

CCHE Agenda  
May 3, 2001  
Colorado History Museum  
Denver, Colorado  
9:00 a.m.

I. Approval of Minutes (April 5, 2001)

II. Reports

A. Chair's Report - Nagel

B. Commissioners' Reports

C. Advisory Committee Reports

D. Public Comment

E.

Update on Core Curriculum Revisions by the Presidents of Colorado State University and the University of Northern Colorado - Foster

F. Higher Education Budget Update - Jacobs

III. Consent Items

A.

Revisions to Section IV, The Statewide Extended Campus to Reflect the New Policy for Reporting Full-Time Equivalent Student Enrollment - Breckel

B. CCHE-Capital Assets Policy Sections, Repeals, Revisions - Adkins

IV. Action Items

A. Teacher Education Authorization - Lindner/Samson

1. Metropolitan State College of Denver

2. University of Colorado at Boulder

3. University of Southern Colorado

B. Teacher Education Authorization of Private Colleges - Lindner/Samson

1. Colorado Christian University

2. Colorado College

3. Regis University

4. University of Denver

C. Teacher Education Grants - Samson

V. Items for Discussion and Possible Action

None

VI. Written Reports for Possible Discussion

A. Report on Out-of-State Instruction - Breckel

B. CCHE-Capital Assets Quarterly Report - Adkins

## COLORADO COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

April 5, 2001  
Community College of Denver  
Denver, Colorado

### MINUTES

#### Commissioners

Present: Raymond T. Baker; Terrance Farina; Marion S. Gottesfeld; David E. Greenberg; Robert A. Hessler; Peggy Lamm, Vice Chair; Ralph Nagel, Chair; Dean Quamme.

#### Advisory Committee

Present: Wayne Artis; John Buechner; Aaron Houston; and Larry Strutton.

#### Commission Staff

Present: Timothy E. Foster, Executive Director; Jeanne Adkins; JoAnn Evans; Jim Jacobs; Ray Kieft; Jeff Richardson; and Sharon Samson.

#### I. Call to Order

Chair Ralph Nagel called the regular meeting of the Colorado Commission on Higher Education to order at 9:35 a.m. in Room 342 of the Tivoli Student Union at the Community College of Denver in Denver, Colorado.

**Action:** Commissioner Greenberg moved approval of the minutes of the February 1, 2001, Commission meeting. Commissioner Hessler seconded the motion, and the motion carried unanimously.

## II. Reports

### A. Chair's Report

The Chair, Commissioner Ralph Nagel, reported that Commissioners James Stewart and Bill Vollbracht were excused absent. Chair Nagel had no further report.

### B. Commissioners' Reports

No reports.

### C. Advisory Committee Reports

Chair Nagel introduced two new Advisory Committee members, John C. Buechner and Larry D. Strutton.

### D. Public Comment

No comments.

## III. Consent Items

### A. Teacher Education Authorization: University of Colorado at Denver

Since the University of Colorado at Denver (UCD) offers only post-baccalaureate teacher education programs, the review differed slightly from the previous reviews of undergraduate teacher education programs. It examined the content knowledge of the program through its admission criteria. UCD's hallmark in teacher education is its rigorous field experience, supported by faculty and close involvement in its partner schools. It has strong professional knowledge, good counseling systems, and high performance on the PLACE examination. The weakness of UCD's program is that it has admission standards that do not provide conclusive evidence of mastery of content knowledge. The site review team and the CCHE staff recommended approval of UCD's teacher education program.

#### **Staff Recommendation:**

That the Commission approve the post-baccalaureate teacher education programs offered by the University of Colorado at Denver with the standard condition concerning admission to a post-baccalaureate program. Specifically, students admitted into UCD's post-baccalaureate program will need to pass a content exam prior to admission into the program and placement in the field. The ETS Academic Profile long form will be used until UCD identifies its content exam and CCHE approves the content test selection.

B. Policy Deletions

The Academic and Student Affairs staff annually reviews existing policies to improve the academic policies' effectiveness, minimize policy duplication, and reduce unnecessary bureaucracy for the state institutions. In the process of reviewing policies for web publication, the staff identified two policies for deletion. In both instances, other initiatives have supplanted the policy.

**Staff Recommendation:**

That the Commission delete its *Policy and General Procedures for the Development of Accountability Programs by State-Supported Institutions of Higher Education* and its *Advanced Placement Examination Reimbursement Policy*.

**Action:** Commissioner Greenberg moved approval of the staff recommendation for Consent Items A and B. Commissioner Hessler seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

IV. Action Items

A. Report on Low Demand Programs

In February 2001 the Commission notified governing boards to take action on several low performing degree programs by April 2001. The governing boards notified CCHS of the status of their low-demand programs. The Trustees discontinued ASC's Physics degree and placed WSC's Physics degree on its exempt list. Metro merged Spanish into Modern Languages, reducing their low demand program list to three exempt programs and African American Studies. In addition, two governing boards filed requests for an extension.

