SB 16-196 Colorado Inclusive Higher Education Pilot Program

Third Annual Report

Cordelia Robinson Rosenberg, Ph.D., RN
JFK Partners
Professor of Pediatrics and Psychiatry
University of Colorado School of Medicine
Cordelia.rosenberg@ucdenver.edu

November 27, 2018

SB 16-196 Inclusive Higher Education Pilot Program
Annual Report

Background

Senate Bill 16-196 created a program to establish inclusive higher education Pilot programs at the University of Northern Colorado, University of Colorado at Colorado Springs, and Arapahoe Community College, for students with intellectual and developmental disabilities (I/DD).

SB 16-196 came about through the collaborative efforts of parents of students with intellectual and developmental disabilities (I/DD) and other committed stakeholders who formed a nonprofit, IN! Colorado Initiative for Inclusive Higher Education. The leadership of IN! was inspired by a movement across the country to create opportunities in institutions of higher education (IHE). both two and four-year programs for students with intellectual and developmental disabilities to experience and gain from inclusive higher education programs.

The creation of such higher education opportunities nationally was stimulated by the Federal 2008 Higher Education Opportunity Act. Under this Act Congress appropriated $10.6 million toward creating model programs for states to use to foster the development of such efforts. Under this funding, the Transition Post-Secondary Education Program for Students with Intellectual Disabilities (TPSID), 27 IHE received funding for "creating, expanding or enhancing high quality inclusive higher education experiences to support positive outcomes for individuals with I/DD." [1] Grants were awarded again in 2015 to 25 IHE to implement the TPSID program: Think College report (https://thinkcollege.net/sites/default/files/files/resources/TC%20reports%20data%20summary_web_F.pdf).

Under the TPSID program Congress also appropriated funding for a National Coordinating Center to support the TPSID projects. This center, Think College, became a resource for the IN! families as they began their pursuit of inclusive postsecondary opportunities in Colorado. The Think College materials, and reports and parent visits to IHE around the country

---

[1] Colorado State University received one of these grants, but the program has not met the needs of the families who started IN! as the students admitted under the program at CSU need to meet the standard admission requirements. SB196 Pilot students do not need to meet requirements of standardized tests for admission.

helped IN! develop a vision of post-secondary education opportunities including college living experiences.

The IN! group, with active participation from the state Arc chapter and JFK Partners, CU School of Medicine, Colorado's University Center of Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research and Service and with the encouragement of Sen. Bill Cadman, Senate President at the time, began to pursue state of Colorado funding to initiate "pilot programs" at three Colorado IHE. As one of the first steps in planning for the legislation several people from the IN! board met with Kachina Weaver from the Colorado Department of Higher Education (CDHE) to determine whether the CDHE could be the home agency if a bill was passed. This location was agreed to and legislation was pursued.

SB 16-196 was signed into law by Governor Hickenlooper on June 6, 2016.
http://www.leg.state.co.us/clics/clics2016a/csl.nsf/fsbillcont/B364570ACA74A58087257F770055BF34?Open&file=196_enr.pdf
The act included the following provisions:

- State funds were provided to three "Pilot" IHE, Arapahoe Community College, University of Colorado at Colorado Springs and University of Northern Colorado, for each school to initiate and develop an inclusive higher education program for students with Intellectual Disabilities.
- Funding for the program from the legislation was intended to continue for four years.
- JFK partners was expected to provide a written evaluation report to CDHE yearly.
- The goal was to grow to a total of 40 students served in this program at each institution over four years.
- Annual funding of $75,000 goes to each of the IHE for the "Pilot" program and $25,000 goes to the University of Colorado School of Medicine, JFK Partners to evaluate the Program and produce an annual report.

SB 16-196 specified requirements for the Pilots included:

(a) An institutional assessment to determine training needs, technical assistance, and other capacity needed to provide a higher education program for students with intellectual and developmental disabilities;

(b) Identification of state and institution regulations, policies, and practices that foster or impede inclusive higher education;

(c) Offer programming and necessary supports for students with intellectual and developmental disabilities that allow a student to take for credit, or, to, audit a minimum of two on-campus undergraduate courses each semester in his or her chosen area of interest, and to take a course each semester that is designed to meet the needs of students with intellectual and developmental disabilities, resulting upon completion in the award of a certificate from the institution;

(d) To the greatest extent possible, integrate students socially and academically into the normative offerings of the institution and give the student all of the rights and responsibilities of a typically matriculating student;

(e) Include peer mentoring;

(f) Coordinate with available vocational rehabilitation supports through the Colorado Department of Labor and Employment;

(g) Prepare the student for gainful competitive employment;

(h) Admissions standards that do not require a student to participate in a curriculum-based, achievement college entrance exam that is administered nationwide;

(i) Determine whether the program is sustainable and if so, to become a certified transition program, as defined in the "Higher Education Opportunity Act", pub. L. 110-315, https://www.uc.edu/content/dam/uc/registrar/docs/higher_education_opportunity_act_of_2008.pdf giving students in the program access to federal financial aid opportunities; and

(j) Require the institutions of higher education to develop a five-year plan for sustainability, including enrollment projections for the inclusive higher education program.

