in Class: Five Principles in Effective Educator Preparation](#) was published in January 2020. The report synthesizes findings into five general principles with several practices under each. These principles were then identified as the new standards for for educator preparation approval and reapproval in [SB20-158](#) (Professional Training for Educators) signed into law on June 30, 2020 by Governor Polis. The act amended various parts of state statute, most prominently CRS §23-1-121 concerning educator preparation. The act changes the performance-based standards to align with best practices identified in the report.

Further, the act creates an additional outcome for the reauthorization of educator preparation programs. Previously, CRS §23-1-121(4)(d) stated that programs who met the performance-based standards could be fully (re)authorized and that those that did not would either be put on probation or termination. SB20-158 adds “conditional” reauthorization as an alternative between full reauthorized and probation that allows educator preparation providers to still admit new students while working on a performance plan to remedy any areas for improvement that were identified as a part of the reauthorization process. See Table 1.

Table 1. Outcomes for Reauthorization

Reauthorization Outcome	Full Authorization	Conditional Authorization	Probation	Termination
Implications for Admission	Can admit new students	Can admit new students	Can not admit new students	Steps toward closure

Finally, policy changes have been made to support units (Educator preparation providers) that receive initial authorization. These provisions allow staff to check in with the new provider 12-18 months following initial approval to learn about implementation and determine if further supports are needed

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

Because of the extensive revisions required to the policy, three addenda of CCHE Policy I, P are attached: 1) a red-lined version with all recommended changes visible; 2) a clean revised version; and 3) Table outlining substantive changes.

The policy has been changed to reflect the following changes in statute

1. New performance-based standards to be used as the measures for the initial authorization and reauthorization of educator preparation programs.
2. An additional option for conditional authorization to be used in the final determination of authorization and reauthorization status.
3. Additional supports for new units (educator preparation providers) to Colorado

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

Discussion item only. In the event the Commission moves the item to action, the staff recommends that the Commission approve proposed changes to CCHE Policy Section I, Part P regarding:

1. New performance-based standards to be used as the measures for the initial authorization and reauthorization of educator preparation programs.
2. An additional option for conditional authorization to be used in the final determination of authorization and reauthorization status.
3. Additional supports for new units (educator preparation providers) to Colorado

V. STATUTORY AUTHORITY

C.R.S. §23-1-121

Commission directive – approval of educator preparation programs – review - report

(1) As used in this section, unless the context otherwise requires:

(a) "Approved educator preparation program" means an educator preparation program that has been reviewed pursuant to the provisions of this section and has been determined by the commission to meet the performance-based standards established by the commission pursuant to this section and the requirements of section 23-1-108.

(a.5) "Candidate" means a person who is participating in an initial, advanced, or other preparation program for education professionals in order to enter the education profession.

(b) "Institution of higher education" means a public, private, or proprietary postsecondary institution authorized by the commission to offer educator preparation programs.

(c) (Deleted by amendment, L. 2011, (SB 11-245), ch. 201, p. 842, § 2, effective August 10, 2011.)

(d) "Program" means a planned sequence of undergraduate, post-baccalaureate, or graduate courses and experiences for the purpose of preparing teachers and other school professionals to be effective educators in prekindergarten through twelfth grade settings. A program may lead to a degree, a recommendation for a state license by the department of education, both, or neither.

(e) "Unit" means the college, school, department, or other administrative body in a college, university, or other organization with the responsibility for managing or coordinating all programs offered for the initial and advanced preparation of educators, regardless of where the programs are administratively housed in an institution.

(2) The commission shall adopt policies establishing the requirements for educator preparation programs offered by institutions of higher education. The department shall work in cooperation with the state board of education in developing the requirements for educator preparation programs. At a minimum, the requirements must ensure that each educator preparation program complies with section 23-1-125, is designed on a performance-based model, and includes:

(a) Program design around a shared vision of candidate proficiency and professionalism that supports decision-making about partnerships and the integration of curricula, learners, and course work and clinical experiences;

(b) Mapping, planning, development, assessment, and support of candidate proficiencies, including candidates' deep understanding of content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, the content knowledge required for educating, and the dispositions and professional qualities necessary to be successful;

(c) With regard to teacher and principal preparation programs, courses that provide content knowledge as described in part 10 of article 7 of title 22, specifically in teaching to the state preschool through elementary and secondary education standards adopted pursuant to section 22-7-1005;

(c.5) Course work that teaches teacher candidates the science of reading, including the foundational reading skills of phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary development, reading fluency including oral skills, and reading comprehension, and the skills and strategies to apply to ensure that every student learns to read. Reading course work and field practice opportunities must be a significant focus for teachers preparing for endorsement in elementary, early childhood, or special education.

(c.7) Course work that provides educator candidates with an overview of Title II of the federal "Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990", 42 U.S.C. sec. 12101 et seq., as amended, and its implementing regulations; section 504 of the federal "Rehabilitation Act of 1973", 29 U.S.C. sec. 701 et seq., as amended, and its implementing regulations; the "Individuals with Disabilities Education Act", 20 U.S.C. sec. 1400 et seq., as amended, and its implementing regulations; individualized education programs; and child find and that teaches educators effective special education classroom practices, including but not limited to inclusive learning environments;

(d) Intentional clinical experience, early and throughout preparation, relating to predetermined state content standards, which experiences afford candidates multiple, intentional experiences to learn from practice. Clinical experiences must be aligned with program curricula so that candidates develop pedagogical skills and pedagogical content knowledge. Teacher preparation candidates must complete a minimum of eight hundred hours, and principal and administrator candidates must

complete a minimum of three hundred hours, of clinical practice. A teacher candidate must complete the hours of clinical practice while enrolled in an approved educator preparation program; except that a program, after review, may accept clinical practice hours completed before enrolling in the program. A majority of the clinical practice hours must be completed through a continuous placement. For every additional endorsement or advanced degree, a candidate must complete an appropriate period of supervised field experiences that relate to predetermined standards, including best practices and relevant national norms related to the candidate's endorsements.

(d.5) A requirement that each teacher candidate in an initial licensure program complete at least one semester or quarter-length course in behavioral health training using culturally responsive and trauma- and evidence-informed practices;

(e) A requirement that each candidate, prior to graduation, must demonstrate the skills required for licensure, as specified by rule of the state board of education pursuant to section 22-2-109 (3), in the manner specified by rule of the state board;

(f) A requirement that preparation program faculty, to improve their work, must engage in continuous evidence-based cycles of self-reflection and review regarding the impact of their programs on their candidates' development throughout the programs. These cycles must include data on current candidates throughout the program and available data on program completers.

(3) The commission shall also adopt policies to ensure that each educator preparation program offered by an institution of higher education includes implementation of procedures to monitor and improve the effectiveness of the program, as well as the effectiveness of its graduates pursuant to section 22-9-105.5, C.R.S., including at a minimum the following:

(a) Periodic review by the institution of higher education offering the educator preparation program to ensure that the program meets the requirements specified by the commission pursuant to this section;

(b) Implementation of a procedure for collecting and reviewing evaluative data concerning the educator preparation program, which shall include periodic surveys of graduates and employers and educator identifier system data, pursuant to section 22-2-112 (1)(q), C.R.S., for modifying the program as necessary in response to the data collected;

(c) Implementation of a procedure for reviewing the scores achieved on the professional competency assessments required pursuant to section 22-60.5-201, C.R.S., by candidates enrolled in and graduating from the program and modifying the program as necessary to improve those scores.

(d) (Deleted by amendment, L. 2011, (SB 11-245), ch. 201, p. 842, § 2, effective August 10, 2011.)

(4) (a) (I) The department, in conjunction with the department of education, shall review each educator preparation program offered by an institution of higher education as provided in subsection (4)(b) of this section and shall establish a schedule for review of each educator preparation program that ensures each program is reviewed as provided in this section not more frequently than once every five years; except that, if a program is placed on conditional approval or probationary status, the program must receive additional reviews within the five-year period, as determined by the department. Reviews of or decisions made concerning a program after it is placed on conditional approval or probationary status do not change the date of the program's next five-year review, as determined by the department.

(I.5) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (4)(a)(I) of this section to the contrary, if a new unit is approved and offers a new educator preparation program, the department shall review the new educator preparation program no sooner than twelve months but not more than twenty-four months after the new educator preparation program is initially approved.

(II) (Deleted by amendment, L. 2008, p. 1476, 16, effective May 28, 2008.)

(III) An institution of higher education that chooses to offer a new educator preparation program or modify an existing program, by significantly modifying the content, field experiences, or program delivery, shall submit the new or modified program to the department for review pursuant to this section. The commission shall adopt policies and procedures for the review of new and modified programs.

(b) Each program review conducted pursuant to subsection (4)(a) of this section must ensure that the program meets the minimum requirements adopted pursuant to subsections (2) and (3) of this section and the requirements of section 23-1-108 and any policies adopted pursuant thereto. In determining whether to initially approve or continue the approval of an educator preparation program, the commission shall consider any recommendations made by the state board of education pursuant to section 22-2-109 (5) concerning the effectiveness of the program content. If the state board of education recommends that a program not be approved or be placed on conditional approval or probation, the commission shall follow the recommendation by refusing initial approval of the program, placing the program on conditional approval, or placing the program on probation.

(c) The department shall work cooperatively with each institution of higher education that offers an educator preparation program to obtain any data requested by the department to determine the admission and enrollment patterns, completion rates, and effectiveness of educator preparation programs offered by the institution. In addition, each institution of higher education shall, upon request from the department, prepare and submit an annual report to assist the department in reviewing the educator preparation programs pursuant to this section. The department shall collaborate with representatives from the governing boards of each institution of higher education that offer educator preparation programs in specifying the information to be included in the annual report.

(d)

(I) Following review of an educator preparation program, if the commission determines that the program does not meet the requirements specified in subsection (4)(b) of this section, it shall grant the program conditional approval, place the program on probation, or terminate the program. The commission shall adopt policies specifying the procedures for placing a program on conditional approval, placing a program on probation, and terminating a program, including a procedure for appeal; the length of time that a program may remain on conditional approval or probation; and the process by which the level of approval of a program is reviewed and changed.

(II) A program that the commission places on conditional approval may continue to accept new students. A program that the commission places on probation must not accept new students until the commission removes the program from probationary status.

(III) If the commission determines that termination of the approval of a program is necessary, the program must be terminated within four years after the determination.

(IV) If the commission places a program on conditional approval or probation based on the recommendation of the state board of education, the commission shall consult with the state board of education in determining as provided in subsection (4)(d)(II) or (4)(d)(III) of this section whether the program should subsequently be reapproved, conditionally approved, placed on probation, or terminated.

(e) The commission shall adopt policies and procedures, including a procedure for appeal, to discontinue any educator preparation program at an institution of higher education that has not had any candidate successfully graduate during the previous five years.

(5) (Deleted by amendment, L. 2011, (SB 11-245), ch. 201, p. 842, § 2, effective August 10, 2011.)

(6) The department shall annually prepare a report concerning the enrollment in, graduation rates from, and effectiveness of the review of educator preparation programs authorized by the commission. In addition the report shall include data on the outcomes of graduates of educator preparation programs pursuant to section 22-2-112 (1)(q). The report shall also state the percentage of educator candidates graduating from each program during the preceding twelve months who applied for and received an initial license pursuant to section 22-60.5-201, and the percentage of the graduates who passed the assessments administered pursuant to section 22-60.5-203. For purposes of completing the report required pursuant to this subsection (6), the department of higher education and the department of education shall share any relevant data that complies with state and federal regulations with the other agency. The department shall provide notice to the education committees of the senate and the house of representatives, or any successor committees, that the report is available to the members of the committees upon request. Notwithstanding the requirement in section 24-1-136 (11)(a)(I), the requirement to submit the report required in this subsection (6) continues indefinitely.

(7) The general assembly encourages the department to collaborate with national accrediting bodies of educator preparation and to offer concurrent and joint site visits to educator preparation programs at institutions of higher education to the extent feasible.

VI. ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Proposed Revisions to CCHE Policy I, P: Educator Preparation (redlined with recommended changes visible)

Attachment B: Clean version of proposed revised CCHE Policy I, P: Educator Preparation (all proposed revisions incorporated into the text)

Attachment C: Table documenting substantive changes

1 SECTION I

2
3
4 PART P EDUCATOR PREPARATION POLICY

5
6
7 **1.00 Introduction**

8
9 This policy describes the performance-based educator preparation model and outlines
10 the criteria and procedures for review, initial approval, and reauthorization of schools,
11 colleges, and departments of educator preparation (hereafter listed as “units” of
12 educator preparation) and of educator preparation programs.

13
14 This policy states the statutory criteria and the corresponding performance measures
15 that new and existing units of educator preparation must meet to qualify candidates
16 for state licensure and against which adopted standards and performance measures are
17 evaluated. The policy also describes the review and accountability processes for
18 Colorado’s units of educator preparation.

19
20 The policy applies to all approved educator preparation units and programs at public,
21 private, and proprietary institutions of higher education in Colorado.

22
23 **2.00 Statutory Authority**

24
25 The CCHE Educator Preparation Policy is based on section 23-1-121 C.R.S. that states:

26
27 The Commission shall adopt policies establishing the requirements for
28 educator preparation programs offered by institutions of higher
29 education. The department shall work in cooperation with the state
30 board of education in developing the requirements for educator
31 preparation programs. At a minimum the requirements shall ensure that
32 each educator preparation program complies with section 23-1- 125,
33 [and] is designed on a performance-based model.