Dr. Samson reported that Metropolitan State College of Denver's (MSCD) African American Studies Program did not meet the exemption last year. Since the program may no longer be exempt, the institution and the governing board took action to discontinue the program. New information was provided and a community partnership has developed that may justify a three-year trial extension.

Dale Mingleton, Chair of The Trustees of the State Colleges, reported that the board told Metro that if the institution could garner community support, the Trustees would consider support. The community members came forward and convinced the governing board to support the program and commit additional funding. In addition the Metro student body rallied to support the program, created a banner and held a rally on campus.

In response to Commissioner Lamm's question about how to increase the low enrollment was low, Dr. Cheryl Norton, Vice President for Academic Affairs at MSCD, stated that the African American Studies Department identified links

between the major and the business community. The community interest will provide internship opportunities for students. An advisory board was established to identify skills that are necessary for effective employees. The program has grown from three students enrolled to fourteen and three graduates in the last five semesters.

Aaron Houston, representative of the Colorado Student Association, spoke on behalf of the students, and commended the Metro and the others for the work to continue the program.

**Staff Recommendation:**

That the Commission approve MSCD's request for a three-year extension for the African American Studies degree program with the understanding that: (1) Metro will provide the requested data before the April Commission meeting; and (2) the third year of the extension is contingent upon Metro's degree program demonstrating reasonable progress in enrolling and graduating a sufficient number of students.

**Action:** Commissioner Hessler moved approval of the staff recommendation. Commissioner Baker seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

Dr. Samson reported that in April 2000, the Regents of the University of Colorado filed an appeal for a one-year extension for University of Colorado at Boulder's Communication M.A. degree. They are requesting the extension because (1) the projections indicated that the Communication M.A. degree would graduate three students. (2) At the end of the one-year extension (April 2001), it would be possible to determine if sufficient interest exists to justify continuing the degree program at the masters' level. One student graduated in 2000. The institution stated that it would voluntarily discontinue the program if its graduation numbers did not justify student demand. In 1997 the institution was given three years to intervene, an additional year last year based belief that there were more students interested in graduating or prepared to graduate. However, they only graduated one student in the last fiscal year. Staff does not believe that data shows sufficient enrollment to meet the goal with a one-year extension.

Dr. Elizabeth Hoffman, President of the University of Colorado, stated that the University probably made a mistake by not requesting a three-year extension last year, as there has been a revamping of the program and ten new students enrolled, expecting to graduate in two years.

Dr. Phil DiStefano, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs at UCB, stated that prior to 1998, the Department of Communications admitted only Ph.D. students. In 1998, the department restructured the program as a two-year program designed to serve pre-doctoral students and those seeking an MA. Two students were admitted in 98-99, four in 99-00, and the first full class of ten were admitted in fall 2000. Applications for fall 2001 have more than doubled to 42 applications.

He supported an amended request for a two-year extension because ten students will graduate in spring 2002. If threshold is not met, the university will agree to close the program in June 2002. He said the job market is good for communication majors and there are 400 students in the undergraduate program and 30 students in the doctoral program.

In response to a question raised by the Commission Dr. DiStefano stated that the policy requires that low demand programs be closed or restructured. It took the department time to restructure and get the student population into the program because the program was a graduate program recruiting through advertising not from undergraduate pool. There are two undergraduate programs on the exemption list, Asian Studies and Italian. Graduate programs are not exempted.

The Commission supports vital programs, however, there was an agreement that three was a good number of exempted programs. Dr. DiStefano responded that of the original five undergraduate low demand degree programs, only two are operating below the benchmark. Graduate programs are not exempted, that is why UCD requested the extension.

Commissioner Baker was concerned that it is dangerous ground and that the problem will have rippling effects down the road. Other institutions will consider this a precedent.

President Hoffman appreciates the comments and reiterated the university's commitment to close the program if numbers are not met.

**Staff Recommendation:**

That the Commission deny the University of Colorado at Boulder's request for a second one-year extension for the M.A. degree in Communications.

**Action:** Commissioner Quamme moved to approve the request by the University of Colorado at Boulder for a two-year extension of the M.A. in Communication program with the automatic termination of the program should they not graduate five students in the next two years or three students in any year. Commissioner Farina seconded the motion. The motion carried with a vote of seven (7) in favor and one (1) opposed (Baker).

B. Proposed Changes to Capital Assets Policy Concerning Renovation of Facilities

Jeanne Adkins reported that the program plan review process outlined in the Commission's policies lends itself well to assessment of new capital construction. However, its relevance to renovation of – particularly extensive renovation and remodeling – existing facilities is less workable. Cost overruns are more likely for these projects than other types of capital projects. Policy changes result from a review of cost overruns after initial estimates have been made and projects have

been referred to the Capital Development Committee. The existing policy does not have an ability to address this. There is a need to see the evaluation of building, structural soundness, and receive accurate cost estimates to prevent cost overruns.

Ms. Adkins outlined the proposed policy changes and concerns received from the higher education community. The revisions are intended to save money and eliminate duplication of architecture and engineering costs. The concern of the CCHE staff and the Capital Development Committee is that the traditional program plan process lends itself well to new construction but not to the renovation project. The Commission needs to receive an evaluation of the building condition and good cost estimates.