Evaluation Approach

The Evaluation of SB 16-196 involves the active participation of multiple stakeholders at the three pilot schools and IN! as a private nonprofit group of committed stakeholders. The Evaluation Plan includes four strategies that the three Pilots and IN! have adopted in collaboration with JFK Partners. This third report covers the second year of operation of the program, academic year 17-18. It also includes information regarding the students admitted for AY 18-19.

Strategy 1. Review of Program Standards.

The intent of the legislation was that the Pilots were to use the Inclusive Higher Education, Think College program standards as SB 16-196 Pilot program standards as applicable. Each of the Pilot schools reviewed the Think College (best practice standards) and assessed their status vis-à-vis the standards and benchmarks and set goals where they wanted to improve their standing. Standards were formally reviewed in the fall of 2016 and updated in the fall of 2017.

In the course of each Pilot rating their status on the benchmarks attached to each standard, differences in interpretation of the benchmarks and differences in the priority given to standards and benchmarks were identified. Initially the Consortium approach was to see the benchmarks as requirements. However, in the course of reviewing them multiple times it became apparent that some were more important than others. The 2017 ratings reflected a reprioritization of the benchmarks. The appropriateness of a more selective approach was confirmed in discussions with a Think College staff member who pointed out that the standards and benchmarks are to be viewed as suggestive rather than universally applicable.

Approach for AY 17-18. In discussion of the 2017 ratings all agreed that development of work experiences needed to be an absolute program priority for AY 17-18. Particular emphasis was placed upon development of work experience for the second-year cohorts at UCCS and ACC. By the end of Spring 2018 each Pilot added a staff member. The two four-year schools added a position dedicated to the development of internships and employment experiences. At ACC a critical additional staff member was added.

Strategy 2. Documentation of Stakeholder Satisfaction with Pilots.

Parents of Pilot Students.
All parents of the 34 students enrolled in the Pilots were sent requests for feedback regarding their experiences with the program at the end of the fall 2017 and spring 2018 semesters. In the fall of 2017, 12 parents responded, and, in the spring of 2018, 18 parents responded. About half of the fall semester respondents also responded in the spring semester.

Parents of students from both year one and year two responded for ACC and UCCS, and almost all of year 2 parents at UNCO responded. In the fall semester the email requests were forwarded to the parents by the Pilots, and it was not possible to tell whether families received them. For the spring semester the Pilots were provided with packets that they mailed to the parents. The packets gave parents several ways to respond. They could mail the form back to the evaluator in an envelope provided, they could log on and respond by email or they could request a phone interview. In the fall semester one parent requested an interview and the remainder responded by email. In the spring semester no one requested an interview and about half responded by mail and half by email.

Overall feedback for all three schools was positive. A number of parents commented on the increased independence shown by their child. Parents were appreciative of the supports the programs provided. A number of parents felt their student needed more support and direction. This issue was common in the fall semester. At ACC several parents felt their students were reluctant to ask for support and suggested that their student needed to be prompted to make sure they understood directions and assignments. At UNCO a lack of social activities was especially difficult on the weekends. This lack of social activities on weekends was also a problem the first year suggesting that the program may need to refine their approach to supporting students in self-determination. At UCCS there were some issues with the college living experience and parents suggested that the program probably needed more support in place for the campus living experiences.

The need for more frequent and detailed communication with parents was a recurring theme. This theme was prevalent across all three pilots. In regard to the questions about program balance across academics, social and vocational domains many parents noted the lack of employment experience. At all three Pilots the addition of staff during the spring semester was noted and appreciated. However, there were still issues in the spring semester regarding the adequacy of supports.

Several parents of students at ACC commented on the level of difficulty of the work in some classes, especially math and literature. ACC has made a point of not modifying classes so that their students would be eligible for student aid. While all of the students made satisfactory progress in the first

two years some parents did feel as though their student was struggling with some classes.

