

**Reauthorization Committee of Colorado Council of Deans of Education (CCODE)  
March 12, 2009 minutes**

**In attendance:**

Jennie Whitcomb, Sara Dallman, Suzie Perry, Carolyn Edwards, Wanda Blanchett, Ian K. Macgillivray, Jami Goetz, Ken Turner, Jeanette Cornier.

**Discussion:**

- 1) About half the teacher preparation programs in the state will seek or maintain NCATE accreditation and half will seek or maintain TEAC so this realignment of the state approval and national accreditation processes will benefit most IHEs. It's worth it.

Will seek or maintain NCATE	Will seek or maintain TEAC	No accreditation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNC</li> <li>• Mesa State</li> <li>• JIU</li> <li>• Adams State (currently TEAC)</li> <li>• UCCS</li> <li>• MSCD</li> <li>• UCD</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ft. Lewis College</li> <li>• CSU (currently NCATE but will switch in 2009)</li> <li>• Regis</li> <li>• Western</li> <li>• DU (possible)</li> <li>• CCU (possible)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CC (likely)</li> </ul>

- 2) At the last meeting it was asked "How many hours of field-based experience do other states require?" See Attachment A.
- 3) The question was asked, "Is the 800 hour requirement on the table as something that could change?" DHE's answer was, "Yes, but it would require a change in statute (not easy!). It would have to wait for the next legislative session." Some IHEs expressed the need for flexibility in these hours. For instance, if the IHE has a special program and can demonstrate a satisfactory clinical experience in less than 800 hours then perhaps they would be given permission for that program not to have to require 800 hours. Another IHE expressed the concern that it could be used as a "marketing tool," that is, that potential applicants might choose one IHE's program over another's because one requires fewer clinical hours. It was decided that this discussion should go to CCODE and was tabled.
- 4) TEAC – Colorado State Partnership proposed agreement (Attachment B) was discussed. The original proposal from TEAC put the responsibility for state site visits within the hands of TEAC. Changes made in red reversed that and made TEAC accreditation and state reapproval side-by-side processes, allowing TEAC to accept the state IR as part of the TEAC Inquiry Brief but not allowing for any of the Inquiry Brief to substitute for the state IR. The point was made that the document wouldn't change anything so is it really necessary? Another point made was to go back to the matrix Nella Bea put together to look for areas of overlap. Further discussion was tabled until the group gets a better sense of where NCATE fits into the larger picture of where this revision/realignment is going.
- 5) The point was made that the following three elements are more explicit in NCATE's IR and it would be good to put them in the state IR:
  - Diversity
  - Quality of faculty
  - Governance and Resources (budget and parity with other departments)

6) In the interest of moving from an inputs model to an outputs model, it was suggested the state focus on the following 4 common assessments, which would also work for NCATE reaccreditation:

- PLACE/Praxis II scores and pass rates—would demonstrate knowledge of content
- Distribution of grades in major content areas—would demonstrate knowledge of content
- Teacher Work Sample—would demonstrate ability to plan instruction and effect on student achievement
- Student teaching evaluations—would demonstrate ability to teach

The suggestion was to use these four outcomes as “sources of data/evidence” and work backwards to see how/where they fit into the currently required statutory performance measures. The idea of CDE moving to an outcomes model and using these four assessments was mentioned to Donna Gollnick at NCATE and she thought this might satisfy the SPAs.

7) The point was made that NCATE is moving to a streamlined reaccreditation review process (after initial accreditation) that would give greater flexibility for how institutions are reviewed. One option may be a more “traditional NCATE review” that would include streamlined reports on new or substantial changes and how the unit continues to meet NCATE standards OR a streamlined “Transformation Initiative” review where the unit picks one initiative for the review to focus on (similar to a TEAC claim) but the initiatives would have to be related to how the teacher preparation program is transforming the field of education in some way (e.g., through partnerships, retention/recruitment, professional development, induction/mentoring, a study of the validity of assessments being used and so on). This has not yet been approved by NCATE’s executive board. (It sounds that if the IHE chooses to go the transformation initiative route, the IR will be replaced with a new type of unit report so don’t know exactly what lies ahead. A proposal paper will soon be posted on the NCATE webpage that it will provide a few more details).

8) The point was made that the state could do the same thing. For initial reapproval site visits, the IR would be more extensive. For successive reapproval site visits, the IR would be streamlined. Ian passed out an example of what the guidelines for an initial IR might look like, given current statutory requirements. The question was raised if a streamlined IR could still meet statutory requirements. Ian believes it could but would probably need to be run through CCHE for approval. Changing the statutory requirements could be an option, too, but would be a major undertaking.

9) Better at this point to look for areas of alignment that already exist between state IR requirements and new streamlined NCATE IR online. If enough alignment can be found between those two, maybe we could go with NCATE’s IR in place of the state’s? The point was made that key issues around alignment are not just process (which we’ve been discussing) but the *content* of NCATE unit standards compared to the state Performance Indicators. Also, streamlining which sources of evidence (outcomes) are most convincing of program quality is a critical issue.