34
35 **3.00 Goals, Principles, and Terminology**

36
37 **3.01 Policy Goals**

38
39 The primary goal of CCHE Educator Preparation Policy is to ensure high
40 quality review of educator preparation programs based, when possible, on
41 outcomes rather than inputs and to assist educator preparation programs with
42 improving the effectiveness of their graduates by maintaining flexibility and
43 encouraging creativity, rather than being strictly regulatory.

To achieve that goal, the policy:

- 3.01.01 Provides a basis for making decisions in the areas of approving new educator preparation programs proposed by institutions of higher education, reauthorizing existing educator preparation programs at institutions of higher education, and holding institutions of higher education accountable for addressing areas for improvement identified during the review process;
- 3.01.02 Requires a periodic review of educator preparation units, not more frequently than once every five years [section 23-1-121 (4) (a) (I) C.R.S.] and that may be offered concurrently or jointly with national accrediting bodies [section 23-1-121 (7) C.R.S.].
- 3.01.03 Provides a basis for the department to ~~assist~~support educator preparation programs at institutions of higher education in complying with federal laws, national educator preparation standards and accreditation, and new state laws and policies regarding aligning the P-20 continuum; requires the department and department of education to work collaboratively to assist educator preparation programs in ensuring alignment with state board of education rules regarding the preparation and licensing of candidates, new P-12 academic standards and postsecondary and workforce readiness, and other state laws and policies that impact P-12 education and the preparation of educators;
- 3.01.04 Provides a basis for the department to ~~assist~~support educator preparation programs in responding to state needs by helping to ensure the preparation of effective educators in high needs content areas and high-needs regions of the state and who are able to respond to the needs of local education agencies;
- 3.01.05 Allows the department and the department of education to implement procedures for collecting and reviewing evaluative data of educator preparation units and to share that data with the educator preparation units for program self-improvement.
- 3.01.06 Requires an annual report on the requirements and effectiveness of educator preparation to the legislative education committees [23-1-121 (6) C.R.S.].

3.02 Principles

CCHE Educator Preparation Policy is based on the following principles:

- 3.02.01 Educator preparation is a shared enterprise among the Colorado Commission on Higher Education, the Colorado State Board of Education (SBE), institutions of higher education, and school districts. The Colorado Commission on Higher Education has responsibility for the review and approval of units of educator preparation designed to prepare educators, while

1 the Colorado State Board of Education is authorized to develop the professional
2 content standards for educator preparation programs and to license those who
3 complete approved programs.
4

5 3.02.02 Units of educator preparation are evaluated on the criteria listed in Section
6 4.00 of this policy.
7

8 **3.03** Terminology 9

10 An Approved Educator Preparation Unit is the college, school, department, or other
11 administrative body in a college, university, or other organization with the
12 responsibility for managing or coordinating all programs offered for the initial and
13 advanced preparation of educators, regardless of where the programs are
14 administratively housed in an institution., which has been reviewed and approved
15 pursuant to this policy and the provisions of C.R.S. 23-1-121.
16

17 An Approved Educator Preparation Program is a planned sequence of undergraduate,
18 post-baccalaureate, or graduate courses and experiences for the purpose of preparing
19 teachers and other school professionals to be effective educators in pre-kindergarten
20 through twelfth grade settings. A program may lead to a degree, a recommendation for
21 a state license by the department of education, both, or neither.
22

23 Assessment is defined as the process used to collect evidence of what a student knows
24 and is able to demonstrate.
25

26 P12 Academic Post-Secondary & Workforce Readiness Standards are the specific
27 statements of what a P-12 student should know or be able to do in specified academic
28 areas.
29

30 Field-based Experiences are experiences that allow candidates to apply content and
31 professional knowledge in authentic school settings under the direct supervision of
32 licensed educators and college or university faculty. Field-based training may include
33 a variety of experiences in supervised settings—classroom observations, assisting
34 licensed educators in school settings, practica, student teaching and internships—or a
35 combination of experiences under a partner school model.
36

37 Endorsement is the designation on a license that the holder is authorized to work in a
38 P12 school in a specific grade or developmental level (e.g., elementary); a subject area
39 (e.g., language arts); a school leader (e.g., principal); or as a special services provider
40 (e.g., speech/language pathologist).
41

42 Licensure refers to the system and criteria that authorizes individuals to work in
43 Colorado public schools. The Colorado State Board of Education is the entity
44 authorized to license candidates following recommendation from the Colorado
45 Department of Education.

1 Educator standards refers to sets of prescribed standards, adopted as rule by State Board
2 of Education, which educator candidates must know and be able to demonstrate.

3
4 Licensure Competencies refers to sets of prescribed standards for each endorsement
5 area, adopted as rule by State Board of Education.

6
7 Performance-Based Model refers to a system that evaluates an educator preparation
8 unit against the statutory performance criteria in Section 4.00 of this policy and the
9 State Board of Education Educator Standards as well as the licensure competencies
10 by endorsement area. Section 4.00 of this policy specifies the performance criteria that
11 apply to the initial approval or reapproval of educator preparation units. Educator
12 preparation units that fail to meet the performance criteria will not be approved, will be
13 placed on probation, or will be discontinued.

14
15 Post-Baccalaureate Educator Preparation is for candidates pursuing initial or advanced
16 non-degree educator preparation who already have an undergraduate degree (e.g.
17 Bachelor of Arts [BA] or Bachelor of Science [BS]).

18
19 Graduate Educator Preparation is for candidates pursuing initial or advanced educator
20 preparation that is part of a graduate degree program (e.g., Master of Education
21 [M.Ed.]).

22
23 Candidate is a person who is participating in an approved educator preparation
24 program.

25 26 27 **4.00 Criteria for Performance-Based Educator Preparation Units or Programs**

28
29 The Commission shall use performance-based measures specified in section 23-1- 121
30 C.R.S. to review and approve educator preparation units and programs within units,
31 including proposals for new programs. The approved sequence of coursework and field
32 experiences will be evaluated on evidence supporting a performance-based model.
33 Recommendation for approval by the State Board of Education (see 4.06) is a necessary
34 precondition for Commission approval. In its review, the Commission will evaluate
35 whether units requesting educator preparation approval meet criteria described in
36 sections 4.01 through 4.07.

37
38 **4.01** Public institutions shall ensure that undergraduate educator preparation programs are
39 designed and implemented in accordance with C.R.S.23-1-125, in regards to degree
40 requirements, credit limits, transferability of courses, core courses, general education
41 requirements, and competency testing, and prior learning.

42 4.01.01 Baccalaureate degrees leading to licensure as an educator may not exceed 126
43 credit hours.

44
45 **4.02** Each program will demonstrate that it has a comprehensive admission system that
46 includes screening of a candidate's dispositions for the field in which he or she is
47 seeking licensure, consideration of a candidate's academic preparation for entry into

1 his or her desired endorsement area or areas, and preadmission advising for students
2 who are considering becoming candidates. The department shall work in
3 collaboration with the programs to define any dispositions considered to be
4 appropriate for educators. [23-1-121 (2) (a) C.R.S.].

5 Each program is designed around a shared vision of candidate proficiency and
6 professionalism that supports decision making about partnerships and the integration
7 of curricula, learners, and coursework and clinical experiences. [23-1-12 (2) (a)]

8
9
10
11 ~~4.01~~ ~~4.03~~ ~~Each program will demonstrate that it has a comprehensive system that includes~~
12 ~~ongoing advising and screening of candidates by practicing educators or faculty~~
13 ~~members [23-1-121 (2) (b) C.R.S.].~~

14 Each program can demonstrate mapping, planning, development, assessment, and
15 support of candidate proficiencies including candidates' deep understanding of
16 content knowledge (such as that described in part 10 of article 7 of title 22,
17 specifically in teaching to the state preschool through elementary and secondary
18 education standards adopted pursuant to section 22-7-1005), pedagogical knowledge,
19 the content knowledge required for educating, and the dispositions and professional
20 qualities necessary to be successful [23-1-121 (2) (b)]

21
22 ~~Each program will demonstrate that its programs contain course work and field-based~~
23 ~~training that integrates theory and practice and educates candidates in methodologies,~~
24 ~~practices, and procedures of teaching standards-based education, specifically in~~
25 ~~teaching the content defined in the Colorado P12 Academic Standards [23-1-121 (2)~~
26 ~~(e) C.R.S.].~~

27 4.04 Ensure teacher and principal preparation programs courses provide content
28 knowledge as described in part 10 of Article 7 of Title 22, specifically in teaching to the
29 state preschool through elementary and secondary education standards adopted pursuant
30 to section 22-7-1005; and include

31
32 4.04.01 Course work that teaches teacher candidates the science of reading, including
33 the foundational reading skills of phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary
34 development, reading fluency including oral skills, and
35 reading comprehension, and the skills and strategies to apply to ensure that every
36 student learns to read. Reading coursework and field practice opportunities must be a
37 significant focus for teachers preparing for endorsement in elementary, early childhood,
38 or special education.

39
40 4.04.02 Course work that provides educator candidates with an overview of Title II of
41 the federal "Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990", 42 U.S.C. sec. 12101 et seq., as
42 amended, and its implementing regulations; section 504 of the federal "Rehabilitation
43 Act of 1973", 29 U.S.C. sec. 701 et seq., as amended, and its implementing regulations;
44 the "Individuals with Disabilities Education Act", 20 U.S.C. sec. 1400 et seq., as
45 amended, and its implementing regulations; individualized education programs; and
46 child find and that teaches educators effective special education classroom practices,
47 including but not limited to inclusive learning environments;

1
2 4.04.03 A requirement that each teacher candidate in an initial licensure program
3 complete at least one semester or quarter-length course in behavior health training using
4 culturally responsive and trauma- and evidence-informed practices;
5

6 4.04.04 Each unit will document that, prior to graduation, its candidates demonstrate
7 the skills required for licensure, as determined by the State Board of Education [23-1-
8 121(2) (e) C.R.S.].
9

10
11 ~~4.02~~ ~~The curriculum of each program will ensure that each teacher candidate in an initial~~
12 ~~licensure program shall complete a minimum of 800 hours, each principal and~~
13 ~~administrator candidate shall complete a minimum of 300 hours, and each other~~
14 ~~advanced degree or add-on endorsement candidate may complete appropriate~~
15 ~~supervised field-based experience that relates to predetermined learning standards and~~
16 ~~includes best practices and national norms related to the candidate's endorsement.~~
17 4.05 Intentional clinical experience, early and throughout preparation, relating to
18 predetermined state content standards, which experiences afford candidates multiple
19 intentional experiences to learn from practice. Clinical experiences must be aligned with
20 program curricula so that candidates develop pedagogical skills and pedagogical content
21 knowledge. Teacher preparation candidates must complete a minimum of eight hundred
22 hours, and principal and administrator candidates must complete a minimum of three
23 hundred hours of clinical practice. A teacher candidate must complete the hours of
24 clinical practice while in an approved educator preparation program; except that a
25 program, after review, may accept clinical practice hours completed before enrolling in
26 the program. A majority of the clinical practice hours must be completed through a
27 continuous placement. For every additional endorsement of advanced degree a
28 candidate must complete and appropriate period of supervised field experiences that
29 relate to predetermined standards including best practices and relevant national norms
30 related to the candidate's endorsements.
31
32

33 ~~4.02~~ ~~4.06 Each unit will document that, prior to graduation, its candidates demonstrate the~~
34 ~~skills required for licensure, as determined by the State Board of Education [23-1-121~~
35 ~~(2)(e) C.R.S.].~~ ~~[.Moved to 4.04.04]~~
36

36 4.03

37 ~~3.~~ ~~4.07 Each unit will provide ongoing and comprehensive assessments including the~~
38 ~~evaluation of each candidate's subject matter and professional knowledge and ability~~
39 ~~to apply the professional knowledge base [23-1-121(2)(f) C.R.S.].~~
40

41 ~~3.~~ ~~4.06 A requirement that preparation program faculty, to improve their work, engage~~
42 ~~in continuous evidence-based cycles of self-reflection and review regarding the impact~~
43 ~~of their programs on their candidates' development throughout the programs. These~~
44 ~~cycles must include data on current candidates throughout the program and available~~
45 ~~data on program completers. [23-1-121(2)(f) C.R.S.].~~
46
47

1 **5.00 Approval Process for New Educator Preparation Programs**

2
3 A unit of educator preparation that chooses to offer a new educator preparation program
4 or substantially modified by significantly modifying the content, field experiences, or
5 delivery of a program that leads to licensure by CDE shall submit a proposal to both
6 the ~~Office of Professional Services~~, Colorado Department of Education (CDE) and the
7 Department of Higher Education (DHE). DHE, in conjunction with the CDE, shall
8 review each program proposal submitted by an institution of higher education. The
9 CDE will first review the proposal for alignment with State Board of Education
10 educator standards and licensure competencies by endorsement area and then submit
11 to DHE its recommendation regarding approval. Program proposals for advanced
12 degrees without licensure shall be submitted to DHE only.

13
14 **5.01** DHE will follow the approval process described in section 4.00 to review educator
15 preparation program proposals.