In summary, parents who responded were positive and appreciative of their students' experience. However only about half of the parents responded. At the beginning of the fall 2018 semester both the IN! Outreach Coordinator and I attended the orientation meeting at all three Pilots. At these meetings we each got signed permission from parents to contact them directly for feedback. For those who did not attend the orientation meeting the program requested this permission. It is hoped that with this contact beforehand response rates will improve.

Pilot Student Feedback
Each of the 34 students enrolled in the Pilots during the 17-18 AY were sent requests for feedback regarding their experiences with the program at the end of the fall 2017 and spring 2018 semesters. In the fall of 2017, 22 students responded, and 13 students responded in the spring semester. The same procedure was used with the students as had been used with the parents each semester. In a number of cases parents asked their students about the survey, with the students responding that they did not know about the survey. In some cases that prompted parents to sit down with their students and discuss the questions. In some cases, parents indicated that they served as "scribe" for their students.

This, parent working with the student together, approach seemed to result in more productive responses. Left to themselves students tended to respond with one word or short phrase answers. In many cases if the student filled the form out by hand their response was illegible, suggesting that improving penmanship or typing and working with parents will be the recommended procedure for the future.

Student feedback was consistent with the parent feedback. The themes were generally positive. However, a theme across all three schools was a lack of opportunities to make friends with non-Pilot students. It may be that efforts to connect students with typical peers needs to be more intentional. Social experiences may need to include role-play to better prepare pilot students for initiating social interaction.

Another theme especially from students at ACC was that the work was difficult and while the staff were great, they needed more help. Also, ACC

by its nature does not have as much of a supply of peer mentors to draw upon. Access to peer mentors is a positive theme at the two four-year schools.

Permissions were obtained for direct contact with the students at the orientation programs in the fall of 2018. Procedures will be modified for the students to include their parents working with them on responses in expectation that response rate and legibility may improve.

Faculty with Pilot students enrolled in their classes.
Faculty who had one or more Pilot students in their class were sent a questionnaire requesting feedback about their experience. Requests were sent at the end of fall 2017 and spring 2018 semesters. Questions addressed whether they felt it was necessary to modify the class content; whether they were provided needed support; whether other students were accepting of the "Pilot" students and whether they had any suggestions to offer. A request was sent to all faculty, approximately 70 individuals, across the three schools. Ten faculty responded, and they were almost all positive. For the most part faculty were quite positive and appreciative of the program and peer mentor assistance. A number did feel however that they wanted to know about the Pilot students at the beginning of class and what assistance they could expect from the program. UCCS held an event for faculty feedback in the in the spring of 2018 semester and was delighted with the positive feedback and the degree of which faculty wanted to welcome students. Inclusion of Pilot students in regular academic classes seems to be going very well with one or two exceptions.

Peer Mentors.
The two four-year Pilots have been able to recruit peer mentors to work with the students primarily around academics. Across the three programs there were approximately 12 peer mentors. All of them responded to requests for input and they were uniformly positive about the experience. The peer mentors all received payment which, was important to their having the time available to do the mentoring. However, they were also very positive about the value of the experience. As program policy and procedures get more refined it would probably behoove the Pilots to try to do more with recruitment of peer mentors and to see if students might get course credit in lieu of payment. The peer mentors provide double benefit by supporting students but also serving as "Pilot" ambassadors as they

pursue their careers. Students were generally positive about peer mentors and would have liked more of their time.

Table 1 contains the questions posed to each of the four stakeholder group. Table 2 contains selected comments from each of the groups.

Table 1. Stakeholder Questions
Questions posed to parents

1. Overall how is this experience with Higher Education going for your student? For you?
2. Were you able to prepare your student for college life? With respect to what you did? What the program did?
3. Are there suggestions you have for other families considering application to the program?
4. Do you have suggestions for improving orientation?
5. Is there an appropriate balance in the experience between academics, work experience, skills of daily living and social life?
6. What are your priorities for your student's experience?
7. Are there experiences you expected your student to have that are not being provided or your student is having difficulty accessing?
8. Has your relationship with your student changed? If so how?
9. Do you have goals for yourself in relation to your students' enrollment in higher education?
10. Are there any additional impacts you see from your students' enrollment? On your student? On you? On your family?
11. Are there any recommendations you have for the program?
12. What is important to consider that hasn't already been asked?