The legal interpretation is that the legislative intent clearly requires an independent review, rather than by someone employed by the institution. The policy would require institutions to submit plans in June of 2002. However, the independent third-party reviews would go into effect immediately.

Ms. Adkins asked for Commission decision relative to the percentage of the renovation project before the Commission needed to be involved in the process, in two sections of 4.04 of the proposed policy. The Commission recommended that the percentage be left to the "discretionary decision" of the institution. If there is a difference of opinion, it will be brought before the Commission.

Ed Bowditch, Vice Chancellor for Administrative Affairs for CSU System, testified that the CSU system will make the policy work and appreciate the modifications to the policy.

**Staff Recommendation:**

That the Commission adopt the policy changes proposed in Capital Assets Policy Part E at its April 2001 meeting.

**Action:** Commissioner Farina moved to approve the proposed changes to the Capital Assets Policy Part E with the changes to pages 19 and 20, section 4.04. -- recommended that the percentage be left to the "discretionary decision" of the institution. If there is a difference of opinion, it will be brought before the Commission. Commissioner Quamme seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimous.

C. Revisions to Section III, Part D, Guidelines for Long-Range Facilities Master Planning

Ms. Adkins reported that the proposed revisions to the Long-Range Facilities Master Planning policy were discussed with the chief financial officers, and were presented to the Commission at the March meeting. The revisions include referencing the institutional academic planning with the facilities plans and

incorporating infrastructure and technology planning as well. Minor changes were made to the proposed revisions that were included in the March agenda. The distance learning objectives have been incorporated in the guidelines. The institution will make its distance learning assessments and relate those decisions to its facilities plan.

The Commission received written objections to the parking portion from Boulder City Council and Planning Office, and from the Fort Collins city planning department that recommend strengthening the requirements that institutions work with communities for more community review. Ms. Adkins pointed out that state institutions are not subject to municipal oversight. However, the Commission advises institutions to work with communities but it is not a requirement.

Gayle Schwartz, Regent of University of Colorado and former CCHE Commissioner, stated her appreciation the incorporation of the distance education portion of policy.

George Walker reported that MIT is opening its entire course system to internet distance learning. He would like to see later discussion as to the impact that has on Colorado.

**Staff Recommendation:**

That the Commission adopt the policy changes in Capital Assets Policy, Section III, Part D, as outlined in Attachment A.

**Action:** Commissioner Lamm moved to approve the staff recommendation. Commissioner Baker seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

D. University of Southern Colorado Master Plan Addendum Review

Ms. Adkins reported that in October 2000 the Commission reviewed the University of Southern Colorado (USC) Master Plan. Several issues concerning the sufficiency of the plan and its conformity to Colorado Commission on Higher Education guidelines were raised at that time. The Commission deferred approval of the USC plan, referring it back to the State Board of Agriculture for its review of the issues raised. Subsequently, USC submitted an addendum.

The revised master plan satisfies staff concerns as follows:

1. *USC re-evaluate its enrollment projections in light of the historic enrollment patterns for the institution in the first phase of the plan.*
2. *Incorporate the vision of the State Board of Agriculture for the institution within the master plan document and outline its relationship to CSU as the board envisions the partnerships outlined in the plan.*

3. *USC present an assessment of its technology plan and its impact on its facility plan.*
4. *USC re-evaluate its proposed administrative space needs and reassess the growth of its administrative resources in light of its inability to achieve expected enrollment growth.*
5. *Given historic performance USC should re-evaluate its graduate/undergraduate projections, its freshmen retention rates and retention projections and its enrollment projections in a 10-year window — not the 20-year window outlined in the two-phase plan — using academic year 99-00 as the base year.*
6. *That the institution provide “the next step” of the USC in Transition assessment, providing CCHE with its vision of how it might re-design its curriculum to meet the needs outlined in that intra-institutional assessment.*
7. *Other informational issues (included in a CCHE staff discussion with USC officials after the October 2000 Commission meeting): The partnership with the private sector as it relates to student housing should be described. Provide commentary about USC’s commitment to renovation as an alternative to new construction. Discuss classroom scheduling.*

In a related analysis referring to the strategic planning at USC, staff requested that upon completion, the institution incorporate the academic plan as part of its master plan. That will allow the academic direction of the institution to be incorporated in the facilities decision-making process. Distance learning has grown on this campus. However, it is the students already on the campus who are taking the distance learning classes, there is not a new market. This is in fact affecting their facility decisions and the utilization pattern will be reviewed. Also, approval for Master Plan should be a six-year approval, rather than a twenty-year overview.

Dr. Tito Guerrero, President of the University of Southern Colorado, spoke on behalf of the USC Master Plan Addendum. He expressed his appreciation to the Commission and supports the staff recommendation to improve the submission. The recommendation is one that makes sense for the institution. The institution plans to coordinate the strategic plan and technology planning with the facilities master plan. Ms. Valerie Borge and Robert Sachs were available to respond to any questions.

Valerie Borge, Vice President for Finance and Administration at USC, stated that the USC strategic planning committee has identified six strategic initiatives and they are developing goals for implementation to be complete in Summer 2001.