16
17 5.01.01 If a new unit is approved to offer educator preparation programs, initially
18 approved programs will be reviewed within 12-24 months.

19
20 5.01.01.02 New units are not permitted to propose adding additional endorsements beyond
21 those that are initially approved until after the unit's first reauthorization.

1
2 **5.02** For programs leading to licensure, CDE is responsible for review and State Board of
3 Education is responsible for approval of the content of each program prior to its
4 consideration for approval by the Commission. The State Board of Education will
5 review the proposal to determine if the program’s content is designed and implemented
6 in a manner that is in compliance with section 22-2-109 (5) (a) C.R.S.
7

8 5.02.01 If the State Board of Education confirms that the content portion of the program
9 is in compliance with its adopted standards, DHE shall review the proposal
10 using the performance-based measures specified in Section 4.00 of this policy
11 and present a recommendation to the Commission.
12

13 5.02.02 If the State Board of Education ~~does not recommend CCHE consideration~~
14 ~~because the program content does not meet the SBE standards, CCHE will not~~
15 ~~take further action to approve the request.~~ recommends that a program be placed
16 on conditional approval or probation, the commission shall follow the
17 recommendation by refusing initial approval of the program, placing the
18 program on conditional approval, or placing the program on probation.
19
20

21 5.03
22

23 **6.00 Reauthorization Process and Site Review of Units of Educator preparation**
24

25 This section describes the reauthorization process for units of educator preparation.
26

27 **6.01** The reauthorization of educator preparation programs at approved units of educator
28 preparation will be conducted by DHE in collaboration with the Office of Professional
29 Services, Colorado Department of Education (CDE). The process consists of seven
30 steps: (1) scheduling the site visit, (2) institutional submission of evidence supporting
31 the performance criteria, (3) review of submitted evidence prior to the site visit, (4) a
32 site visit by the review team, (5) written notification of approval recommendations to
33 the institutions by the CDE and DHE, (6) an appeals process, and (7) formal action by
34 the SBE and the Commission.
35

36 6.01.01 DHE and CDE will notify the institution of its upcoming site visit, confirm the
37 dates and provide a description of the materials the institution needs to submit
38 prior to the site visit.
39

40 6.01.02 The institution will submit materials documenting how its unit and programs
41 meet the criteria specified in Section 4.00.
42

43 6.01.03 The review team will review the submitted evidence prior to the site visit to
44 identify the unit and programs’ strengths and areas for improvement or missing
45 information needed to document the performance criteria defined in this policy.
46

47 6.01.04 The review team will conduct an on-site review that focuses on the results of

1
2

the preliminary review and on those performance criteria best evaluated on-site.

DRAFT

1
2 6.01.05 DHE and CDE will prepare a written report with recommendations using the
3 findings of the joint review team and formally share a draft report with the unit's
4 administration within 60 days of the site visit.

5
6 6.01.05.01 The institution shall note any errors of fact in the report and respond
7 in a rejoinder with any supplemental information requested within 30
8 days.

9
10 6.01.05.02 An institution may submit a rebuttal to the findings or, if necessary,
11 request a second visit to address the findings of the review panel. A
12 final report of the on-site review will be made available reflecting
13 necessary revisions, corrections, areas for improvement, and the
14 results of any second visit.

15
16 ~~6.01.05~~ 6.01.06 The staff will recommend **full approval** of a program or unit that meets
17 the ~~performance criteria adopted by the Commission and the professional~~
18 ~~content standards adopted by the SBE, criteria specified in Section 4.00~~
19 ~~following confirmation of the SBE's approval of the program content.~~

20
21 ~~6.01.05.02.01~~ 6.01.07 The staff may recommend conditional
22 approval, probation for, or termination of a program
23 or unit that does not meet the ~~performance criteria adopted~~
24 ~~by the Commission or the professional content standards~~
25 ~~adopted by the SBE, specified in Section 4.00~~

26 ~~6.01.05.02.02~~ 6.01.05.02.01

27 6.01.07.01 A program on conditional approval may
28 continue to accept new students.

29 6.01.07.02 A program on conditional approval may receive
30 a performance plan and require a follow-up site visit.

31 (a) If the Commission has placed a program or unit on
32 conditional approval, or probation based upon the
33 recommendation of the SBE, the Commission shall
34 ~~consult with~~ again consider the SBE recommendation.

35 (b) Any program or unit placed on probation shall not
36 accept new students until DHE recommends that the
37 program or unit be removed from probationary status
38 and the Commission approves. The length of the
39 probationary status shall not exceed one year.

40
41 (b.1.) If after one year on probation the program or
42 unit fails to correct any of its areas for improvement
43 with regard to the performance criteria adopted by
44 the Commission or the standards adopted by the SBE,
45 the Commission shall order termination of the
46 program or unit.

(c) If the Commission determines that a program or unit should be terminated, the program or unit must not accept new students and must terminate within four years of the determination.

6.01.06 Within 30 days of the Commission's action, a governing board may appeal a recommendation of conditional authorization, probation, or termination of an educator preparation program or unit.

6.01.06.01 To initiate an appeal, the governing board shall submit a written request that identifies the program or unit and cites the reasons why it is contesting the recommendation. This material will be included in the agenda materials for the Commission.

6.01.06.02 The representative of the governing board filing an appeal shall have an opportunity to testify at the Commission meeting at which the ~~site~~ report is presented.

6.01.07 The Commission will act on the educator preparation approval recommendations, including any programs or units that have appealed a staff recommendation. The Commission's action is binding.

6.01.07.01 If the Commission votes to terminate a program or unit, the decision is effective immediately. The institution may not admit, re-admit, or enroll new students effective on the date of the Commission vote.

6.01.07.02 Candidates enrolled in a terminated unit at the time of the Commission action may complete their programs of study under the original graduation requirements. Under state statute, these candidates have a maximum of four years to complete the graduation and licensure requirements.

6.01.07.03 Educator Preparation providers at public institutions shall reimburse CDHE for the costs of the site visit team to include hotel and meals

6.01.07.026.01.07.04 Educator Preparation providers at private institutions will be billed for reauthorization expenses per XXX

6.02 Process for Discontinuing a Unit or Program by Institution Decision

6.02.01 Any institution wishing to discontinue an approved educator preparation program must submit notification to DHE in writing indicating the program to be discontinued, the reasons for the decision, and a schedule for ending the program. If students are still completing the program, a plan for moving them to completion of the program or into another degree plan must be described.

6.02.02 The Commission may discontinue any educator preparation program that has

1 not had any candidate successfully graduate during the previous five years
2 [section 23-1-121 (4) (e) C.R.S.]. Enrollment data is collected annually in the
3 Educator Preparation File in the SURDS database. The department reviews

DRAFT

1 and reports the data and will notify the institution if one or more of their
2 programs has not had a candidate graduate during the previous five years.
3
4

5 **7.00 Data Reporting and Accountability**
6

7 **7.01** DHE, in consultation with the educator preparation units, will define the necessary data
8 elements required to monitor and evaluate the performance standards defined in statute
9 and CCHE policy.
10

11 **7.02** DHE will collaborate with CDE and the educator preparation unit administrators
12 regarding the information and evaluation methodology used for the annual report to the
13 education committees of the General Assembly.
14

15 **7.03** CCHE will submit the annual report on the performance, quality, and effectiveness of
16 educator preparation units and programs and the effectiveness of the review and
17 approval process to the House and Senate education committees.
18

19 **7.04** For the purposes of completing the report, DHE and CDE shall share any relevant
20 data pursuant to S.B. 11-245; C.R.S. 23-1-121(6).
21

22 **7.047.05** Any educator preparation program that has not had candidates complete the
23 program during the previous 5 years should be discontinued.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

HISTORY: CCHE Agenda Item II, C – September 8, 2011

DRAFT

SECTION I

PART P EDUCATOR PREPARATION POLICY

1.00 Introduction

This policy describes the performance-based educator preparation model and outlines the criteria and procedures for review, initial approval, and reauthorization of schools, colleges, and departments of educator preparation (hereafter listed as “units” of educator preparation) and of educator preparation programs.

This policy states the statutory criteria and the corresponding performance measures that new and existing units of educator preparation must meet to qualify candidates for state licensure and against which adopted standards and performance measures are evaluated. The policy also describes the review and accountability processes for Colorado’s units of educator preparation.

The policy applies to all approved educator preparation units and programs at public, private, and proprietary institutions of higher education in Colorado.

2.00 Statutory Authority

The CCHE Educator Preparation Policy is based on section 23-1-121 C.R.S. that states:

The Commission shall adopt policies establishing the requirements for educator preparation programs offered by institutions of higher education. The department shall work in cooperation with the state board of education in developing the requirements for educator preparation programs. At a minimum the requirements shall ensure that each educator preparation program complies with section 23-1- 125, [and] is designed on a performance-based model.

3.00 Goals, Principles, and Terminology

3.01 Policy Goals

The primary goal of CCHE Educator Preparation Policy is to ensure high quality review of educator preparation programs based, when possible, on outcomes rather than inputs and to assist educator preparation programs with improving the effectiveness of their graduates by maintaining flexibility and encouraging creativity, rather than being strictly regulatory.

To achieve that goal, the policy:

- 3.01.01 Provides a basis for making decisions in the areas of approving new educator preparation programs proposed by institutions of higher education, reauthorizing existing educator preparation programs at institutions of higher education, and holding institutions of higher education accountable for addressing areas for improvement identified during the review process;
- 3.01.02 Requires a periodic review of educator preparation units, not more frequently than once every five years [section 23-1-121 (4) (a) (I) C.R.S.] and that may be offered concurrently or jointly with national accrediting bodies [section 23-1-121 (7) C.R.S.].
- 3.01.03 Provides a basis for the department to support educator preparation programs at institutions of higher education in complying with federal laws, national educator preparation standards and accreditation, and new state laws and policies regarding aligning the P-20 continuum; requires the department and department of education to work collaboratively to assist educator preparation programs in ensuring alignment with state board of education rules regarding the preparation and licensing of candidates, new P-12 academic standards and postsecondary and workforce readiness, and other state laws and policies that impact P-12 education and the preparation of educators;
- 3.01.04 Provides a basis for the department to support educator preparation programs in responding to state needs by helping to ensure the preparation of effective educators in high needs content areas and high-needs regions of the state and who are able to respond to the needs of local education agencies;
- 3.01.05 Allows the department and the department of education to implement procedures for collecting and reviewing evaluative data of educator preparation units and to share that data with the educator preparation units for program self-improvement.
- 3.01.06 Requires an annual report on the requirements and effectiveness of educator preparation to the legislative education committees [23-1-121 (6) C.R.S.].

3.02 Principles

CCHE Educator Preparation Policy is based on the following principles:

- 3.02.01 Educator preparation is a shared enterprise among the Colorado Commission on Higher Education, the Colorado State Board of Education (SBE), institutions of higher education, and school districts. The Colorado Commission on Higher Education has responsibility for the review and approval of units of educator preparation designed to prepare educators, while

the Colorado State Board of Education is authorized to develop the professional content standards for educator preparation programs and to license those who complete approved programs.

- 3.02.02 Units of educator preparation are evaluated on the criteria listed in Section 4.00 of this policy.

3.03 Terminology

An Approved Educator Preparation Unit is the college, school, department, or other administrative body in a college, university, or other organization with the responsibility for managing or coordinating all programs offered for the initial and advanced preparation of educators, regardless of where the programs are administratively housed in an institution., which has been reviewed and approved pursuant to this policy and the provisions of C.R.S. 23-1-121.

An Approved Educator Preparation Program is a planned sequence of undergraduate, post-baccalaureate, or graduate courses and experiences for the purpose of preparing teachers and other school professionals to be effective educators in pre-kindergarten through twelfth grade settings. A program may lead to a degree, a recommendation for a state license by the department of education, both, or neither.

Assessment is defined as the process used to collect evidence of what a student knows and is able to demonstrate.

P12 Academic Post-Secondary & Workforce Readiness Standards are the specific statements of what a P-12 student should know or be able to do in specified academic areas.

Field-based Experiences are experiences that allow candidates to apply content and professional knowledge in authentic school settings under the direct supervision of licensed educators and college or university faculty. Field-based training may include a variety of experiences in supervised settings—classroom observations, assisting licensed educators in school settings, practica, student teaching and internships—or a combination of experiences under a partner school model.

Endorsement is the designation on a license that the holder is authorized to work in a P12 school in a specific grade or developmental level (e.g., elementary); a subject area (e.g., language arts); a school leader (e.g., principal); or as a special services provider (e.g., speech/language pathologist).

Licensure refers to the system and criteria that authorizes individuals to work in Colorado public schools. The Colorado State Board of Education is the entity authorized to license candidates following recommendation from the Colorado Department of Education.

Educator standards refers to sets of prescribed standards, adopted as rule by State Board of Education, which educator candidates must know and be able to demonstrate.

Licensure Competencies refers to sets of prescribed standards for each endorsement area, adopted as rule by State Board of Education.

Performance-Based Model refers to a system that evaluates an educator preparation unit against the statutory performance criteria in Section 4.00 of this policy and the State Board of Education Educator Standards as well as the licensure competencies by endorsement area. Section 4.00 of this policy specifies the performance criteria that apply to the initial approval or reapproval of educator preparation units. Educator preparation units that fail to meet the performance criteria will not be approved, will be placed on probation, or will be discontinued.