Questions posed to students

1. How was your college experience this semester (Spring 2018)? Is it: not good, okay, good, great. Why?
2. Where did you live? What do you like about where you lived? Is there anything you would like to change about where you live?
3. What classes did you take?
4. What did you like about your classes? What do you wish was different about your classes?
5. Did you receive the supports you needed for your classes? What help did you receive for your homework and classwork?
6. Do you feel the professors welcomed you in class?
7. Do you feel your classmates accepted you in class?
8. Did you receive the supports you needed for your day to day activities? Getting to and from class and activities? Maintaining your calendar/ schedule?
9. Did you receive the supports you needed for social activities?
10. What additional supports if any would you have liked?
11. Has it been easy or difficult to adjust to college? What has been easy? What has been difficult?
12. What are the three things you like best about college?
13. What are the things you like least?
14. What goals have you set for work after college?

15. Have your goals changed at all since you started college?
16. If so in what way?
17. If you lived on campus how often did your family contact, you and how? Was it too much? Too little? Just right?
18. How much contact did you have with other students not in your program? Is it the right amount?
19. Is there anything else you would like to say about your experience?

Questions posed to faculty

1. What is the name of the class where you have had a Pilot Student?
2. How many Pilot students do you have in class?
3. What has been your previous experience if any with students with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities?
4. How, if at all, have you adjusted your class to accommodate the Pilot student(s)?
5. Have the modifications (if any) made for the student by Pilot staff been appropriate?
6. Are there things that need to be done to help you as a professor better to support Pilot students?
7. Do you feel other students in the class are accepting of the Pilot students in your class?
8. Do you have any reservations about having Pilot students in future classes? If so, what are they? What might be done to address these concerns?
9. Has your perception as an educator changed after having a Pilot student in your class? If yes, how so?
10. What recommendations do you have for the Pilot program going forward?
11. Are there additional considerations regarding the Pilot program you would like to share?

Questions posed to peer mentors

1. Please tell me a little about yourself? How many years have you attended college? What is your major? How did you learn about the program?
2. What role are you playing, i.e. peer mentor, tutor?
3. What preparation has the inclusive program at your school provided for you for this role?
4. Do you feel the preparation is adequate? Is there more preparation you would like?
5. Have you had previous experience in this kind of role? If so where and when?
6. Are you receiving course credit or payment for your role? How important is credit or payment for you to do this work?
7. What has been a benefit for you for doing this work? Will you continue to do so next year?
8. Are you serving in this role because you anticipate a career working with people with disabilities?
9. Have there been any surprises for you in your work with the inclusive program students?
10. Are there any recommendations you have to improve the inclusive program or inspirational message you would offer?
11. Is there anything else you would like to comment on? Is there quote you can offer to fellow students?

Table 2. Stakeholder Comments
Parent Feedback

Overall experience for student.
- "My son is thrilled at the opportunity to participate in college life. We see an increase in his confidence and ability to hold meaningful discussions."

Overall experience for parent.
- "The staff who manage the program, show a genuine interest in the well-being of the students and go above and beyond their jobs to make sure the students are thriving. I can't say how much it means to me to see my child so happy and excited to be a college student."

Impacts
- "One thing we have noticed is that he is quicker to understand and realize the meaning of a discussion… Now, he is able to say how he feels and what he will do to improve a situation."
- "I see a group of young women and men who feel a sense of belonging who otherwise would not have had the opportunity to belong. Their lives are enriched with this positive experience of college life and making connections with others."
- "Has more friends, motivated to do more in a day, week and life."
- "We expect much more from her now. She works and has to keep track of her finances. She makes many of her meals… She schedules her own appointments. She has matured immensely."
- "I see wonderful growth in her in many ways as she works on becoming more independent. Positives include better decision making, more confidence and broader understanding. Negatives are more stress and anxiety… This opportunity is something we all strongly embrace."
- "All positive impacts, she continues to set an example for her younger brothers."
- "We have drawn closer and can discuss just about anything. I feel like she can be trusted even more."

Balance among academics, social and vocational
- "At beginning of experience 1st semester, social life was slow to develop on weekends, more support for connections would have been helpful. 2nd semester was a better balance."
- "Our daughter has benefitted from academic support, social support and advocacy skills. We are looking forward to the second-year emphasis on job/professional skills."

Recommendations
- "Better communication with parents, with students' personal goals, achievements and expectations."

Student Feedback

Experiences and likes
- "Great made lots of new friends, live on my own."
- "Like to learn, being with people my age and I feel independent."
- "Great, hanging out with new friends."

Classes
- "Fun and interesting and the professors were really nice."
- "Additional supports, spring 2018 would have liked time with a mentor."
- "Big success for my first year… cannot wait for another year there."