Dr. Guerrero stated that the institution had six years of declining enrollments and two years ago USC had a nine-percent increase in freshman enrollment. This past

fall they had a seven-percent increase. The institution is focused on student retention and drawing new students to the institution.

Commissioner Baker referred to the previous staff write-up on the master plan discussing the administrative staff growth. In its addendum submission, the institution attributes that growth to the increased student service administrative staffing. Ms. Adkins said the initial assessment was done using figures by State Board of Agriculture and the institution for a Joint Budget Committee footnote on the growth of administrative positions. The addendum, however, draws information from a variety of resources. The number is higher if the positions are considered Administrative Personnel. Lower number reflects the total of Student Services personnel, a subset, reported by USC.

**Staff Recommendation:**

That the Commission:

- Grant a six-year approval for the University of Southern Colorado Master Plan as amended by the Addendum submitted January 2001;
- That USC on completion of its strategic plan file an executive summary of the document as an addendum to the plan for future review of program plans submitted during the life-span of the facility planning document; and
- That USC's technology planning document incorporate its distance learning objectives and its infrastructure needs as it is updated as an addendum.

**Action:** Commissioner Baker moved to accept the staff recommendation to accept the six-year Master Plan. Commissioner Farina seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

E. Non-General Funded Buildings

Ms. Adkins reported that the Capital Development Committee has requested that the CCHE staff, the State Building Department staff, and the Office of State Planning and Budgeting address five issues on controlled maintenance support, and funding. That report was submitted to the Capital Development Committee (CDC) last month. CDC asked the Commission to weigh in on recommendation five and a preferred solution to that recommendation. The recommendation asks for annual controlled maintenance building assessments that detail the condition of the facility be completed on non-general funded buildings. This would include auxiliary funded buildings and buildings that are operated as cash-funded buildings. This is not significant on most campuses, however, at research institutions there is a large amount of square footage in these categories. Some community colleges have large auxiliary facilities such as dorms. The CDC would like to know if the Commission wants to weigh in on changing the statute that says that an assessment should be done by the State Buildings Division on

these facilities or an alternative. An alternative is a Memorandum of Understanding between the State Buildings Division and CCHE to cooperatively work on this issue and use the Buildings Division process, rather than changing the statute.

**Action:** Commissioner Nagel moved that there be a Memorandum of Understanding between CCHE and the State Building Division to handle the non-general (auxiliary and cash) funded facilities controlled maintenance report. Commissioner Quamme seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

V. Items for Discussion and Possible Action

A. None

VI. Written Reports for Possible Discussion

A. Degree Program Name Change: University of Colorado at Denver and Metropolitan State College of Denver

The Commission accepted the degree program name change as approved by the Executive Director as follows:

1. Institution: **Metropolitan State College of Denver**
- Current Program Names: Spanish (BA), French (BA), German (BA)
- New Program Name: **Modern Languages (BA)**
- Approved by: The Trustees for the State Colleges of Colorado (March 16, 2001)**
- Rationale: To positively impact low demand programs.

Scope of Proposed Change:

The merging the three-degree programs has improved the quality of the foreign language offering. The three tracks require students to take four core courses, four courses of advanced French, German, or Spanish, five literature and culture courses, and a senior experience. The redesign occurred concurrently with the redesign of teacher education. In summary, the proposed name change/merger will have a positive impact on Modern Language students by allowing them to

complete the degree program in 120 credits and potentially increase the enrollment level.

2. Institution: **University of Colorado at Denver**
- Current Program Name: Administration, Supervision, and Curriculum Development (MA) (Ed.S)
- New Program Name: **Administrative Leadership and Educational Policy Studies** (MA) (Ed.S)
- Approved by:** **The University of Colorado Board of Regents (March 16, 2001)**
- Rationale: To address a trademark infringement complaint.
- Scope of Proposed Change:
- No change in program graduation requirements, course offerings, or course content. Therefore, proposed name change has no impact on currently enrolled or future students.

B. Concept Paper:

1. Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) In Neuroscience at the University of Colorado at Boulder

The Commission accepted the concept paper for a Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D) in Neuroscience at the University of Colorado at Boulder.

Dr. Barbara Bowmann, Vice President for Academic Affairs at the Community College of Denver, on behalf of the President, Dr. Christine Johnson, welcomed the Commission to the campus. She presented an overview of the campus and gave the Commissioners a gift from the institution.

**Action:** Commissioner Greenberg moved to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Hessler seconded the motion and the meeting adjourned at 11:50 a.m.

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE)  
May 3, 2001  
Agenda Item II, A

**TOPIC: CHAIR'S REPORT**

**PREPARED BY: RALPH NAGEL**

This item will be a regular monthly discussion of items that he feels will be of interest to the Commission.

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE)  
May 3, 2001  
Agenda Item II, B

**TOPIC: COMMISSIONERS' REPORT**

**PREPARED BY: COMMISSIONERS**

This item provides an opportunity for Commissioners to report on their activities of the past month.