Post-Baccalaureate Educator Preparation is for candidates pursuing initial or advanced non-degree educator preparation who already have an undergraduate degree (e.g. Bachelor of Arts [BA] or Bachelor of Science [BS]).

Graduate Educator Preparation is for candidates pursuing initial or advanced educator preparation that is part of a graduate degree program (e.g., Master of Education [M.Ed.]).

Candidate is a person who is participating in an approved educator preparation program.

4.00 Criteria for Performance-Based Educator Preparation Units or Programs

The Commission shall use performance-based measures specified in section 23-1-121 C.R.S. to review and approve educator preparation units and programs within units, including proposals for new programs. The approved sequence of coursework and field experiences will be evaluated on evidence supporting a performance-based model. Recommendation for approval by the State Board of Education (see 4.06) is a necessary precondition for Commission approval. In its review, the Commission will evaluate whether units requesting educator preparation approval meet criteria described in sections 4.01 through 4.07.

4.01 Public institutions shall ensure that undergraduate educator preparation programs are designed and implemented in accordance with C.R.S.23-1-125, in regards to degree requirements, core courses, competency testing, and prior learning.

4.01.01 Baccalaureate degrees leading to licensure as an educator may not exceed 126 credit hours.

4.02 Each program is designed around a shared vision of candidate proficiency and professionalism that supports decision making about partnerships and the integration of curricula, learners, and coursework and clinical experiences. [23-1-12 (2) (a).

- 4.03** Each program can demonstrate mapping, planning, development, assessment, and support of candidate proficiencies including candidates' deep understanding of content knowledge (such as that described in part 10 of article 7 of title 22, specifically in teaching to the state preschool through elementary and secondary education standards adopted pursuant to section 22-7-1005), pedagogical knowledge, the content knowledge required for educating, and the dispositions and professional qualities necessary to be successful [23-1-121 (2) (b)]
- 4.04** Teacher and principal preparation programs courses provide content knowledge as described in part 10 of Article 7 of Title 22, specifically in teaching to the state preschool through elementary and secondary education standards adopted pursuant to section 22-7-1005; and include
- 4.04.01 Course work that teaches teacher candidates the science of reading, including the foundational reading skills of phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary development, reading fluency including oral skills, and reading comprehension, and the skills and strategies to apply to ensure that every student learns to read. Reading coursework and field practice opportunities must be a significant focus for teachers preparing for endorsement in elementary, early childhood, or special education.
 - 4.04.02 Course work that provides educator candidates with an overview of Title II of the federal "Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990", 42 U.S.C. sec. 12101 et seq., as amended, and its implementing regulations; section 504 of the federal "Rehabilitation Act of 1973", 29 U.S.C. sec. 701 et seq., as amended, and its implementing regulations; the "Individuals with Disabilities Education Act", 20 U.S.C. sec. 1400 et seq., as amended, and its implementing regulations; individualized education programs; and child find and that teaches educators effective special education classroom practices, including but not limited to inclusive learning environments;
 - 4.04.03 A requirement that each teacher candidate in an initial licensure program complete at least one semester or quarter-length course in behavior health training using culturally responsive and trauma- and evidence-informed practices.
 - 4.04.04 Each unit will document that, prior to graduation, candidates can demonstrate the skills required for licensure, as determined by the State Board of Education [23-1-121(2) (e) C.R.S.].
- 4.05** Intentional clinical experience, early and throughout preparation, relating to predetermined state content standards, which experiences afford candidates multiple intentional experiences to learn from practice. Clinical experiences must be aligned with program curricula so that candidates develop pedagogical skills and pedagogical content knowledge. Teacher preparation candidates must complete a minimum of eight hundred hours, and principal and administrator candidates must complete a minimum of three hundred hours of clinical practice. A teacher candidate must

complete the hours of clinical practice while in an approved educator preparation program; except that a program, after review, may accept clinical practice hours completed before enrolling in the program. A majority of the clinical practice hours must be completed through a continuous placement. For every additional endorsement of advanced degree a candidate must complete and appropriate period of supervised field experiences that relate to predetermined standards including best practices and relevant national norms related to the candidate's endorsements.

- 4.06** A requirement that preparation program faculty, to improve their work, engage in continuous evidence-based cycles of self-reflection and review regarding the impact of their programs on their candidates' development throughout the programs. These cycles must include data on current candidates throughout the program and available data on program completers.

5.00 Approval Process for New Educator Preparation Programs

A unit of educator preparation that chooses to offer a new educator preparation program or by significantly modifying the content, field experiences, or delivery of a program that leads to licensure by CDE shall submit a proposal to both the, Colorado Department of Education (CDE) and the Department of Higher Education (DHE). DHE, in conjunction with the CDE, shall review each program proposal submitted by an institution of higher education. The CDE will first review the proposal for alignment with State Board of Education educator standards and licensure competencies by endorsement area and then submit to DHE its recommendation regarding approval. Program proposals for advanced degrees without licensure shall be submitted to DHE only.

- 5.01** DHE will follow the approval process described in section 4.00 to review educator preparation program proposals.

- 5.01.01 If a new unit is approved to offer educator preparation programs, initially approved programs will be reviewed within 12-24 months.
- 5.01.02 New units are not permitted to propose adding additional endorsements beyond those that are initially approved until after the unit's first reauthorization.

5.02 For programs leading to licensure, CDE is responsible for review and State Board of Education is responsible for approval of the content of each program prior to its consideration for approval by the Commission. The State Board of Education will review the proposal to determine if the program's content is designed and implemented in a manner that is in compliance with section 22-2-109 (5) (a) C.R.S.

5.02.01 If the State Board of Education confirms that the content portion of the program is in compliance with its adopted standards, DHE shall review the proposal using the performance-based measures specified in Section 4.00 of this policy and present a recommendation to the Commission.

5.02.02 If the State Board of Education recommends that a program be placed on conditional approval or probation, the commission shall follow the recommendation by refusing initial approval of the program, placing the program on conditional approval, or placing the program on probation.

6.00 Reauthorization Process and Site Review of Units of Educator preparation

This section describes the reauthorization process for units of educator preparation.

6.01 The reauthorization of educator preparation programs at approved units of educator preparation will be conducted by DHE in collaboration with the Colorado Department of Education (CDE). The process consists of seven steps: (1) scheduling the site visit, (2) institutional submission of evidence supporting the performance criteria, (3) review of submitted evidence prior to the site visit, (4) a site visit by the review team, (5) written notification of approval recommendations to the institutions by the CDE and DHE, (6) an appeals process, and (7) formal action by the SBE and the Commission.

6.01.01 DHE and CDE will notify the institution of its upcoming site visit, confirm the dates and provide a description of the materials the institution needs to submit prior to the site visit.

6.01.02 The institution will submit materials documenting how its unit and programs meet the criteria specified in Section 4.00.

6.01.03 The review team will review the submitted evidence prior to the site visit to identify the unit and programs' strengths and areas for improvement or missing information needed to document the performance criteria defined in this policy.

6.01.04 The review team will conduct an on-site review that focuses on the results of the preliminary review and on those performance criteria best evaluated on-site.

- 6.01.05 DHE and CDE will prepare a written report with recommendations using the findings of the joint review team and formally share a draft report with the unit's administration within 60 days of the site visit.
- 6.01.05.01 The institution shall note any errors of fact in the report and respond in a rejoinder with any supplemental information requested within 30 days.
- 6.01.05.02 An institution may submit a rebuttal to the findings or, if necessary, request a second visit to address the findings of the review panel. A final report of the on-site review will be made available reflecting necessary revisions, corrections, areas for improvement, and the results of any second visit.
- 6.01.06 The staff will recommend **full approval** of a program or unit that meets the criteria specified in Section 4.00 following confirmation of the SBE's approval of the program content.
- 6.01.07 The staff may recommend conditional approval, probation, or **termination** of a program or unit that does not meet the criteria specified in Section 4.00
- 6.01.07.01 A program on conditional approval may continue to accept new students.
- 6.01.07.02 A program on conditional approval may receive a performance plan and require a follow-up site visit.
- (a) If the Commission has placed a program or unit on conditional approval, or probation based upon the recommendation of the SBE, the Commission shall again consider the SBE recommendation
- (b) Any program or unit placed on probation shall not accept new students until DHE recommends that the program or unit be removed from probationary status and the Commission approves. The length of the probationary status shall not exceed one year.
- (b.1.) If after one year on probation the program or unit fails to correct any of its areas for improvement with regard to the performance criteria adopted by the Commission or the standards adopted by the SBE, the Commission shall order termination of the program or unit.

- (c) If the Commission determines that a program or unit should be terminated, the program or unit must not accept new students and must terminate within four years of the determination.

6.01.08 Within 30 days of the Commission's action, a governing board may appeal a recommendation of conditional authorization, probation, or termination of an educator preparation program or unit.

6.01.08.01 To initiate an appeal, the governing board shall submit a written request that identifies the program or unit and cites the reasons why it is contesting the recommendation. This material will be included in the agenda materials for the Commission.

6.01.08.02 The representative of the governing board filing an appeal shall have an opportunity to testify at the Commission meeting at which the report is presented.

6.01.09 The Commission will act on the educator preparation approval recommendations, including any programs or units that have appealed a staff recommendation. The Commission's action is binding.

6.01.09.01 If the Commission votes to terminate a program or unit, the decision is effective immediately. The institution may not admit, re-admit, or enroll new students effective on the date of the Commission vote.

6.01.09.02 Candidates enrolled in a terminated unit at the time of the Commission action may complete their programs of study under the original graduation requirements. Under state statute, these candidates have a maximum of four years to complete the graduation and licensure requirements.

6.01.09.03 Educator Preparation providers at public institutions shall reimburse CDHE for the costs of the site visit team to include hotel and meals

6.01.09.04 Educator Preparation providers at private institutions will be billed for reauthorization expenses per C.R.S. 23-2-101

6.02 Process for Discontinuing a Unit or Program by Institution Decision

6.02.01 Any institution wishing to discontinue an approved educator preparation program must submit notification to DHE in writing indicating the program to be discontinued, the reasons for the decision, and a schedule for ending the program. If students are still completing the program, a plan for moving them to completion of the program or into another degree plan must be described.

6.02.02 The Commission may discontinue any educator preparation program that has

not had any candidate successfully graduate during the previous five years [section 23-1-121 (4) (e) C.R.S.]. Enrollment data is collected annually in the Educator Preparation File in the SURDS database. The department reviews

DRAFT

and reports the data and will notify the institution if one or more of their programs has not had a candidate graduate during the previous five years.

7.00 Data Reporting and Accountability

7.01 DHE, in consultation with the educator preparation units, will define the necessary data elements required to monitor and evaluate the performance standards defined in statute and CCHE policy.

7.02 DHE will collaborate with CDE and the educator preparation unit administrators regarding the information and evaluation methodology used for the annual report to the education committees of the General Assembly.

7.03 CCHE will submit the annual report on the performance, quality, and effectiveness of educator preparation units and programs and the effectiveness of the review and approval process to the House and Senate education committees.

7.04 For the purposes of completing the report, DHE and CDE shall share any relevant data pursuant to C.R.S. 23-1-121(6).

7.05 Any educator preparation program that has not had candidates complete the program during the previous 5 years should be discontinued.

HISTORY: CCHE Agenda Item II, C – September 8, 2011
DRAFT RECCOMENDATIONS 3/17/21

SECTION I PART P: EDUCATOR PREPARATION POLICY

Substantive Changes

Page(s), Line(s)	2011	2021	Purpose/Rationale
4.0 Criteria For Performance-Based Educator Preparation Units or Programs			
p4, 38-43	4.01 Public institutions shall ensure that undergraduate educator preparation programs are designed and implemented in accordance with C.R.S.23-1-125, in regards to degree requirements, credit limits, transferability of courses, general education requirements, competency testing.	4.01 Public institutions shall ensure that undergraduate educator preparation programs are designed and implemented in accordance with C.R.S.23-1-125, in regards to degree requirements, core courses, competency testing, and prior learning. a. Baccalaureate degrees leading to licensure as an educator may not exceed 126 Credit hours	Alignment with C.R.S. 23-1-125 “Student Bill of Rights” C.R.S. 23-1-125 allows programs leading to licensure to extend past 120 credit hours to 126.
p.4, 45 – p.5, 7	4.02 Each program will demonstrate that it has a comprehensive admission system that includes screening of a candidate’s dispositions for the field in which he or she is seeking licensure, consideration of a candidates academic preparation for entry into his or her desired endorsement area or areas, and preadmission advising for students who are considering becoming candidates. The department shall work in collaboration with the programs to define any dispositions considered to be appropriate for educators. [23-1-121 (2)	4.02 Each program is designed around a shared vision of candidate proficiency and professionalism that supports decision making about partnerships and the integration of curricula, learners, and coursework and clinical experiences. [23-1-12 (2) (a)]	Alignment to 23-1-121(2) (a) per SB20-158