Support for social activities

- "I would have liked a little more support for more weekend activity- even talking through scheduling an activity with someone."
- "My experience has been good for the most part, but I would have liked more peer mentors."
- "People who run the program are awesome."
- "It is an amazing opportunity… For me it has been awesome and know that no matter how many years it takes I will still keep going and getting my certificate or degree."
- "Last semester was hard, but this semester is going much better for support for more social activities.
- "I would like to hang out more with other students."

Goals Change
- "Getting fully prepared, staying organized and scheduled. Having ownership of my work."

Faculty Feedback

Previous experience
- "Knowledge of the program has allowed the instructors the opportunity to engage the students appropriately into the classroom discussion without much disruption and to build their confidence to participate. The instructors have embraced the diversity it provides, and I believe that all the students benefit."

Any reservations? Recommendations?
- "No, I just want to know who they are and be given tips on how I can help them integrate into the classroom, so everyone has a good experience."
- "Disclose students and give us some training before the semester begins on what these students might need from us."
- "Faculty training from staff or professionals who specialize in working with individuals with IDD is essential to the success of the program."
- "Would like to reduce the amount of work the instructor has to do to accommodate these students and increase the level in which the program provides these resources to the instructor."

Other Students Accepting
- "Most are, yes, it was a "communication" class, so we talked A LOT about being aware of everyone and their differences while not just judging and being tolerant."
- "The other students have been very accepting of the students. Have only received positive feedback on how they contribute to the overall classroom experience."

Perceptions changed
- "Yes, I do see how capable these students are without changing the rigor or modifying the assignments."
- "Yes, the student was a joy to have in my class and helped challenge other students to have more patience."

Additional Considerations

- "Thank you, as the program is wonderful, and I am happy to be part of it."

Peer Mentor Feedback

Receiving credit or payment
- "I was a volunteer at first and loved it and then got the opportunity to get paid but that was jus a bonus and would still be doing this job even if I didn't get paid."
- "The payment is very important to me because I do have bills to pay, but the information and experience I am getting means so much to me as well."

Recommendations
- "The program has improved so much from when I started last year until now and it is constantly improving and making sure that the best is done and taking steps in order to grow and expand and do everything that they can to make the program more successful. All the staff are amazing at what they do, and the program wouldn't be the same without them!"

Benefits
- "The benefit of this work is the overall experience I have gained. I have gained a lot of experience with one on one support as well as group support and it is an experience that I have been able to grow from and also impact the lives of others and that is something I really enjoy. I plan on having this job for the rest of my time here at school."

Surprises
- "I wouldn't call it a surprise but being able to see different students with the same disability and the ways they are so different has been really eye opening."
- "The students are teaching me. they have taught me about myself, the need to accept, and the need to listen. I have learned that all people can exceed if given a chance."

Strategy 3: Establish a Cross Pilot database.

Common data regarding characteristics of the students participating in the Pilot is collected. The Think College National Coordinating Center (NCC) Annual Report (http://www.thinkcollege.net) was used to identify key variables to be documented about the students. NCC reports were used to guide the design of a cross site database. In addition to information about the students, data was collected regarding the activities in which they participate, and supports they receive. The data set was modeled after the Think College data set used for reporting by the federally funded grants. In order to maintain confidentiality of the data set, each IHE assigns a unique

ID to each student and maintains that ID in their records so that they can track their students longitudinally. Table 3 contains enrollment information about the first, second and third cohorts of students. Table 4 contains summary information regarding the student's activities during the 17-18 AY for the first two cohorts. Data regarding student enrollment and activities were collected at the end of each semester.

Table 3. Characteristics of SB196 Pilot Students

Number of students admitted each year	2016	2017	2018
ACC	5*	11	6
UCCS	3	8	5
UNC	4**	7	5
Total New	12	26	16
Total Enrollment	12	32	47
Gender			
Male	4	17	10
Female	8	9	6
Race			
White	11	22	10
Black	1	1	1
Asian	0	3	2
Hispanic	0	0	3
Age Range	20 yrs - 33 yrs	18 yrs - 29 yrs	18 yrs – 28 yrs

Most frequent diagnosis			
Autism	3	7	3
Intellectual Disability	6	12	7
Living situation			
With family	7	15	8
Inclusive housing	4	10	6
Other	1	1	2
Enrollment with Vocational Rehabilitation			
Currently applying	0	4	0/Unknown
Eligible	9	14	8
Have not applied	3	8	3
IEP status in HS			
Yes	12	25	16
High School Status			
Graduated	12	25	16
GED		1	0

Attended a Transition Program			
Yes	5	15	8
Dual enrolled		1	1
Not answered	7	0	7

*Two students did not return for year 2
** These students did not return to UNCO, one applied to UCCS and attended in 17-18, and another applied to and is attending UCCS in 18-19

Students on all three campuses were active in both academic and social activities. The first year at all three schools was predominantly focused on initial adjustment to a more demanding environment. All three programs had to start up with minimal preparation. The first priority at each school was to establish the required specialized learning experience and getting students enrolled in at least two classes with their peers. In AY17-18 the programs began to provide more support for all aspects of the program, academic, career development and social development. A key learning from year 1 was that for a number of students, especially those living on campus, supports had to be much more intentionally provided than had been the practice in year 1.