10) Ian raised the issue that streamlining the IR is only half the process. The other half is the CDE content review so should we bring Jo O’Brian into the discussion as she’s working on the current revision of model content standards? But then it was pointed out that when IHEs do the SPA reports they are aligning with the SPA standards for teachers (not the SPA-related K-12 standards) which are most directly aligned with the Performance-Based Standards for Colorado Teachers, not the Model Content Standards.

- 11) The big question we ended on was, "Will DHE/CDE accept an NCATE or TEAC report (in place of the current state IR) and how will DHE/CDE see Colorado statutory performance measures in those reports? This is a big question we'll need to keep in mind throughout this process.

**Action Items:**

- 1) Sarah: Put 800 hour discussion on CCODE agenda and send us details.
- 2) Sarah: Make sure Reauthorization Committee can use the same space directly after the CCODE meeting and let Ian know the location.
- 3) Ian, Carolyn, Jennie and anybody else who wants to help out: Look for areas of overlap between state's IR and NCATEs new streamlined online IR.
- 4) Ian and Jami: Attend TEAC Inquiry Brief writing workshop March 23-24 in Denver.
- 5) Ian: Attend NCATE Clinic, May 20-22, in Louisville, KY to become active member of Board of Examiners (BOE).

**Miscellaneous:**

- Previous meeting minutes and documents related to DHE/CDE teacher preparation program reviews (Carolyn's and Nella Bea's matrices) at <http://highered.colorado.gov/Academics/TeacherEd/>

**Next meeting:**

Tentative: Friday, April 24, 2009, directly following the CCODE meeting at Metro (will be held in the same location).

Attachment A

Other states' requirements for field-based experiences:

	2008	2008	2008	2008
	Minimum number of weeks required for student teaching	Minimum number of hours required for clinical experiences	Minimum number of Hours for Student Teaching (weeks x 30hrs)	APPROXIMATE Minimum Amount of Hours Totaled
Alabama	15	150	450	600
Alaska			0	0
Arizona			0	0
Arkansas	12		360	360
California	9		270	270
Colorado	13	400	390	790
Connecticut	10		300	300
Delaware			0	0
District of Columbia			0	0
Florida	10		300	300
Georgia	10		300	300
Hawaii			0	0
Idaho	6 semester hours*		90	90
Illinois			0	0
Indiana			0	0
Iowa	12	50	360	410
Kansas	12		360	360
Kentucky	12		360	360
Louisiana	9	180	270	450
Maine			0	0
Maryland	20		600	600
Massachusetts	150-300 hours*		150	150
Michigan	12		360	360
Minnesota	10		300	300
Mississippi	12		360	360
Missouri	8 semester hours*	2 semester hours*	120	150
Montana			0	0
Nebraska	14	100	420	520
Nevada	8 semester hours*		120	120

New Hampshire	15		450	450
New Jersey	15		450	450
New Mexico	14		420	420
New York	8	100	240	340
North Carolina	10		300	300
North Dakota	10		300	300
Ohio	12	100	360	460
Oklahoma	12	45	360	405
Oregon	15		450	450
Pennsylvania	12		360	360
Rhode Island			0	0
South Carolina	12	100	360	460
South Dakota	10		300	300
Tennessee	15		450	450
Texas	12		360	360
Utah			0	0
Vermont	12	60	360	420
Virginia	5	150	150	300
Washington			0	0
West Virginia	12	125	360	485
Wisconsin	18		540	540
Wyoming	8		240	240
U.S.		13	0	13

[1] Source: Education Week. A "week" is presumed to entail approximately 30 hours.

**DRAFT March 12, 2009**

AGREEMENT FOR CONDUCTING COLORADO EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAM  
APPROVAL and ACCREDITATION by the TEACHER EDUCATION ACCREDITATION  
COUNCIL

Colorado Department of Higher Education (~~CDHE~~)

~~Colorado Commission of Higher Education (CCHE)~~ Colorado Department of Education (CDE)

Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC)

As a means for ensuring that all institutions of higher education in Colorado offering Colorado Department of Higher Education and Colorado ~~Commission of Higher~~Department of Education approved professional educator preparation programs at the undergraduate, post-baccalaureate and/or graduate level(s) are meeting State standards and performance criteria, as set forth in their rules, (~~add citations of any appropriate laws and regulations here~~C.R.S. 22-60.5 and C.R.S. 23-1-121), programs must undergo an on-site review.

The on-site review for state approval will be conducted by ~~CDHE~~ and ~~CCHE~~ CDE and may be undertaken as a joint visit in collaboration with TEAC. For those programs that opt to seek TEAC accreditation, this agreement outlines the requirements of a joint review and audit leading to Colorado program approval and to TEAC accreditation. TEAC accreditation and state program reviews ~~will~~ may be conducted concurrently.

~~1. TEAC will serve as a mechanism that Colorado would rely on in its approval of the Colorado professional educator preparation programs for those programs that elect to affiliate with TEAC.~~

~~21.~~ TEAC would require that *Inquiry Briefs* or *Inquiry Brief Proposals* from Colorado teacher educator programs include evidence that adequately supports the program's claim that it meets the Performance-Based Standards for Colorado Teachers ~~teacher education standards~~ and statutory performance criteria (C.R.S. 23-1-121(2)). The following language was suggested here: "The IHE is free to add other claims to their Inquiry Brief" (3/12/09). The question was raised if this #1 (or the entire document) is really necessary? (3/12/09).