	(a) C.R.S.].		
p. 5, 11-20	4.03 Each program will demonstrate that it has a comprehensive system that includes ongoing advising and screening of candidates by practicing educators or faculty members [23-1-121 (2) (b) C.R.S.].	4.03 Each program can demonstrate mapping, planning, development, assessment, and support of candidate proficiencies including candidates’ deep understanding of content knowledge (such as that described in part 10 of article 7 of title 22, specifically in teaching to the state preschool through elementary and secondary education standards adopted pursuant to section 22-7-1005), pedagogical knowledge, the content knowledge required for educating, and the dispositions and professional qualities necessary to be successful [23-1-121 (2) (b)	Alignment to 23-1-121(2) (b) per SB20-158
p. 5, 22 – p.6, 4	4.04 Each program will demonstrate that its programs contain course work and field-based training that integrates theory and practice and educates candidates in methodologies, practices, and procedures of teaching standards-based education, specifically in teaching the content defined in the Colorado P12 Academic Standards [23-1-121 (2)(c) C.R.S.].	4.04 Teacher and principal preparation programs courses provide content knowledge as described in part 10 of Article 7 of Title 22, specifically in teaching to the state preschool through elementary and secondary education standards adopted pursuant to section 22-7-1005; and include 4.04.01 Course work that teaches teacher candidates the science of reading, including the foundational reading skills of phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary development, reading fluency including oral skills,	Alignment to 23-1-121(2) (c) per SB20-158 Alignment to 23-1-121(2) (c.5) per SB20-158

		<p>and reading comprehension, and the skills and strategies to apply to ensure that every student learns to read. Reading coursework and field practice opportunities must be a significant focus for teachers preparing for endorsement in elementary, early childhood, or special education.</p> <p>4.04.02 Course work that provides educator candidates with an overview of Title II of the federal "Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990", 42 U.S.C. sec. 12101 et seq., as amended, and its implementing regulations; section 504 of the federal "Rehabilitation Act of 1973", 29 U.S.C. sec. 701 et seq., as amended, and its implementing regulations; the "Individuals with Disabilities Education Act", 20 U.S.C. sec. 1400 et seq., as amended, and its implementing regulations; individualized education programs; and child find and that teaches educators effective special education classroom practices, including but not limited to inclusive learning environments;</p> <p>4.04.03 A requirement that each teacher candidate in an initial licensure program complete at least one semester or quarter-length course in behavior health training using culturally</p>	<p>Alignment to 23-1-121(c.7) per HB20-1128</p> <p>Alignment to 23-1-121 (d.5) per HB20-1312</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>responsive and trauma- and evidence-informed practice.</p>	
<p>p.6, 7-26</p>	<p>4.05 The curriculum of each program will ensure that each teacher candidate in an initial licensure program shall complete a minimum of 800 hours, each principal and administrator candidate shall complete a minimum of 300 hours, and each other advanced degree or add-on endorsement candidate may complete appropriate supervised field-based experience that relates to predetermined learning standards and includes best practices and national norms related to the candidate's endorsement.</p>	<p>4.05 Intentional clinical experience, early and throughout preparation, relating to predetermined state content standards, which experiences afford candidates multiple intentional experiences to learn from practice. Clinical experiences must be aligned with program curricula so that candidates develop pedagogical skills and pedagogical content knowledge. Teacher preparation candidates must complete a minimum of eight hundred hours, and principal and administrator candidates must complete a minimum of three hundred hours of clinical practice. A teacher candidate must complete the hours of clinical practice while in an approved educator preparation program; except that a program, after review, may accept clinical practice hours completed before enrolling in the program. A majority of the clinical practice hours must be completed through a continuous placement. For every additional endorsement of advanced degree a candidate must complete and appropriate period of supervised field experiences that relate to predetermined standards including best practices and relevant national norms</p>	<p>Alignment to 23-1-121(2) (d) per SB20-158</p>

		related to the candidate's endorsements.	
p. 6, 33-41	4.06 Each unit will provide ongoing and comprehensive assessments including the evaluation of each candidate's subject matter and professional knowledge and ability to apply the professional knowledge base [23-1-121 (2) (f) C.R.S.].	4.06 A requirement that preparation program faculty, to improve their work, engage in continuous evidence-based cycles of self-reflection and review regarding the impact of their programs on their candidates' development throughout the programs. These cycles must include data on current candidates throughout the program and available data on program completers.	Alignment to 23-1-121(2) (f) per Alignment to SB20-158
Approval Process for New Educator Preparation Programs			
p. 6, 44- p7, 8	5.0 A unit of educator preparation that chooses to offer a new or substantially modified program that leads to licensure by CDE shall submit a proposal to both the, Colorado Department of Education (CDE) and the Department of Higher Education (DHE)	5.0 A unit of educator preparation that chooses to offer a new educator preparation program or by significantly modifying the content, field experiences, or delivery of a program that leads to licensure by CDE shall submit a proposal to both the, Colorado Department of Education (CDE) and the Department of Higher Education (DHE).	Alignment to 23-1-121 (4)(a)(III) per SB 20-158
p.7, 13-14	New	5.01.01 If a new unit is approved to offer educator preparation programs, initially approved programs will be reviewed within 12-24 months.	Creates a mid-cycle check-in with new units to ensure quality and provide support.
p.7, 16-17	New	5.01.02 New units are not permitted to propose adding additional endorsements beyond those that are initially approved until after the unit's first reauthorization.	Ensures quality of existing programs at the unit can be sustained before new programs are added

p.8, 13-19	5.02.02 If the State Board of Education does not recommend CCHE consideration because the program content does not meet the SBE standards, CCHE will not take further action to approve the request.	5.02.02 If the State Board of Education recommends that a program not be approved or that it be placed on conditional approval or probation, the commission shall follow the recommendation by refusing initial approval of the program, placing the program on conditional approval, or placing the program on probation.	Alignment to 21-1-121 (4)(b) per SB20-158
Reauthorization Process and Site Review of Units of Educator preparation			
p.10, 16-20	6.01.05.01 The staff will recommend full approval of a program or unit that meets the performance criteria adopted by the Commission and the professional content standards adopted by the SBE.	6.01.06 The staff will recommend full approval of a program or unit that meets the criteria specified in Section 4.00 following confirmation of the SBE's approval of the program content.	Alignment to 23-1-121(4)(d)(I) per SB20-158
p. 10, 21-29	6.01.05.02.02 The staff may recommend probation for or termination of a program or unit that does not meet the performance criteria adopted by the Commission or the professional content standards adopted by the SBE	6.01.07 The staff may recommend conditional approval, probation, or termination of a program or unit that does not meet the criteria specified in Section 4.00	Alignment to 23-1-121(4)(d)(I) per SB20-158
p. 10, 27-29	New	6.01.07.01 A program on conditional approval may continue to accept new students.	Alignment to 23-1-121(4)(d)(II) per SB20-158
	New	6.01.07.02 A program on conditional approval may receive a performance plan outlining areas for improvement and supports available and require a follow-up site visit.	Programs that are not in alignment with performance criteria may need extra support from the Department.
p. 10, 30-35	6.01.05.02.02 (a) If the Commission has placed a program or unit on probation based upon the recommendation of the SBE, the Commission shall consult with the SBE in	6.01.07.02(a) If the Commission has placed a program or unit on conditional approval, or probation based up the recommendation of the SBE, the	Alignment to 23-1-121(4)(d)(IV) per SB20-158

	determining whether the program or unit should be reauthorized or whether the program or unit should be terminated.	Commission shall again consider the SBE recommendation	
Data Reporting and Accountability			
p. 12, 22-23	New	7.05 Any educator preparation program that has not had candidates complete the program during the previous 5 years will be discontinued.	Ensures underutilized programs are removed and renewed with demonstrated need.

TOPIC: ANNUAL REPORT FROM THE STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR PARENT INVOLVEMENT IN EDUCATION (SACPIE)

PREPARED BY: MICHAEL VENITE

I. SUMMARY

This discussion item provides an overview of the State Advisory Council for Parent Involvement in Education (SACPIE) and its annual report.

II. BACKGROUND

[SACPIE](#) is a legislated body of diverse stakeholders charged to advise state organizations and school districts on issues related to increasing parent involvement in education with the premise that by promoting family-school partnerships, the quality of public education will improve and the level of students' academic performance throughout the state will increase. SACPIE is a 24-member council convened by the Colorado Department of Education (CDE). Conversations are facilitated by Dr. Darcy Hutchins (Director of Family, School and Community Partnerships) and the Leslie Levine (SACPIE Chair, Early Childhood Manager at Cooking Matters Colorado). CDHE staff participate in SACPIE meetings and functions to provide a higher education perspective to the group's work.

Each year, CDE releases [an annual report](#) outlining SACPIE's progress in promoting family-school partnerships in the state. This report includes a description of SACPIE's structure and membership, a list of advisory duties, SACPIE's progress in fulfilling those duties, and next steps.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

An overview of SACPIE's work will be provided by Dr. Hutchins and Chair Levine.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

This is an information item only; no formal action is required by the Commission.

V. STATUTORY AUTHORITY

Not applicable.



State Advisory Council for Parent Involvement in Education

2020 Annual Report State Advisory Council for Parent Involvement in Education

Submitted to:

**Colorado State Board of Education
Colorado Commission on Higher Education
Colorado House Education Committee
Colorado Senate Education Committee**

By:

**The State Advisory Council for Parent Involvement in Education
Leslie Levine, Chair
Dee Leyba, Vice Chair**

Prepared by:

Dr. Darcy Hutchins, CDE Director of Family, School, and Community Partnerships

December 2020

The State Advisory Council for Parent Involvement in Education is staffed by the
Colorado Department of Education.

For more information, contact Dr. Darcy Hutchins
201 E. Colfax Ave., Denver, CO 80203
303-866-5921

hutchins_d@cde.state.co.us



COLORADO
Department of Education

Table of Contents

SACPIE Structure and Membership	3
SACPIE Advisory Duties	4
Next Steps	9

Appendices	11
• Appendix A: SACPIE Membership List	11
• Appendix B: SACPIE Membership Application	14

The State Advisory Council for Parent Involvement in Education (SACPIE) is a legislated body of diverse stakeholders charged to advise state organizations and school districts on issues related to increasing parent involvement¹ in education. The premise is that by promoting family-school partnerships, the quality of public education will improve and the level of students' academic performance throughout the state will increase (C.R.S. § 22-7-301 and C.R.S. § 22-7-304). This responsibility specifically includes involving families in programs to increase high school and college graduation rates, decrease drop-out rates, and close the achievement and growth gaps between learner groups in the state. A listing of the current SACPIE membership and the groups they represent can be viewed in Appendix A.

Pursuant to Senate Bill 13-193, the purpose of this report is to outline SACPIE's progress in promoting family-school partnerships in the state and in fulfilling the duties specified in [C.R.S. § 22-7-304 from SB 09-090 and SB 13-193](#). This report includes a description of SACPIE's structure and membership, a list of advisory duties,² SACPIE's progress in fulfilling those duties, and next steps.

SACPIE Structure and Membership

The 24-member council, along with Colorado Department of Education (CDE) support staff, meet quarterly. In 2020, three of the four meetings were shortened and held remotely due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Shortening the virtual meetings from six hours to 2.5 hours required prioritizing discussion topics and presentations. Each meeting still has a time dedicated to organization presentations and member resource sharing. These portions of the meetings support the council's primary legislated responsibility to learn and share about best practices of family partnerships.

In 2020, SACPIE members unanimously voted to change subcommittee structures. Rather than having standing committees organized around students' grade level, members now form ad hoc subcommittees based on topic, need, and interest. In 2020, SACPIE members formed ad hoc subcommittees to collect information about school and district accountability committees, revise the SACPIE website, and update the operating procedures.

The Council also still had an Executive Committee, comprised of the SACPIE Chair, Vice-Chair, and the CDE Family Partnership Director. The purpose of the Executive Committee is to:

- Plan SACPIE meetings;
- Lead SACPIE meetings;
- Recruit and interview new members; and
- Check-in with current members.

¹ In an effort to align state and national language, based on current research, this report uses the word "family" as opposed to "parent" and "engagement" or "partnering" instead of "involvement." This is done purposefully to be more inclusive and suggest a higher level of collaboration beyond involvement.

² C.R.S. § 22-7-304 outlines 15 recommendations for advisory duties and technical assistance for SACPIE to conduct in Colorado. This report includes the recommendations that SACPIE is currently implementing.

In 2020, the SACPIE Executive Committee filled eight vacancies. A copy of the SACPIE parent member application can be viewed in Appendix B. This basic application is adapted for other representatives when vacancies for other membership roles arise on the council.

SACPIE's operating procedures state that each year, the council will select a Chair and Vice Chair. In 2020, SACPIE members elected Leslie Levine, a health and wellness representative, to be the Chair and Dee Leyba, a parent representative from La Junta, to be the Vice Chair.

SACPIE Advisory Duties

Advisory Duty: The council shall inform, at a minimum, the early childhood councils and the early childhood care and education councils created pursuant to article 6.5 of title 26 (C.R.S. § 22-7-304(1)).

In 2020, SACPIE filled vacancies for both an early childhood representative and a Colorado Department of Human Services (CDHS) representative. The early childhood representative diligently kept the Council informed about COVID-19 related supports for families with young children. The early childhood representative also shared information about Denver Great Kids Head Start in the [November FSCP Key](#).

The Council's new CDHS representative wrote about CDHS' Family Voice Council in the [October FSCP Key](#). The article helped CDHS staff recruit new families and improve outreach.