Table 4. Pilot Students Participation in Campus Life

Living Situation	2016-2017 AY	2017-2018 AY
With family	7	19
Campus residential	4	11
Other – roommate in apartment	1	1
Course Work		
Pilot specialized course	12	32
Classes in regular curriculum	12 (Range of credit hours 6-12)	32 Average range of credit hours 7-9
Employment*		
Student had paid employment	1	7
Social Activities		
1-3 hours per week	3/12	11/32
4-8 hours per week	7/12	12/32
9-15 hours per week	1/12	0

*More detailed employment information has been added to the database for AY 18-19

Enrollment Expectations.
Originally the Pilots were expected to admit 10 new students a year and to have 40 students enrolled at each Pilot by the fourth year, the 19-20 AY. The first year the schools admitted only 5 at ACC, 3 at UCCS, and 4 at

UNCO for a total of 12 students. This number was mutually agreed upon between IN! And the Pilots given the lack of planning time. Only UNCO provided an on campus living experience in year one. For AY 16-17 the schools had, very little time to prepare and it turned out that the low enrollment was a wise choice as the way they were staffed was minimal given the demands of supporting students while designing the program. Three of the students at ACC and all of the students at UCCS returned for the second year. None of the four students at UNCO returned for year 2.

Year 2 AY 17-18 Cohort
For year 2, AY 17-18 each Pilot attempted to increase their enrollment. UCCS added an on campus living arrangement and UNCO continued an on campus living arrangement that kept the Pilot students together, something they had not been done the first year. The year 2 new cohort included 11 students at ACC, 8 students at UCCS and 7 students at UNCO. The year 2 new admissions was 26 students so 4 short of the goal of 30 new students in Year 2. However, 26 year 2 students and six returning first cohort students for a total of 32 students proved to be a challenge to the programs.

Year 3 AY 18-19 Cohort.
For the 18-19 AY the total new enrollment of students was 16 students; 6 at ACC, 5 at UCCS, and 5 at UNCO for a total enrollment of 48 students.

The total enrollment across the three pilots is just a little over 50% of the target enrollment specified in the original planning. However, the current number is appropriate given the current staffing of the programs. As previously noted, each of the programs added a staff member in the spring of 2018. These people have been excellent additions to the staff to do the work that needs to be done especially in developing practicum and job placements for the students as well as supporting the year 1 (6 students) and year 2 (26 students) in job placements. It is recommended that each Pilot review experience and success with their student enrollment at the end of the fall 2018 semester to determine the number of year 4, (AY 19-20) students they will be able to support. This review will require a critical look at the success in providing students with employment experiences. While there may be some economies of scale benefits to accrue from spring 2017 and fall 2018 semesters, the Pilots need to be sure they can support the first three cohorts with sufficient employment experience as a basis for deciding how many new students they can accept for AY 19-20.

Strategy 4: IN! Consortium Meetings.

One of the expectations in the design of the Colorado legislation and IN! was that the Pilots would benefit from experiences of one another. Pilot faculty and staff, the Evaluator and IN! Board President and staff have met at least 8 times since the Pilots began. The liaison for the CDHE participated in meetings as available. The consortium meetings in year 2 were hosted by ACC as a halfway point between the 2 four-year Pilots. In year 2 each Pilot tended to have different administrative concerns so the work that was most fruitful as a group tended to be that of the work with the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation in better understanding how best to support students and families in pursuit of DVR support.

Four areas that were originally viewed as collective work included pursuit of Certified Transition Program status, pursuit of an Inclusive Educational Certificate, use of a person-centered planning model and development of financial sustainability are not being pursued collectively. Pilot status on these four critical issues will be addressed for each Pilot separately.