~~32.~~ The ~~CDHE~~ and ~~CCHE~~ CDE receive the *Inquiry Brief* and the parts of the *Audit Report* that pertained to the audit of the evidence for the program's meeting the Performance-Based Standards for Colorado Teachers~~standards~~ and statutory performance criteria.

43. TEAC audits will incorporate information from the institution's program endorsement areas leading to licensure; this includes, but is not limited to, teacher education, counselor education, administration and supervision, and other professional educator preparation programs options.

OR

4. All ~~other~~ educator preparation programs leading to initial ~~or advanced professional educator licensure offered by that institution, but not selected for TEAC accreditation review,~~ must seek approval from the ~~GDHE and GCHE-CDE~~ following state procedures.

5. Colorado institutions selecting TEAC will confirm the dates of each TEAC accreditation audit with the ~~GDHE and GCHE-CDE~~ before submitting dates to TEAC in order to facilitate scheduling of ~~GDHE and GCHE-CDE~~ staff for all accreditation audits. Continuing audits will be scheduled according to ~~TEAC's the state's~~ timetable for accreditation, with ~~TEAC the CDHE and GCHE~~ reserving the right to schedule a visit to a TEAC-accredited institution if it deems a visit necessary. Each institution will notify TEAC and ~~GDHE and GCHE-CDE~~ of the contact person for the review.

6. Institutions selecting TEAC will pursue program accreditation according to TEAC'S accreditation categories, guidelines, and terms.

7. Institutions will prepare a single *Inquiry Brief* or *Inquiry Brief Proposal* in the format specified by TEAC ~~and send a copy to the CDHE and GCHE.~~ The documents will include evidence that TEAC quality principles and standards for capacity have been met ~~as well as provide evidence that Colorado standards and performance criteria have been met.~~ The TEAC auditors will verify ~~the evidence used to support the program's claims that it has met the appropriate Colorado adopted standards and performance criteria in addition to verifying other~~ evidence that pertains to TEAC's quality principles and standards. The TEAC auditors will determine if the institution's *Inquiry Brief* or *Inquiry Brief Proposal* receives a clean, qualified, adverse, or disclaimer option based upon TEAC guidelines and submit an *Audit Report* to the institution ~~and the CDHE and GCHE.~~ The TEAC auditors' decision will be non-binding for state reapproval purposes and DHE and CDE reviewers will make their own separate assessment of each institution's proficiency, partial proficiency or non-proficiency in regards to Performance-Based Standards for Colorado Teachers and other performance criteria outlined in C.R.S. 23-1-121(2).

8. Annual reports to TEAC will be in the format prescribed by TEAC.

9. Institutions may choose to be reviewed by TEAC and CDE/DHE at the same time. TEAC auditors will make up the TEAC audit team and be appointed according to TEAC guidelines. DHE and CDE reviewers will make up the state reapproval team and be appointed according to DHE and CDE guidelines. One ~~CDHE~~ and ~~CCHE-CDE~~ representative ~~shall~~may serve as a point-of-contact to TEAC as well as an audit team member during the TEAC audit. Additional CDHE and CCHE-CDE representatives may be added to any TEAC audit team as observers and/or consultants. TEAC representatives may be added to any DHE/CDE team as observers and/or team members. In addition, the ~~CDHE~~ and ~~CCHE-CDE~~ representative may provide program and Colorado contextual information during the audit process. The TEAC auditors will verify the evidence used to support the claims made in the institution's Inquiry Brief. DHE/CDE representatives will verify the evidence used to support the claims made in the institution's Institutional Report. ~~CDHE~~ and ~~CCHE-CDE~~ representatives may attend the training of TEAC auditors and/or the training of the institution's staff, with no training expense charged to the ~~CDHE~~ and ~~CCHE-CDE~~. The ~~CDHE~~ and ~~CCHE-CDE~~ will be responsible for the travel expenses of its representative(s) for such training.

10. The institution shall cover all travel and maintenance expenses for the TEAC auditors according to TEAC guidelines, as well as those of DHE and CDE reviewers according to DHE and CDE guidelines. ~~The CDHE and CCHE will cover all travel and maintenance expenses for the CDHE and CCHE representative(s) and observer(s).~~

11. This partnership agreement shall be for an initial period of five years (April 1, 2009 through March 31, 2014) and may be modified by the ~~two~~three parties during that time, if deemed to be necessary. The intention of this agreement is to have an ongoing partnership with TEAC.

12. The terms of this agreement have been reached by mutual consent and have been read and understood by the persons whose signatures appear below. The parties agree to comply with the terms and conditions of the plan as set forth herein.

---

Frank B. Murray

Date

President, Teacher Education Accreditation Council

---

David E. Skaggs

Date

Executive Director

Colorado Department of Higher Education

---

Dwight Jones

Date

Commissioner

Colorado Department of Education