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE)

May 3, 2001

Agenda Item II, C

**TOPIC:                   ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORTS**

**PREPARED BY:       ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

This item provides an opportunity for Commission Advisory Committee members to report on items of interest to the Commission.

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE)  
May 3, 2001  
Agenda Item II, D

**TOPIC: PUBLIC COMMENT**

**PREPARED BY: TIM FOSTER**

This item provides an opportunity for public comment on any item unrelated to the meeting agenda. A sign-up sheet is provided on the day of the meeting for all persons wishing to address the Commission on issues not on the agenda. Speakers are called in the order in which they sign up. Each participant begins by stating his/her name, address and organization. Participants are asked to keep their comments brief and not repeat what others have said.

**TOPIC: UPDATE ON CORE CURRICULUM REVISIONS BY THE  
PRESIDENT OF COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY AND  
THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN COLORADO**

**PREPARED BY: TIM FOSTER**

Dr. Al Yates, President of Colorado State University, and Hank Brown, President of the University of Northern Colorado, will update the Commission on the core curriculum revisions made by their respective institutions.

**TOPIC: HIGHER EDUCATION BUDGET UPDATE**

**PREPARED BY: JAMES JACOBS**

**I. SUMMARY**

This item will provide an opportunity for CCHE staff to update the Commission on the current state of the higher education budget.

**TOPIC: REVISIONS TO SECTION IV, THE STATEWIDE EXTENDED CAMPUS TO REFLECT THE NEW POLICY FOR REPORTING FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENT ENROLLMENT**

**PREPARED BY: ANDREW BRECKEL III**

- I. **SUMMARY** On March 1, 2001 the Colorado Commission on higher Education approved the new **Policy for Reporting Full-time Equivalent Student Enrollment**. This policy goes into effect on July 1, 2001. As a result of the adoption of this policy there are some minor changes required in **Section IV, Part B, 6.05.05** (Attachment A), **B** of **The Statewide Extended Campus Policies**. These changes will reflect the content and intent of the new FTE policy.
  
- II. **BACKGROUND** The new FTE policy applies to all state supported institutions of higher education. All institutions are obligated to conform to the policies set by the commission within the authorities delegated to it. (C.R.S. 23-1-102(2). Furthermore, the Commission has authority delegated to it under C.R.S. 23-1-109 to oversee off-campus instruction. These policy changes will align The FTE policy and The Statewide Extended Campus Policy.
  
- III. **STAFF ANALYSIS** The staff has reviewed the recommended changes in The Statewide Extended Campus Policy and finds that those changes align that policy with the new FTE policy adopted by the Commission on March 1, 2001
  
- IV. **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**  
  
**That the Commission approve the changes to The Statewide Extended Campus Policy, Section IV, Part B, 6.05, B of the compilation of Commission policies and implemented on July 1, 2001.**

## Section IV

### Part B General Policies

#### 1.00 INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

##### **1.01 Designated Administrative Unit and Administrative Officer**

To assure both internal coordination and coordination among the various programs offered off-campus and at cooperating institutions throughout the state, each institution/campus shall designate the administrative unit and administrative officer to hold responsibility for the delivery and coordination of programs delivered off the sponsoring institution's campus or delivered by another institution on its campus.

The planning, management, and coordination of the institution's cash-funded Extended Studies Program shall be a primary responsibility of one designated administrative officer who also may hold these responsibilities for the institution's Off-Campus State-Funded Programs. The institution/campus or governing board may designate either the same administrative officer or another institutional officer to hold those responsibilities in connection with Off-Campus State-Funded Programs. The designated officer(s) (not more than two at each institution) shall serve as the liaison officer(s) to the Commission regarding these programs.

The designated administrative unit(s) and administrative officer(s) shall have the responsibility for the logistics of delivery, off-campus site selection and management, and the marketing of any program delivered away from the sponsoring institution's campus, offered outside the institution's traditional resident instruction program, or delivered by another institution to the campus. They also shall be responsible for other administrative functions, such as the payment of faculty travel and compensation, and the arrangement for books and other educational materials to be available on-site.

If the designated officer for the cash-funded Extended Studies Program is also designated to administer and coordinate Off-Campus State-Funded Programs delivered to the campus or by the institution to another campus, the institution shall equitably compensate that administrative unit from funds for Off-Campus State-Funded Programs.

No off-campus instruction shall be initiated or conducted by any institution/campus that has not been coordinated through the designated institutional officer(s) and the Commission. Nor shall any off-campus program be offered in association with professional societies, research organizations, institutes, alumni organizations, etc., independently of the designated

administrative unit(s) and officer(s). The institutions participating in The Statewide Extended Campus shall ensure that all off-campus instruction is coordinated through their designated office(s) and administrative officer(s).

## **1.02 Advertising Policies**

No advertisement, publication, announcement, or other public notification shall be released by any official or agency concerning any Statewide Extended Campus program, course of instruction, policy, or procedure of any institution of higher education except by authorization of the president or the designated institutional officer who is assigned the responsibility for Commission liaison and for coordination of programs in The Statewide Extended Campus.