Obtain Comprehensive Transition and Post-Secondary Program Status. One of the expectations for the Pilots is that their institution receives Comprehensive Transition and Post-Secondary program status. While the Pilots can initiate this application, it requires approval from the administration of the IHE in order to submit the request to the US Department of Education. This status is beneficial as it may make some students eligible for federal aid for tuition. At ACC all of the second-year students are pursuing an established Associate Degree or Certificate Program available to any ACC student and are maintaining Satisfactory Academic Progress, so they are currently eligible for federal financial aid (Pell grants, Colorado student grants, work study and subsidized/ unsubsidized student loans). As of October 2018, ACC has submitted their application to the US Department of Education and has begun the process of clarification and revision. The status of UNCO's application has been under review by upper level administration for over a year. As of October 2018, the program was hopeful that the University administration would release it for submission to the US Department of Education this semester. The status of the CTP at UCCS is that it is still under development by the Program Director. It is recommended that UCCS place an absolute priority on completion and submission of the CTP application. If there are barriers

at administrative levels within the respective Universities, the "Pilots" should work to identify individuals who can help address these barriers.

Development of a Uniform Credential
Initially the Pilots thought that they collectively could develop a credential that could be available across the three Pilots and then could be applied to other IHE as they began to support Inclusive programs.

However, during year 2 it became apparent that what was feasible for the community college and the four-year schools differed. In this regard ACC went forward and developed a 36-hour three-year credential that has been approved by the Community College System and therefore will be available should any of the other community colleges elect to provide staffing to support inclusive higher education students.

The two four-year schools elected to join forces on specifying a 4-year 56-credit hour credential. As specified in the legislation these 56 hours will include 2 general education courses each semester for 4 years plus the special course. Standard requirements for the credential are yet to be defined. Priority should be placed on this definition of requirements as there are second- and third-year students currently who may have taken courses, they will not meet requirements.

Approach to Person Centered Planning
Each of the Pilots has adopted an expectation that they will use an individualized person-centered planning approach in working with the Pilot students to develop a program plan and career path. The programs vary somewhat in how well they have detailed their approach to individualized planning.

At ACC, aided by the definition provided in the credential, they have developed this process and it is well defined and documented. In the course of this work Elevate at ACC has gotten good information as to the staffing required to implement this approach. With this documentation it has become apparent that they are working at close to capacity with their current enrollment of 19 students supported by 2 FTE, plus some volunteer help.

UCCS has used a person-centered planning approach from day one and the Pilot faculty and staff are very skilled in working with the students in

eliciting information from the students regarding career goals and paths. The assistance provided to faculty in class modifications and adaptations is exemplary and worthy of adoption at the other schools. Faculty in the regular academic classes at UCCS has been particularly complementary about the value of such an approach.

A systematic approach to individualized program planning taking student's interests and goals into account is less apparent at the UNCO GOAL program. On the other hand, the GOAL special course syllabi are comprehensive in scope.

Each school has strengths in aspects of development of individualized plans with Pilot students. However, each program would benefit from providing more extensive documentation of what is working and not working in their approaches and taking the time to understand each other's process.

Financial Sustainability
The original projected enrollment was as noted a total of 30 students per school for the 18-19 AY, and 40 per school for AY 19-20 for the two four-year schools. ACC having defined a three-year credential is expected to have turnover so that they will have 30 students enrolled in any given year. However, it is conceivable that some students may take more than 3 years to earn their credential. The assumption made in the financial plan was that each pilot would charge a fee in place of tuition, but about comparable to tuition in order to be able to sustain the Pilots without State money by year 5. The fees charged were based upon the expected enrollment of 10 new students per year for a cumulative total of 40 students at four-year schools and 30 students at ACC. The budgeted funds were $75,000 per pilot per year of State of Colorado funds plus $25,000 per year from IN! for the two 4-year Pilots. The annual amount of funding ($100,000 for 4-year schools, $75,000 for community college) is not adequate for appropriate staffing of these programs. The experience of the first four semesters, with less than half of the originally projected number of students has demonstrated that each Pilot requires at least two full-time staff members to support the students and faculty, and consequently provide the person-centered planning necessary to each student's success. So, a bare minimum staffing is an academic advisor and a vocational advisor. In order to support the students in gaining confidence and independence in social skills and skills of daily living it would be best to have a third FTE. However, part of an FTE

could be made up of paid student mentors. Additional demands for time perhaps .25 to .50 FTE comes from the administrative work that needs to be done including the application for Certified Transition Program Status and development of a special certificate in lieu of a diploma.

Each of the Pilots has dealt with insufficient funding in different ways. UCCS delayed adding a vocational staff person until well into the fourth semester (Spring 2018). UCCS does receive special fee funding which families pay in lieu of tuition. Also, UCCS has some related program opportunities that they have leveraged to enhance their staffing.