Both SACPIE's CDHS representative and CDE early childhood representative lead efforts to align CDE's new [Family School and Community Partnerships \(FSCP\) Framework and User's Guide](#) into early learning initiatives and reports. The CDHS representative took the assessment tool to create a baseline for CDHS Offices' Community and Family Engagement work. The CDE early childhood representative worked with colleagues in the P-3 Office to incorporate the FSCP rubrics in the Colorado Preschool Program evaluation and annual report for 2021. More details about this new tool are discussed later in this report.

Advisory Duty: Creating and implementing programs to effectively involve parents in improving their children's education and levels of academic achievement. To identify these best practices and strategies, the council shall review the programs implemented in other states and the results of state and national research conducted in this area (C.R.S. § 22-7-304(1)(a)).

SACPIE is driven by research and data. To that end, the council aligns its work with the [National Standards for Family-School Partnerships](#) (PTA, 2008) and references those standards in its resources and presentations. SACPIE also aligns its work with the [Dual Capacity-Building Framework](#), a document published by the U.S. Department of Education in April 2014 and updated by Dr. Karen Mapp in July 2019.

To continually stay informed about new research findings and effective partnering programs, a SACPIE representative participates with CDE staff in a monthly national call with other state representatives, facilitated by the American Institutes for Research (AIR). In 2020, the CDE Family Partnership Director shared SACPIE's work regularly during the monthly calls.

SACPIE has identified resources for practitioners from nationally recognized organizations, including:

- [The Center on School, Family, and Community Partnerships at Johns Hopkins University](#);
- [The Global Family Research Project](#);
- [The National Association of Family, School, and Community Engagement](#); and
- [The Flamboyan Foundation](#).

In 2020, SACPIE worked with CDE to expand the collection of [Promising Partnership Practices](#) from schools, districts, and Institutes of Higher Education across Colorado. About 40 sites submitted a practice for the sixth annual publication. Each practice is aligned with the National Standards for Family-School Partnerships and [Colorado's Four Essential Elements](#).

Council members also helped to collect examples about how schools, districts, and organizations are supporting students and families during the COVID-19 pandemic. This [document](#), compiled right after schools closed in March 2020, assisted schools to partner more closely with families and fulfil both basic and educational needs.

Representatives from SACPIE and CDE have shared this new resource with hundreds of school and district leaders at conferences, workshop presentations, site visits, social media, and in the FSCP Key.

Advisory Duty: Involving parents in programs to raise academic achievement, increase high school graduation rates, decrease student dropout rates, and close the achievement and growth gap (C.R.S. § 22-7-304(1)(b)).

SACPIE is committed to building capacity in school personnel and families to partner for student achievement. To this end, SACPIE regularly encourages family participation in programs that promote student success. For the ninth year, in October 2020, Governor Polis declared October as *Family and School Partnership in Education Month*. School districts and organizations across the state shared the proclamation with boards, educators, families, and community members.

The annual in-person October Kickoff was canceled this year due to COVID-19. In its place, the CDE Director of Family, School, and Community Partnerships recorded interviews with 2020 Promising Partnership Practices recipients. These [interviews](#), housed on their corresponding Essential Element website, include an in-depth description of the practice and potential next steps for upcoming school years.

The CDE Communications Division shared the interviews on Twitter and Facebook throughout all of October. Over 500 people viewed the interviews on Facebook and over 12,000 people viewed the interviews on Twitter.

In 2020, SACPIE continued its Spotlight program. At two Council meetings, a SACPIE representative shared information about his or her organization or work as a parent. Spotlights in 2020 included:

- Michael Vente, Colorado Department of Higher Education

- Ayde Avila, RISE Colorado

To be better informed on current Colorado events and policies focused on improving student achievement, SACPIE members heard presentations and shared feedback at their quarterly meetings on the following topics:

- School and district accountability committees;
- Colorado's Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) state report cards; and
- Action for Healthy Kids Family-School Partnership Guidebook.

Advisory Duty: Increasing parent involvement in education-related committees at the local and state levels (C.R.S. § 22-7-304(1)(e)).

Several of SACPIE's parent representatives serve on a school and/or district accountability committee. Two parent representatives are also local school board members. These council members take information from SACPIE back to their local accountability committees to strengthen implementation. One parent representative led her school accountability committee (SAC) through a review of its objectives and state requirements. As a result, the SAC created an inventory for members, re-organized the membership of the SAC (following guidelines), encouraged school leadership to have the parent chair facilitate meetings, and started allowing public comment.

Another parent representative organized a CDE-facilitated SAC training for parents in three counties in southeast Colorado. Attendees, most of whom were parents, learned their rights and responsibilities to serve on an accountability committee. As a result, many more parents were better equipped to advocate for students and serve as leaders in their local communities.

Advisory Duty: Requiring each school district and the state Charter School Institute, as part of the accreditation process, to increase the level of parent involvement in education (C.R.S. § 22-7-304(2)(a)).

A CDE staff member who also serves as a Commissioner-appointed representative on SACPIE assisted in providing feedback on Unified Improvement Plans to schools identified as Priority Improvement or Turnaround. The aim for all feedback was to ensure high-quality and high-impact FSCP strategies were included within plans. The reviewers aligned feedback with language from SACPIE materials to provide a consistent frame for Local Education Agencies.

Advisory Duty: Initiatives to increase admissions to institutes of higher education and the degree-completion rate and to reduce the need for remediation (C.R.S. § 22-7-304(2)(b)).

In 2020, SACPIE and the Colorado Department of Higher Education (CDHE) formed a more intentional partnership. Dr. Angie Paccione, the Executive Director of CDHE, attended a portion of the November SACPIE meeting to express support and answer member questions. Leah Porter, a member of the Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) is now an advisory SACPIE member and will attend quarterly meetings moving forward.

As mentioned above, the Colorado Department of Higher Education representative presented about [My Colorado Journey](#), a resource for secondary students to use to plan for their futures. Discussions continue about what family partnerships look like in postsecondary education.

In 2020, CDE, CDHE, and SACPIE began a new project. Colorado was selected, by the National Association for Family, School, and Community Engagement (NAFSCE) as one of seven states to be part of a [Pre-service Family Engagement Consortium](#). This consortium, currently running from January 2020 to July 2021, has both national and Colorado-specific implications.

Nationally, the initiative has three intended outcomes:

- Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs) across the country will address family, school, and community engagement (FSCE) in meaningful and effective ways within their educator and administrator preparation programs.
- State agencies with pre-service oversight and key stakeholder groups across the country will address family and community engagement in meaningful and effective ways within their educator and administrator preparation program requirements, standards, and accreditation regulations.
- Educators and administrators will have the preparation, exposure, and support needed to effectively put in place teaching practices, organizational infrastructure, and policies that create equitable and meaningful opportunities for families to engage in their children's education, to support child development, student achievement, and school improvement, as well as overall teacher quality.

The Colorado leads of this initiative held a [week-long virtual convening](#) for Educator Preparation Program (EPP) faculty and staff. The convening included an opportunity for participants to learn the research base behind FSCP in EPPs and to share best and promising practices to better prepare pre-service teachers and administrators to work with families. Beginning in February 2021, CDHE, CDE, and SACPIE will convene a monthly Community of Practice with EPP faculty and staff to continually discuss and improve FSCP in prep programs.

Advisory Duty: The council shall work with the department to provide regional training programs for school district accountability committees and school accountability committees. At a minimum, the training programs must address parent leadership and increasing parent engagement with school district accountability committees and school accountability committees, including best practices for parent engagement with school district accountability committees and school accountability committees (C.R.S. § 22-7-304(3)(b)).

In 2020, SACPIE collaborated with CDE's Director of Family, School, and Community Partnerships to conduct trainings across Colorado about family participation on SACs and district accountability committees (DACs). The trainings included information about:

- Basic responsibilities and composition of SACs and DACs;
- How to recruit, prepare, and sustain effective SAC and DAC membership; and
- How to collaborate with various stakeholders (e.g., community members, other families, other accountability committees, local boards of education).

Accountability committee trainings and resource development in 2020 occurred as a result of a survey administered to superintendents and principals. The Colorado Association of School Executives (CASE) representative on SACPIE worked with SACPIE members and CDE staff to develop a brief survey administered in early 2020. The purpose of this survey was to better understand district and school leaders' experiences with accountability committee implementation. Respondents shared that a "toolkit" and a "best practice guide" would be the most helpful resources for SACPIE and CDE to develop.

Historically, the CDE Director of Family, School, and Community Partnerships has provided trainings upon request by districts. In 2020, CDE and SACPIE offered a networking opportunity for district and school leaders to discuss promising practices and challenges with SAC and DAC implementation, particularly during the COVID-19 pandemic.

SACPIE also contributed to the newly developed [SAC and DAC website](#). The website provides resources for SAC and DAC members aligned with their statutory responsibilities. SACPIE and CDE staff are also collecting promising practices about committee functioning to assist other schools and districts across the state to support and sustain membership.

Advisory Duty: The council shall work with the department to provide regional training programs for school districts and charter schools concerning best practices and skills for district and school personnel in working with parents (C.R.S. § 22-7-304(3)(c)).

SACPIE and CDE collaborated to plan and implement regional trainings for Family Partnership Liaisons, SACs and DACs, and other interested school and district stakeholders about promising practices and skills in working with families. The overall purpose of the trainings was to help schools and districts implement comprehensive, sustainable structures for student success. The four components of this structure are:

- The framework of the National Family-School Partnership Standards;
- Sharing leadership;
- Action planning; and
- Evaluation.

Advisory Duty: The council, in consultation with the department of education and the department of higher education, shall identify key indicators of successful parent engagement in education and use the indicators to develop recommendations for methods by which the department of education and the department of higher education may measure and monitor the level of parent engagement with elementary and secondary public schools and with institutions of higher education in Colorado (C.R.S. § 22-7-304(4)).

In January 2020, CDE staff completed an 18-month endeavor to write a Preschool through Grade 12 family engagement framework. This task was part of a national project with nine other states, sponsored by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and the National Association of Family, School, and Community Engagement (NAFSCE). Each state in the cohort received technical assistance from national subject-matter experts and quarterly in-person meetings to help write their individual frameworks.

The purpose of the framework is to develop system and sustainable state- and district-level structures that integrate and elevate FSCP, LINKING to positive students outcomes and an inviting school culture. District-level staff are the primary audience for this new resource.

SACPIE, along with many other stakeholders across Colorado, worked with CDE staff throughout the process to provide feedback and help draft a statewide FSCP definition and four essential elements for district-level staff to implement to improve partnering for student outcomes. Below is the overview of the definition and essential elements.

FSCP Definition:

Families, early childhood programs, schools, and communities actively partnering to develop, implement, and evaluate effective and equitable practices to improve educational outcomes for children and youth.

Essential Elements:

Create an inclusive culture that honors the lived experience of families in early childhood programs and/or the school community.

Build trusting relationships that enable families and programs/schools to partner about the education outcomes for children and youth.

Design capacity building opportunities for staff and families that promote shared leadership about educational outcomes for children and youth.

Dedicate necessary resources that integrate and elevate partnering practices to scale.

In July 2020, CDE staff partnered with Johns Hopkins University to write a [User's Guide](#) for the framework, including a series of rubrics to help schools, districts, and early childhood programs self-assess FSCP starting points and next steps. Schools, districts, and SACPIE members participated in a webinar in October 2020 entitled [Family, School, Community Partnerships: From Paper to Practice](#). The webinar include a national subject-matter expert sharing how to evaluate FSCP with CDE's rubrics and a statewide panel of practitioners working with families to improve educational outcomes for students.

Next Steps

SACPIE will continue to increase and broaden the implementation of its legislated responsibilities in 2021. These efforts include, but are not limited to:

- Gathering resources that support implementation of Colorado's Family-School-Community Partnerships Framework;
- Using data to guide SACPIE's continued family partnership initiatives;
- Implementing trainings about best practices and skills to improve home-school partnering for student achievement in districts and schools in collaboration with CDE;
- Implementing trainings for SACs and DACs about family recruitment, retention, and participation on accountability committees in collaboration with CDE;

- Collecting and publishing promising practices from schools, districts, and organizations across Colorado;
- Streamlining and refreshing the SACPIE website;
- Working with the Department of Higher Education to increase family partnership in postsecondary and workforce readiness;
- Working with the Department of Human Services to foster effective family-school partnerships, particularly in early childhood education;
- Intentionally communicating more regularly with all stakeholders about the importance of family partnerships; and
- Seeking additional opportunities to promote family-school partnership practices in Colorado.