## **1.03 Instruction Excluded from The Statewide Extended Campus**

The following types of programs and courses may be offered as part of an institution's Resident Instruction program.

- 1.03.01 Internships, cooperative education experiences, and student teaching;
- 1.03.02 Study-abroad programs which are administered on-campus and offered primarily for, and actually enroll, regularly-enrolled degree-seeking students of the sponsoring institution;
- 1.03.03 Class excursions of a temporary nature which are provided to supplement the institution's regular curriculum and are offered solely for the benefit of regularly-enrolled degree-seeking students of the sponsoring institution;
- 1.03.04 Credit courses which are part of the regular curriculum which cannot be taught without specific equipment available only at an off-campus site or which require field experience. (The availability of special equipment at convenient off-campus locations does not justify an off-campus class when the special equipment is available on-campus.)

Approval for instruction off-campus that falls into definitions of either parts 1.03.03 or 1.03.04, above, shall be requested from the Colorado Commission on Higher Education in advance of the advertisement of or publication of the availability of the instruction.

Such courses shall not be advertised to off-campus clientele, but shall be regarded as part of the regular on-campus program for regularly-enrolled, degree-seeking students. Institutions should request approval from the Commission in writing and should supply all necessary details about the course and include a justification for the off-campus setting.

## **2.00 REPORTING AND ACCOUNTABILITY**

### **2.01 Reporting on Extended Studies Programs**

#### 2.01.01 Mid-Year Report

A mid-year report shall be submitted to the Commission by each institutional Extended Studies unit on or before January 1 which gives total data for the summer and fall terms as follows:

- A. Number of Credit Courses Run;
- B. Number of Non-Credit Courses Run;
- C. Number of Credit Course Enrollments;
- D. Number of Non-Credit Course Enrollments.

#### 2.01.02 End-of-Year Report

- A. The B-2 Report
- G Each institutional Extended Studies unit shall submit a B-2 report of instruction and administrative data in the prior year. The report is to be submitted in accordance with the instructions in Appendix C. The report should be submitted on or before September 15. A cover memorandum should accompany the report verifying the data submitted and signed by the Extended Studies program officer and the institution's chief academic officer.

All instruction sponsored by the institutions' Extended Campus administrative unit shall be included in the B-2 report.

#### B. Instruction Using Telecommunications Technology

Extended Studies instruction offered for credit, both cash-funded and state-supported, that is delivered through telecommunications technology is to be reported in the "Telecommunications" program type category in the B-2 report. Other, supplementary learning activities, such as reading, preparation of papers, and written final examinations may be required, but if class attendance is required in addition to a televised component, the class attendance must be less than the standard 50-minute class per week per credit hour.

Instruction to be reported in this category includes the following:

- I. Televised Courses Offered for Credit -- all Extended Studies courses in which there is a televised component for students to view regularly throughout the duration of the course. The student may view instruction on videotape, videodisc, or distributed via telephone lines, cable, satellite, broadcast television, or any other method.
- ii. All Credit Courses Primarily Based on One of the Following Delivery Technologies: computer, telephone, radio, videotape, and audio tape.

Independent study (correspondence) courses that enable students to study at their own pace with materials sent to their homes should be reported as "Independent Study" and not in the "Telecommunications" category if audio or video tapes are the only supplemental learning materials. Except for the FTE Reporting Policies governing alternative delivered instruction, any course that is delivered to a single individual, even if telecommunications media are used for the delivery, should be reported as "Independent Study." Only completed courses are to be reported, not Independent Study courses for which students have enrolled.

Courses that have regularly scheduled classes meeting for the standard 50-minute class per week per credit hour, both cash- and state-funded, should be reported in one of the other categories ("Non-Credit," "Contract," "Space Available," or "Open Classes") and not be reported as "Telecommunications" even if there is a component of the course delivered via one of the telecommunications technologies.

#### C. Reporting Financial Data

Financial data shall be reported on the Year-End Extended Studies Program Financial Report found as Appendix F. The signatures of the institution's chief fiscal officer and Extended Studies Program director should be affixed. These reports are due on or before September 15.

No subsidy shall be paid until a satisfactory year-end financial report has been received by the Commission.

#### 2.01.03 Failure to Submit Timely and Correct Reports

Failure to submit reports as prescribed in this policy will result in notification of the institution's chief executive officer and a request for that officer's explanation for the

non-compliance. Commission approval of institutions' Extended Studies Program Plans/Budgets is contingent upon compliance with Commission policies.

2.01.04 Certification of Compliance with Extended Studies Program Policy

The designated Extended Studies Program officer at each institution/campus shall submit, by April 1, a signed Policy Compliance Form which verifies that Extended Studies Program policies have been followed. (A form is included as Appendix D.)

**2.02 Reporting on Off-Campus State-Funded Programs**

Off-Campus State-Funded Programs, as Resident Instruction programs, shall be reported like all other FTE-generating programs. An annual report on Off-Campus State-Funded Programs also is required. See Section D., 3.06 and Appendix I.

**2.03 Audits**

Institutional components of The Statewide Extended Campus are subject to both performance and financial audits annually, either as part of the regular institutional audit or a special audit conducted by the State Auditor or requested by the Commission.