UNCO received additional support from a foundation that supports special education at UNCO. In year 2, AY 17-18, UNCO had three full-time staff first semester and a fourth full-time staff member once the vocational staff member was added in the spring of 2018. UNCO also has paid student assistants and receives the special fee funds credited to their budget.

Arapahoe Community College. ACC only receives the state funding although they have requested funding from IN! to assist them in adding needed staff. ACC is trying to provide a program without charging their students a special fee which means that they did not receive any funds in addition to the state funding. Also, students at ACC today have been regularly matriculated in the program and as such are eligible for the same financial support as other students at ACC. The administration at ACC has been supportive of the program, but it is not clear how sustainable the program will be without continued state support. While many of the Elevate students could otherwise attend community college, they need more support than can be provided through the Disability Support Program at ACC.

The experiences of the first two years indicates that the original financial sustainability model is not workable for several reasons: 1) enrollment of the projected number of students is not feasible especially during initial program development; 2) the amount of funding ($100,000 or $75,000) is not adequate to support the required number of staff necessary to support the varied aspects of the program; 3) the special fees at UCCS and UNCO are currently at the maximum amount that families can manage especially given that the two four-year schools have not yet submitted for Certified Transition Program Status to the US Department of Education which would make students eligible for financial aid.

It is worth noting that nationally and at CSU, programs have had the benefit of a TPSID grant of approximately $500,000 per year for five years to develop and implement their model and become sustainable. While IN!'s proposal was developed and submitted in good faith, it may have been an overly ambitious plan to think that the amount of funding was adequate to staff programs initially and that the enrollment would be adequate for sustainability. The sustainability plan needs to be reviewed and revised in light of the experience of the first two years.

Given these factors it would be advisable for IN! and the Pilots to review the sustainability plan and revise it in accordance with the first two years of experience. It would be good if the enrollment could increase to be at least 10 students per IHE per year, but it will take more than four years to get to that point.

Recommendations for Year 3 Priority Work.
- Greater documentation of what worked, what didn't work.
- Have documentation, such as job descriptions to facilitate introduction of new personnel.
- Place priority on convening of their respective advisory committees with particular attention to develop champions in the community.
- Develop a priority skills checklist for attending higher education successfully to assist families in preparing their students for college. Even students living at home need to become more independent in their skills of daily living.
- Offer advanced Pilot students' opportunities to mentor incoming students.
- Provide instructional support for Pilot peer to peer mentoring.
- Start a directory of classes and faculty where Pilot students have participated and with what success.
- Place an increased emphasis on employment activities for all students including year 1 students. Implement a systematic Individual Placement and Support model for development of job and career interests.
- Develop an MOU with Division of Vocational Rehabilitation with the purpose of clarifying how the Pilot students and families and the Pilot programs and DVR can best work together so that students can

benefit from DVR expertise in the context of the Individual Placement and Support Model.

- Review and revise as necessary the fiscal sustainability model differentiating between community college and four-year institution models.

Summary.

The SB 16-196 Pilot programs have completed the first four semesters of development and have admitted their third cohort of students. Based upon that experience the programs have learned a number of things about how to develop and implement these programs. One of the major learnings has been how much effort is required to both develop program procedures and implement them at the same time. After taking on an ambitious number of new students in year 2, (26 new students), the Pilots scaled back new admissions in year 3 to 16 new students.

In the spring semester of year 2 (2018) each program added a staff member to focus on career pathways which resulted in increased capacity to support Pilot students in employment goals. Adding these personnel however also made it apparent how much development work is needed in employment in addition to individual student advisement.

The three Pilots have varied in how much they have successfully documented aspects of their policies and procedures with ACC having the most extensive documentation to date. All three Pilots need to place an emphasis on program documentation including documentation of the rationale for decisions going forward if the Pilots are to be replicable.

Stakeholders, including parents, students, faculty of academic courses and peer mentors with a few exceptions continue to be positive about their experience with the Pilots. However, it is not clear how well the questionnaire or interview approach serves to elicit productive feedback from stakeholder groups. Plans going forward will be to seek out more informative ways of soliciting feedback helpful to program improvement.

It has become apparent that the original program financial model does not allow for adequate staffing to fully support the Pilot students. It is

recommended that each Pilot be looked at individually before admitting year 4 students to determine the number of students who can reasonably be supported.

IN! staff have been documenting Pilot experiences through video. An example may be found at
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=anTRbp2zLuA&index=3&liszxt=PLVRtMHkHB2R0KFhiQH668BOTmiWHfz8f