Appendix A
SACPIE Membership 2020

SACPIE Membership 2020			
Member Name	SACPIE Role	Organization	Congressional District of Parent Representatives
Leslie Levine, Chair	Nonprofit organization that partners with funding providers, state agencies, and service providers to assist organizations in providing services to improve the health and well-being of families and children	Cooking Matters	--
Dee Leyba, Vice Chair	Parent Representative serving on a school or district accountability committee	--	Congressional District 4
DJ Anderson	Parent Representative	--	Congressional District 2
Ayde Avila	State-based nonprofit organization specializing in promoting the involvement of families of traditionally underserved populations	RISE Colorado	--
Nora Brown	Statewide organization of parents and teachers	Colorado Parent Teacher Association	--
Pam Christy	Nonprofit organization that specializes in promoting the involvement of families of students with disabilities	PEAK Parent Center	--
Kristen Collins	Colorado Department of Education-Federal Programs Unit	Colorado Department of Education	--
Brooke Coté	Parent Representative serving on a school or district accountability committee	--	Congressional District 5
Dr. Angie Frank	Parent Representative serving on a school or	--	Congressional District 6

	district accountability committee		
Yoni Dobie-Geffen	State-based nonprofit organization specializing in promoting the involvement of families of traditionally underserved populations	Climb Higher Colorado	--
Dr. Kris Greer	Representative from higher education	Teacher Education Department/Fort Lewis College	--
Chelsey Hall	Representative of the department of human services appointed by the executive director of said department	Colorado Department of Human Services	--
Brandon Hellwig	Statewide organization that represents charter schools	Colorado League of Charter Schools	--
Stacy Johns	Parent Representative serving on a school or district accountability committee	--	Congressional District 1
Eryn Kaiser	Parent Representative	--	Congressional District 3
Mary McNeill	Expertise in early childhood care and education	Denver Great Kids Head Start	--
Dr. Chris Miller	Colorado Department of Education-P-3 Office	Colorado Department of Education	--
Priscilla Orozco-Garcia	Parent Representative serving on a school or district accountability committee	--	Congressional District 7
Joanna Peters	State-based nonprofit organization specializing in promoting the involvement of families of traditionally underserved populations	Colorado Council of High School and College Relations	--
Mark Sass	Statewide organization that represents teachers	Teach Plus Colorado, Adams 12 School District	--
Jason Taylor	Statewide organization that represents school executives	Platte Valley Middle School	

Joyce Thiessen-Barrett	Colorado Department of Education-Exceptional Student Services Unit	Colorado Department of Education	--
Michael Vente	Representative from higher education	Colorado Department of Higher Education	--
Stacey Zis	Statewide organization that represents members of school district boards of education	Colorado Association of School Boards	

SACPIE Advisory Members and CDE Support 2020	
Name	Organization
Dr. Darcy Hutchins, SACPIE Staffer	Colorado Department of Education-Office of Family, School, and Community Partnerships
Leah Porter	Colorado Commission on Higher Education

Appendix B

SACPIE 2020 Parent Membership Application

2020 Application for State Advisory Council for Parent Involvement in Education

Overview of SACPIE

On behalf of the Colorado Board of Education, the State Advisory Council for Parent Involvement in Education (SACPIE) invites applications from candidates to fill three (3) Parent Representative vacancies. Two of these vacancies are for parents who currently serve as the parent representatives on a District Accountability Committee (DAC) or School Accountability Committee (SAC).

In accordance with SB09-090, 22-7-301 C.R.S., the Council has been charged with the task of informing public education entities concerning best practices and strategies, aligned with National Standards for Family-School Partnerships, for increasing parent involvement in public education and promoting family and school partnerships in order to help improve the quality of public education and raise the level of students' academic achievement throughout the state.

As required by State law, parent membership appointments must be filled by parents of children who are:

- 1) Enrolled in a publicly funded preschool program; or
- 2) In any of grades kindergarten through twelve; or
- 3) In a state supported institution of higher education; and
- 4) Who represent student populations that are significantly represented in the state.

As required by State law, the State Board of Education, in appointing members to the Council, shall, to the greatest extent possible, select persons who will reflect the gender balance and ethnic and racial diversity of the state and will provide representation from throughout the state.

Membership appointments will begin in November 2020 and continue for three years, with an opportunity to continue for another term.

Application Summary

Applications are due September 30, 2020 to Darcy Hutchins (hutchins_d@cde.state.co.us).

Complete applications should include:

- Contact and Background Information Form*
- Statement of Interest*
- Current CV, Resume, or Background Summary*
- Contact for Two References*

SACPIE Responsibilities

Time Commitment. Members are expected to be active participants in the Council and attend at least 75% of monthly meetings in the metro Denver area, or by audio conference call-in. Meetings are currently held quarterly on the third Tuesday of February, May, August, and November from 11:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Compensation. SACPIE members can be reimbursed for mileage and meals (related to SACPIE business) and some required activities (e.g., trainings for the field).

Application Process. Completed Applications must be submitted to Darcy Hutchins by September 30, 2020 (hutchins_d@cde.state.co.us; 303-562-8175).

Please see the SACPIE website (<http://www.cde.state.co.us/sacpie>) for more information about the Council.

Application Checklist

	Completed Contact Information/Background Form
	Completed Statement of Interest
	Current Curriculum Vitae, Resume, or Background Summary
	Contact Information for Two References

Contact and Background Information Form

SACPIE Application
(Please Type)

Contact Information

First Name:	
Last Name:	
Preferred Title (Mr., Ms., Mr., Dr.):	
Mailing Address:	
Email Address:	
Phone Number:	
Gender:	
Ethnicity:	
Congressional District of Residence:	
Child's Grade:	
Child's School:	
Congressional District (if known):	

Are you currently serving on a School Accountability Committee (SAC) or District Accountability Committee (DAC)? Yes _____ No _____

Do you plan to do so in the future? Yes _____ No _____

References

Please provide contact information for two references that would be able to speak to skills/tasks needed of SACPIE applicants.

First Name:	
Last Name:	
Current Title:	
Organization:	
Email Address:	
Phone Number:	
Relationship:	

First Name:	
Last Name:	
Current Title:	
Organization:	
Email Address:	
Phone Number:	
Relationship:	

Statement of Interest

SACPIE Application

Provide a brief description of why you are interested in serving on the State Advisory Council for Parent Involvement in Education. The response should not take more than one full typed page. Type your response below:

Return of Applications

Please email applications to Darcy Hutchins at hutchins_d@cde.state.co.us and note in the subject line: "SACPIE Application". Emailed applications are preferred.

To apply by mail, send to:

Darcy Hutchins
Colorado Department of Education
201 E. Colfax, Room 409
Denver, Colorado 80203

All applications and supporting material must be received at the email or U.S. mail address above no later than 5:00 p.m. September 30, 2020. Questions regarding the application process may be directed to Darcy Hutchins at 303.562-8175.

SACPIE will review application materials and recommend candidates for the vacant positions to the State Board of Education by September 30, 2020.

TOPIC: COLORDO'S AREA TECHNICAL COLLEGES

PREPARED BY: DR. BEN BOGGS, CHIEF OF STAFF

I. SUMMARY

This discussion item will offer a presentation by the Executive Directors of Colorado's Area Technical Colleges.

II. BACKGROUND

This discussion item is intended to be a broad discussion of Colorado's Area Technical Colleges and the unique contributions they provide to their regions of the state, as well as to the Commission's Master Plan *Colorado Rises*. Panelists will present data on enrollment, retention and student success metrics, as well as credentials earned and areas of demand. Panelists will also discuss funding structure as they are connected to local public school (K-12) districts. Panelists will include:

1. Randy Johnson, Executive Director, Emily Griffith Technical College
2. Dr. Teina McConnell, Executive Director, Pickens Technical College
3. Dr. Allen Golden, Executive Director, Technical College of the Rockies
4. Ed Bowditch, Lobbyist, Area Technical Colleges

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

An overview of Area Technical Colleges (ATCs) will be provided by the Executive Directors.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

This is an information item only; no formal action is required by the Commission.

V. STATUTORY AUTHORITY

Not applicable.

ATTACHMENT(S):

PowerPoint slides to be published April 2, 2021.

TOPIC: BUDGET AND LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

PREPARED BY: JASON SCHROCK, CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER
CHLOE MUGG, LEGISLATIVE LIAISON

I. SUMMARY

This discussion item is to provide a status update on the 2021 legislative session.

II. BACKGROUND

The Legislature is currently in session. It is during this time that legislation is considered and the State budget is developed for the upcoming fiscal year.

The Department is involved in both the budget development and consideration of public policy by legislators and staff that would impact higher education.

The Department meets regularly and works closely with the institutions of higher education, the Governor's office and General Assembly on all bills impacting higher education and provides policymakers with information about pending legislation and key issues.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

A status update of pending legislation impacting higher education, as well as higher education funding in the State budget, will be shared and discussed at the meeting.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

This is an information item only; no formal action is required by the Commission.

V. STATUTORY AUTHORITY

Not applicable.

COLORADO COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION - BYLAWS

Section 1. Organization and Meetings

- 1.1 **Organization:** Pursuant to C.R.S. §23-1-102, the Commission shall consist of eleven members appointed by the Governor with the consent of the Senate. The members of the Commission are selected on the basis of their knowledge of and interest in higher education and shall serve for four-year terms. No member of the Commission may serve more than two consecutive full four-year terms.
- 1.2 **Officers:** Pursuant to C.R.S. §23-1-110, the officers of the Commission shall be the Chair and Vice Chair. The Secretary shall be the Executive Director of the Commission and the Department and is a non-voting member of the Commission. The Governor appoints, with the consent of the Senate, the Executive Director to serve as the executive officer of the Commission and the Department.
- 1.3 All officers shall be elected at the May meeting of the Commission to serve a term of one year, except the Secretary whose term shall be coterminous with his or her term as Executive Director. Any member may nominate themselves or another member to be chair or vice-chair. Members will vote on each position; if there is more than one nomination the vote will be conducted by private ballot to be counted by the Secretary. Officers shall be limited to two consecutive terms, unless an exception is approved by a vote of more than 60 percent of the Commission. When possible, a Commissioner is encouraged to serve as vice-chair prior to becoming chair.
- 1.4 **Regular Meetings of the Commission:** The Commission shall adopt at the October Commission meeting a schedule of regular meetings of the Commission for the following calendar year.
- 1.3 **Notice of Meetings:** Any meetings at which the adoption of any proposed policy, position, resolution, rule, regulation, or formal action occurs or at which a majority or quorum of the body is in attendance, or is expected to be in attendance, shall be held only after full and timely notice to the public. In addition to any other means selected by the Commission for giving notice to the public, the Commission shall post notice of its meetings at the office of the Colorado Department of Higher Education located at 1560 Broadway, Suite 1600, Denver, Colorado 80202 and on the Colorado Department of Higher Education website. Notices shall be posted no less than two days prior to the holding of the meeting. The posting shall include specific agenda information where possible.
- 1.4 **Special Meetings:** Special meetings of the Commission may be held at the call of the Chair on two days' notice, or at the request of five members of the Commission who may petition the Chair to call such a meeting. Notice of special meetings shall be made electronically or by telephone and posted at the office and on the website of the Colorado

Department of Higher Education no less than two days prior to the meeting date.

- 1.5 **Conduct of Meetings:** The Chair shall preside at all meetings at which he or she is present. In the Chair's absence, the Vice Chair shall preside, and in the event both are absent, those present shall elect a presiding officer. All meetings shall be conducted in accordance with all State laws and regulations. The parliamentary rules contained in Robert's Rules of Order, latest revision, shall govern in all cases to which they are applicable, except as modified herein.
- 1.6 **Attendance at Meetings:** The term of any member of the Commission who misses more than two consecutive regular Commission meetings without good cause, as determined by the Chair, shall be terminated and his successor appointed in the manner provided for appointments under C.R.S. §23-1-102.
- 1.7 **Preparation of Agenda:** Meeting agendas shall be prepared by the Executive Director of the Department. A monthly agenda call will be scheduled with the Chair, Vice Chair, and Executive Director, or his or her designee, to discuss and approve the proposed agenda. At a regular or special meeting, an item of business may be considered for addition to the agenda by a majority vote of the Commissioners present.
- 1.8 **Minutes of the Commission:** The Secretary shall maintain an accurate set of minutes of Commission meetings, which shall include a complete record of all actions taken by the Commission. Such minutes shall constitute a permanent record. After the minutes of each meeting are completed they shall be reviewed by the Commission and, after approval, posted on the CCHE website and made available to the public for inspection upon written request.
- 1.9 **Standing Committees:** The Commission may create standing or ad hoc committees comprised of Commissioners to research and make recommendations on specific issues for the full Commission to consider and act on.

Section 2. Duties and Responsibilities of Officers

- 2.1 **Chair of the Commission:** The Chair of the Commission shall preside at meetings of the Commission at which he or she is in attendance.
- 2.2 **Vice Chair of the Commission:** The Vice Chair shall perform all duties of the Chair in the Chair's absence.
- 2.3 **The Secretary/Executive Director of the Commission:** In addition to performing those duties established by law, the Executive Director of the Commission and Department shall: (a) serve as the Secretary of the Commission, (b) meet with the officers and staff of institutions of higher learning as the needs dictate for a mutual discussion of the matters affecting the responsibilities of the Commission, (c) meet with appropriate state and federal groups and/or officials on matters pertaining to the Commission, (d) meet with appropriate committees of the General Assembly on matters pertaining to the

Commission's responsibilities, (e) appoint such professional staff as in his or her judgment are required and are within the budget approved by the Commission and for which funds are available, (f) prepare an annual operating budget and work program for approval by the Commission, (g) implement the policies of the Commission and communicate those policies to interested parties as appropriate.