**3.00 TUITION AND FEES**

**3.01 Tuition and Fees in the Colorado Statewide Extended Studies Program**

3.01.01 Tuition for Credit and Non-Credit Courses and Courses Offering Continuing Education Units (CEU)

Tuition for credit, non-credit and CEU courses shall be set at levels which ensure that at least full instructional and administrative costs associated with the courses are recovered.

3.01.02 Tuition for Non-Credit Courses and Courses Offering Continuing Education Units (CEU)

Tuition for non-credit and CEU courses shall be set at levels which ensure that at least full instructional and administrative costs associated with the courses are recovered.

3.01.03 Contract Rates and Contract Stipulations

A. Rates

For instruction in which a school district or other agency or organization contracts with a sponsoring Extended Studies Program institution for services only, the charges to the district or other agency shall be at a level sufficient to insure full recovery of direct and indirect costs.

In contracted instruction where credit is available, the following minimum fee schedule is in effect.

For Each Student Enrollment:

<u>One Semester Credit</u>	<u>Each Additional Credit</u>
\$35.00	\$25.00

#### B. Contract Stipulations

Contracting provisions and contract rates may be offered by the Extended Studies unit only to agencies and organizations. Extended Studies units shall not extend contracting provisions or rates to individuals, including regular faculty members, for the delivery of instruction to third party groups or organizations. Extended Studies units may offer an employment contract to an individual, including a member of the regular faculty, to teach one or more classes as part of the institution's Extended Studies program.

In contracting with another agency, institutions shall stipulate in the contract document that the contracting agency:

- i.. Shall assume all costs associated with the contracted instruction and shall provide all services associated with the instruction (e.g., teaching, registration). The higher education institution/campus shall only be responsible for assuring course content, awarding credit, and providing a transcript to the student.
- ii. Shall not for any reason establish a tuition rate above that established by the contracting Extended Studies Program officer.
- iii. May allow an instructor to assess an additional fee for contracted instruction (above the tuition and fees charged by the institution), but the amount of the additional fee shall be approved by the institution's Extended Studies Program officer.
- iv. Shall not advertise contracted courses to the public.

v. Shall agree to the responsibilities for quality control detailed in Part B, 6.04.05.

The institution's designated Extended Studies director or the director's designated contracts officer (in addition to the institution's chief executive officer or his designee) are the only institutional officials authorized to sign contracts with external agencies. Contracts shall only be with an agency external to and not associated with the institution/campus unless express approval has been granted by the Commission's Extended Campus Director. The sponsoring institution/campus may request a financial statement from the contracting agency upon completion of a contracted course. Degree or certificate programs shall not be contracted.

#### 3.01.04 Tuition for State-Funded Instruction Offered Through the Extended Studies Program

Tuition for alternative delivered instruction that meets the criteria for state funding in the Commission's FTE Reporting Policies should be the same as the resident and non-resident tuition charged to regular on-campus students unless the institution's governing board has expressly established a different tuition rate.

#### 3.01.05 Liability

Extended Studies Programs, their sponsoring institutions, and the Commission are not liable for theft, property damage, loss of equipment or materials, or for personal injury sustained in facilities provided for instructional purposes. No liability is implied by any Extended Studies Program agent by contracting for use of facilities and equipment. Clauses in facilities use contracts that state or imply liability should be deleted before signing.

### **3.02 Fees in Off-Campus State-Funded Programs and Extended Studies Programs**

Fees for resources supplementing the instructional program may be charged and fees for student services from which off-campus students actually can benefit may be charged. Fees specifically for facilities or services available only on-campus shall not be charged to off-campus students, but fees directed to a higher education institution for costs associated with that role are permissible when such fees are included in the agreement developed between the host institution and the institution delivering the instruction.

## **4.00 STUDENT QUALIFICATIONS AND SERVICES TO STUDENTS**

### **4.01 Student Admission to Degree and Certificate Programs Off-Campus**

Persons who wish to enroll in a degree or certificate program offered either through the Extended Studies Program or the Off-Campus State-Funded Program shall meet exactly the same institutional requirements for admission that are applied to students enrolling on-campus.

## **4.02 Admission to Off-Campus Courses**

Students who have not been formally admitted to an institution and who wish to enroll in any off-campus course not offered as part of a complete off-campus degree program may enroll through the Extended Studies Program. The sponsoring institution/campus may implement policies regarding enrollment of non-matriculated off-campus students.

Students enrolling for courses through the Extended Studies Program, upon deciding to complete a degree, apply for admission, and, if accepted, are matriculated and become degree candidates. When they apply for admission they shall meet exactly the same admission standards as are applied to students enrolling on-campus who have previously completed the same number of credits. (A non-matriculated student with credits earned through the Extended Studies Program could be formally admitted to the institution, depending upon the number of credits actually earned, either as a new freshman student or as a transfer student.)

A student who has been formally admitted to the institution may enroll in courses through the Extended Studies Program and apply the credits toward a degree, but should be advised to consult with the institution to ensure that the credits earned would fulfill degree requirements.

