

**Reauthorization Committee of Colorado Council of Deans of Education (CCODE)
November 23, 2009 minutes**

In attendance:

Jennie Whitcomb, Suzie Perry, Ian Macgillivray, Jami Goetz, Jeannette Cornier, Nella Bea Anderson, Debora Scheffel and Carole Basile.

Discussion:

1. CCODE agreed to include its members on one another's reauthorization site visits. Dr. Suzie Perry, Dean, School of Education and Counseling, Regis University will be on the reauthorization team for Fort Lewis College, January 27-29, 2010. Following established protocol, DHE will pay for Dr. Perry's travel to and from Durango, and Fort Lewis College will pay for Dr. Perry's expenses (hotel and meals) during the site visit. Dr. Perry will be a full member of the team and will assist in writing the final report. For more information on this protocol, visit <http://higher.ed.colorado.gov/Academics/TeacherEd/> and click on "Protocol and Code of Conduct for On-Site Review Team Members." This opportunity was extended DU and they declined.
2. Adams State College will be invited to participate on DU's site visit April 19-21, 2010.
3. Several members of CCODE will give a presentation titled, "Colorado's Higher Education Leadership in Teacher Preparation" to the CCE at its December 3, 2009 meeting at Community College of Aurora.
4. Update on Colorado's R2T proposal. It's currently being written and the writing team will decide in first week of December what to include in it. As far as we know, a draft will be made available for public comment.
5. Discussion of CDE's Program Content Review process began with pointing out the three different sets of "standards:"
 - A. Performance Based Standards for Colorado Teachers (1-8) (mix of pedagogy and content)
 - B. Colorado Model Content Standards (just content)
 - C. Teacher competencies as spelled out in the *Rules for the Administration of the Educator Licensing Act of 1991*. Available at http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdeboard/download/bdregs_301-37.pdf (mix of pedagogy and content)

Some of the confusion around preparing for the content review process and constructing the curriculum/map matrices that show alignment with "the standards," might come from not understanding which of the three sets of "standards" are being referred to. Although another member added that each time a teacher prep program goes through reauthorization, a different agency takes the lead on particular standards and each time the specificity of documentation varies. It was mentioned that this occurs "because the players never overlap." This raises the question: What process/policies?? can CDE and DHE put in place to help ensure consistency in the reauthorization process so that the reviews are "process driven" and not "people driven" and don't change radically with new people getting hired at CDE and DHE?

Post-baccalaureate Licensure Only Programs (not sure if this includes Master's licensure only programs too—Jeanette will have to confirm) : To review these programs, the reviewers at CDE use (1) the teacher competencies as spelled out in the *Rules* and (2) Performance Based

Standards for Colorado Teachers. Only the pedagogy courses are reviewed because candidates already have their content.

Undergraduate Initial Licensure Programs: To review these programs, the reviewers at CDE use (1) the teacher competencies as spelled out in the *Rules* and the (2) Performance Based Standards for Colorado Teachers to review the pedagogy courses. They also use (1) the teacher competencies, (2) the Performance Based Standards for Colorado Teachers AND (3) the Colorado Model content standards to review syllabi of both pedagogy and content courses for content.

Summary of Options/Agreements Coming Out of This Discussion:

Option A: Use CDE's new website tools and give feedback on the process and suggestions for improvement. Goal is for current content review process to be timely and transparent.

Option B: When revised Model Content Standards are adopted, reconvene this committee and content faculty from IHE's to make recommendations to CDE on how to revise content review process. Include CDE content specialists in this discussion.

Option C: Are there more efficient and effective ways to look at content without making a more burdensome process with unintended consequences? One idea was to use Teacher Work Samples and Praxis II/PLACE scores and Teacher Identifier data to gauge student outcomes rather than using inputs (syllabi). State law says CDE must do a content review but does not explicitly detail what the content review should consist of. At some point we can work with Eduventures to find out what other states are doing.

Conclusion: The Reauthorization Committee decided to go with Option A above for now. The rationales were (a) if we tinker too much the current process or try to come up with a whole new process we might end up creating more work for IHE's and there could be unintended consequences, (b) the Model Content Standards are currently being revised so it might be good to wait and see how that affects teacher preparation programs before we propose any big changes, and (c) CDE is working on making the current process more timely and transparent so let's wait and see what happens for now.

Action Items:

1. Jeanette Cornier will confirm or not if the review of Post-baccalaureate Licensure Only Programs described above includes Master's licensure only programs too.
2. Jami Goetz will send a link to CDE's website for Program Content Review information. Link is: http://www.cde.state.co.us/edprepprogram/epp_index.htm
3. Jami Goetz, Jeanette Cornier and Ian Macgillivray will meet December 9 to discuss revisions to program content review process and assistance offered to those IHE's with one or more failed content reviews.
4. Put on next agenda: What process/policies?? can CDE and DHE put in place to help ensure consistency in the reauthorization process so that the reviews are "process driven" and not "people driven" and don't change radically with new people getting hired at CDE and DHE?

Tabled for next time:

1. New IR Template questions/concerns (will new NCATE IR templates affect ours?)

2. Update on meetings with private programs to bring initial program approval in line with that of publics.
3. ELED and ECE statewide articulation agreements.
4. TEAC & NCATE Colorado partnerships.

Next meeting:

To be determined at next CCODE meeting on December 3.