Section 3. The Advisory Committee

3.1 There is hereby established an advisory committee pursuant to C.R.S. §23-1- 103).

Advisory Committee Members: The advisory committee shall consist of not less than thirteen members, to be designated as follows:

(a) Six members shall be appointed from the General Assembly, including three senators, two of whom shall be from the majority party, appointed by the President of the Senate and one of who shall be from the minority party appointed by the Minority Leader of the Senate, and three representatives, two of whom shall be from the majority party, appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and one of who shall be from the minority party appointed by the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives. Said six members shall be appointed for terms of two years or for the same terms to which they were elected to the general assembly, whichever is the lesser. Successors shall be appointed in the same manner as the original members;

(b) One member shall be selected and designated by the Commission, as recommended by the Colorado Faculty Advisory Council, to represent the faculty in the state;

(c) One member shall be selected and designated by the Commission, as recommended by the Student Affairs Council, to represent the students in the state for a term of one year, commencing on July 1 of the year appointed;

(d) One member shall be selected and designated by the Commission who is a parent of a student enrolled in a state supported institution of higher education in Colorado to represent the parents of students for a term of two years, commencing on July 1 of the year appointed.

(e) Not more than four additional members representing educational or other groups may be selected and designated by the Commission to serve on the advisory committee.

The Commission has designated the four additional advisory committee members to represent:

- Chief Academic Officers of Colorado's state supported institutions of higher education, as recommended by the Colorado Academic Council;
- Chief Financial Officers of Colorado's state supported institutions of higher education, as recommended by the, as recommended by the Chief Financial Officers group;

- Independent Higher Education Institutions in Colorado (Colorado College, Regis, and Denver University), as recommended by the Independent Higher Education Council; and,
- The K-12 system, as recommended by the Colorado Department of Education.

All such appointments shall be for a term of two years, commencing on July 1 of the year appointed.

- 3.2 Notice and Agendas: All members of the advisory committee shall receive agendas and background material and be notified of all public meetings of the Commission and shall be invited to attend for the purpose of suggesting solutions for the problems and needs of higher education and maintaining liaison with the general assembly.
- 3.3 Recommendations of the Advisory Committee: The members of the advisory committee shall have full opportunity to present their views on any matter before the Commission.

Section 4. Change in Bylaws

- 4.1 Bylaws shall be subject to amendment at any meeting of the Commission provided any such proposed change is listed on the agenda in accordance with the procedure outlined in Section 1.5 Notice of Meetings. Bylaw changes must be approved by a majority of the Commission.

HISTORY: Adopted on September 10, 1965. Amended January 14, 1966; February 25, 1972; June 1, 1978; July 1, 1993; October 7, 2004; May 6, 2011; CCHE Agenda March 3, 2017 Item V; April 5, 2019



COLORADO COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

- Chair Vanecia Kerr (D- 6th Congressional District) 2nd term ends June 2022
- Vice Chair Sarah Kendall Hughes (D-3rd Congressional District) 1st term ends July 2023
- Commissioner Paul Berrick Abramson (*U-7th Congressional District*) 1st term ends July 2023
- Commissioner Luis Colón (*R-4th Congressional District*) 2nd term ends June 2021
- Commissioner Teresa Kostenbauer (*U-4th Congressional District*) 1st term ends July 2024
- Commissioner Tom McGimpsey (R-2nd Congressional District) 1st term ends June 2021
- Commissioner Steven Meyer (*U-3rd Congressional District*) 1st term ends July 2024
- Commissioner Charlotte Olena (*D-1st Congressional District*) 1st term ends July 2023
- Commissioner Brittany Stich (*D-1st Congressional District*) 1st term ends July 2022
- Commissioner Steven Trujillo (*D-3rd Congressional District*) 1st term ends July 2023
- Commissioner Eric Tucker (*U-5th Congressional District*) 1st term ends July 2023

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Legislative Advisors

- Representative Julie McCluskie, *House Majority Appointment*
- Representative Cathy Kipp, *House Majority Appointment*
- Representative Tonya Van Beber, *House Minority Appointment*
- Senator Rachel Zenzinger, *Senate Majority Appointment*
- Senator Tammy Story, *Senate Majority Appointment*
- Senator Kevin Priola, *Senate Minority Appointment*

Subject Matter Advisors

- Mr. Wayne Artis, *Faculty Representative*
- Mr. Mark Cavanaugh, *IHEC Representative*
- Mr. Brad Baca, *Institutional Finance Representative*
- Dr. Landon Pirius, *Academic Council Representative*
- Ms. Misti Ruthven, *K-12 Representative*
- Ms. Leah Porter, *Parent Representative*





INSTITUTION AND SYSTEM LEADERS

<u>INSTITUTION</u>	<u>CEO</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>
Adams State University	Dr. Cheryl Lovell, President	Alamosa
Aims Community College	Dr. Leah Bornstein, President	Greeley
Community College System	Joe Garcia, Chancellor	Denver
Arapahoe CC	Dr. Diana Doyle, President	Littleton
Colorado Northwestern CC	Ron Granger, President	Rangely
CC of Aurora	Dr. Betsy Oudenhoven, President	Aurora
CC of Denver	Marielena DeSanctis, President	Denver
Front Range CC	Andy Dorsey, President	Westminster
Lamar CC	Dr. Linda Lujan, President	Lamar
Morgan CC	Dr. Curt Freed, President	Ft. Morgan
Northeastern JC	Jay Lee, President	Sterling
Otero JC	Dr. Timothy Alvarez, President	La Junta
Pikes Peak CC	Dr. Lance Bolton, President	Colorado Springs
Pueblo CC	Dr. Patty Erjavec, President	Pueblo
Red Rocks CC	Dr. Michele Haney, President	Lakewood
Trinidad State JC	Dr. Rhonda Epper, President	Trinidad
Colorado Mesa University	Tim Foster, President	Grand Junction
Colorado Mountain College	Dr. Carrie Besnette Hauser, President	Glenwood Springs
Colorado School of Mines	Paul Johnson, President	Golden
Colorado State System	Dr. Tony Frank, Chancellor	Denver
CSU-Ft Collins	Dr. Joyce McConnell, President	Fort Collins
CSU-Pueblo	Dr. Timothy Mottet, President	Pueblo
CSU-Global Campus	Pamela Toney, President	Aurora
CU System	Mark Kennedy, President	
CU – Boulder	Dr. Philip DiStefano, Chancellor	Denver
UCCS	Dr. Venkat Reddy, Chancellor	Boulder Colorado
UCD	Dr. Michelle Marks, Chancellor	Springs Denver
UC-Anschutz	Don Elliman, Chancellor	Aurora, Denver
Emily Griffith Technical College	Randy Johnson, Executive Director	Denver
Ft. Lewis College	Dr. Tom Stritikus, President	Durango
Metropolitan State University of Denver	Janine Davidson, President	Denver



Pickens Technical College	Dr. Teina McConnell, Executive	Aurora
Technical College of the Rockies	Allen Golden, Director	Delta
University of Northern Colorado	Dr. Andy Feinstein, President	Greeley
Western State Colorado University	Dr. Gregory Salsbury, President	Gunnison

Higher Education Glossary

529 Savings Plan - 529 plans are more than just savings accounts. These state-sponsored college savings plans were established by the federal government in Section 529 of the Internal Revenue Code to encourage families to save more for college. They offer unique state and federal tax benefits you can't get from other ways to save, making them one of the best ways to save for college.

Accuplacer - A suite of computer-adaptive placement tests that are used as assessment tools at institutions to evaluate the level of course work for a student. Students measured as needing additional course work will be assigned to remediation.

Admission Standard - includes both Freshman and Transfer standard. The freshman standard applies to all in-state and out-of-state new freshmen applicants and to transfer applicants with 12 or fewer college credit hours, except freshmen and transfer applicants who meet one of the admissions standards index exemptions. The transfer standard applies to all degree-seeking undergraduate transfer applicants with more than 12 college credit hours who do not meet one of the exemptions

Admission Window - Defined in Admission policy, "The maximum allowable percentage of admitted students who are not required to meet the CCHE admission standards within a specific fiscal year is referred to as the admissions window. Separate windows exist for the freshmen and transfer standards. The allowable percentage is determined by the Commission." The percentages vary by institution.

CAP4K - SB08-212, Preschool to Postsecondary Education Alignment Act; Colorado Achievement Plan for Kids.

CHEA - Council for Higher Education Accreditation. As described on their website, CHEA is "A national advocate and institutional voice for self-regulation of academic quality through accreditation, CHEA is an association of 3,000 degree-granting colleges and universities and recognizes 60 institutional and programmatic accrediting organizations."

CIP - Classification of Instructional Program; The purpose of which is to provide a taxonomic scheme that will support the accurate tracking, assessment, and reporting of fields of study and program completions activity. (Relevant in Role & Mission)

CLEP - College Level Examination Program; Earn college credit for passing a subject specific examination.

COA - Cost of Attendance; in the context of financial aid, it is an estimate of what it will reasonably cost the student to attend a given institution for a given period of time.

Concurrent Enrollment – A high school student enrolled for one or more classes at a college or university in addition to high school courses.

Dually Enrolled - A student enrolled at two institutions at the same time. This may affect enrollment reports when both institutions count that student as enrolled.

EFC - Expected Family Contribution; in the context of financial aid, it is calculated by a federally-approved formula that accounts for income, assets, number of family members attending college, and other information.

FAFSA - Free Application for Federal Student Aid. This is a free service provided by the Federal government under the Department of Education and students are not charged to complete/file the FAFSA.

FAP – Financial Aid Plan (HESP specific)

FERPA - Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, view federal website. The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) (20 U.S.C. § 1232g; 34 CFR Part 99) is a Federal law that protects the privacy of student education records. The law applies to all schools that receive funds under an applicable program of the U.S. Department of Education.

FFS – Fee-For-Service Contracts; A portion of the College Opportunity Fund program in addition to COF stipends, this contract provides funding to certain higher education institutions to supplement high cost programs and purchase additional services (such as graduate programs).

Floor - In reference to the admission window, the floor is the minimum requirements for admission without requiring an exception of some kind. This usually coincides with the Index score.

FTE - Full-time Equivalent; a way to measure a student's academic enrollment activity at an educational institution. An FTE of 1.0 means that the student is equivalent to full-time enrollment, or 30 credit hours per academic year for an undergraduate student.

GEARUP - Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs; A Federal discretionary grant program designed to increase the number of low-income students who are prepared to enter and succeed in postsecondary education.

Guaranteed Transfer, GT Pathways - gtPATHWAYS applies to all Colorado public institutions of higher education, and there are more than 900 lower-division general education courses in 20 subject areas approved for guaranteed transfer. Courses are approved at least twice per academic and calendar year and apply the next semester immediately following their approval.

HB 1023 - In most cases, refers to HB 06S-1023, which declares "It is the public policy of the state of Colorado that all persons eighteen years of age or older shall provide proof that they are lawfully present in the United States prior to receipt of certain public benefits."

HB 1024 - In most cases, refers to HB 06-1024, which declares "On or before September 1, 2006, each governing board of a state institution of higher education shall submit to the Colorado commission on higher education and the education committees of the senate and the house of representatives, or any successor committees, a report regarding underserved students".

HB 1057 - In most cases, refers to HB 05-1057, which declares "a college preparation program operating within the school district that the college preparation program shall provide to the Colorado commission on higher education, on or before December 31 of each school year, a report specifying each student, by unique identifying number."

HEAR - Higher Education Admission Requirements, 2008-2010.

Index, Index Score - This index score is a quantitative evaluation that is part of a larger student application evaluation. The score is generated from academic achievement (GPA or High School Rank) and college placement tests (ACT or SAT). You can calculate your index score online. Index varies by institution depending on that institutions selection criteria.

IPEDS - Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System; Run by NCES, this system collects statistical data and information on postsecondary institutions. The Colorado Department of Higher Education submits aggregated data on public institutions to IPEDS.

Need - In the context of student financial aid, Need is calculated by the difference between the COA (Cost of Attendance) and the EFC (Expected Family Contribution)

NCATE - National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education; NCATE is the profession's mechanism to help establish high quality teacher preparation.

NCLB - No Child Left Behind; The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) -- the main federal law affecting education from kindergarten through high school.

PSEO - Post Secondary Enrollment Option; A program that offers concurrent enrollment in college courses while in high school.

PWR - Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness; Definition was created during the SB08-212 CAP4K meetings.

QIS - Quality Indicator System; Implemented in HB96-1219, the specific quality indicators involved in QIS are similar to those used in the variety of quality indicator systems found in other states: graduation rates, freshmen retention and persistence rates, passing scores or rates on tests and licensure examinations, undergraduate class size, faculty teaching workload rates, and institutional support/administrative expenditures.

REP - Regional Education Provider; Colorado Statute authorizes Adams State College, Fort Lewis College, Mesa State College and Western State College to function as regional

educational providers and “have as their primary goal the assessment of regional educational needs...”
Regional education providers focus their attention on a certain geographical area.

SB 3 – In most cases refers to SB10-003, the Higher Education Flexibility Bill.

SB 212 - In most cases, refers to HB 08-212, the CAP4K legislation.

SBE - State Board of Education; As described on their website, "Members of the Colorado State Board of Education are charged by the Colorado Constitution with the general supervision of the public schools. They have numerous powers and duties specified in state law. Individuals are elected on a partisan basis to serve six-year terms without pay."

SFSF – State Fiscal Stabilization Fund; A component of the ARRA legislation and funding.

SURDS - Student Unit Record Data System

WICHE - Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education; A regional research and policy organization that assists students, policymakers, educators, and institutional, business and community leaders. WICHE states include: Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.

WUE - Western Undergraduate Exchange Program, managed by WICHE