## **5.00 FACULTY STANDARDS**

### **5.01 Instructor Qualifications**

Instructors teaching in either component in The Statewide Extended Campus, if not members of the resident faculty of the sponsoring institution, shall have qualifications equivalent to those required of regular, on-campus faculty appointed to teach the same courses in the resident program. Instructors teaching in either program component are subject to the same approval and evaluation processes required of resident faculty.

### **5.02 Evaluation of Faculty**

Provision shall be made by the institution sponsoring instruction in the Extended Studies Program or in the Off-Campus State-Funded Program for student evaluation of both faculty and course content. A summary of student evaluation procedures used in the Extended Studies Program is to be submitted annually, as part of the policy compliance survey, by April 1.

### **5.03 Faculty Policies in the Extended Studies Program**

#### **5.03.01 One-Class Limit**

An otherwise fully-employed instructor normally shall teach no more than one class or the equivalent of one class per term in any off-campus program unless this limit has been expressly modified by the chief academic officer or appropriate school or college dean of the institution/campus in which he is regularly employed.

#### **5.03.02 Dean's Approval**

As a condition of teaching in an off-campus program, full-time resident faculty and adjunct faculty shall have prior approval of the appropriate academic dean acting in conjunction with the designated Extended Studies Program officer.

#### **5.03.03 Faculty Responsibility**

Any individual who agrees to teach an Extended Studies Program class and becomes the "instructor of record" must actually serve as the primary instructor. Substitute teachers may not be assigned except in cases of emergency. This policy does not preclude the use of outside resource personnel as long as they are used only to supplement instruction.

#### **5.03.04 Faculty as Independent Contractors**

Institutions' Extended Studies administrative units may contract with members of the regular institutional faculty as independent contractors, but they must ensure that the following criteria are met: (A) the contracted faculty member must retain control over the methods used to obtain the contracted-for result; (B) the contract must state that the results to be obtained include a description of course content to be covered; and (C) the contract must state that the results to be obtained include the academic standards or achievements to be accomplished. The methods of achieving the results must then be left to the contracted faculty member.

### **6.00 PROGRAM AND COURSE APPROVAL: QUALITY CONTROL**

#### **6.01 Responsibility for Academic Standards**

In both program components, the Extended Studies Program and the Off-Campus State-Funded Program, responsibility for (A) course content, (B) course requirements, (C) outcomes, (D) assessments, and (E) evaluation rests with the appropriate academic unit (school, college, or department). Such requirements and standards shall be comparable to those for on-campus instruction.

Degree programs delivered off-campus shall only be those approved for offering on-campus by the sponsoring institution/campus and shall be composed of the same curriculum and shall have comparable academic requirements as the on-campus program.

#### **6.02 Approval of Off-Campus State-Funded Programs**

Off-Campus State-Funded Programs shall be developed in compliance with the Commission's policies in Section IV, Part D.

#### **6.03 Approval of Major Degree Components or Degree Programs Offered Through The Extended Studies Program**

A degree or certification program or significant component of a degree program which is to be offered at an off-campus location in Colorado shall be offered, cash-funded, through the Colorado Statewide Extended Studies Program unless the program has been approved as an Off-Campus State-Funded Program.

The Commission staff, with consideration given to outside reviews and the Extended Studies Advisory Committee's recommendation, will approve or disapprove a degree program proposed for offering through the Extended Studies Program. Program proposals, prepared in accordance with the format and procedures included in Appendix E, should be submitted well in advance of the planned delivery date to accommodate the review process. Students should not be admitted to the program nor should it be advertised until it has received approval. An approved program shall be subject to all policies and procedures of the Extended Studies Program.

A degree or certification program or major component of a degree program offered through the Extended Studies Program shall be a program that has been approved for the institution/campus to offer, shall have been offered previously on-campus, and shall have been demonstrated to be a viable on-campus program. In addition, new programs delivered off-campus through the Extended Studies Program should have a plan to employ or to develop telecommunications technology in the delivery of instruction and/or for student-faculty interaction. Off-campus degree programs or major components of degree programs shall be administered and coordinated by the Extended Studies administrative office and designated institutional administrative officer and shall not be contracted to any other agency.

#### **6.04 Review of Institutional Extended Studies Programs by Other Extended Studies Administrators**

The Commission's Statewide Extended Campus director may establish a team of Extended Studies professionals to examine any institution's Extended Studies program on behalf of the system, and to report its findings to the Commission. Copies of the report also shall be made available to the institution's chief executive officer and to the institution's Extended Studies officer. Such a review will be held when negative circumstances or questions exist about the program or when a review could positively affect the quality or strength of the program. Costs associated with the review will be borne by the Extended Studies Program.

## **6.05 Policies and Standards for Instruction Specific to The Extended Studies Program**

### 6.05.01 Applicability of Credits Toward Degrees

All credit courses offered through the Extended Studies Program shall be applicable toward a degree from the sponsoring institution/campus as elective or required subjects and shall be listed in the institution's general catalog. New courses in approved programs may be offered for credit off-campus when they have received formal approval by the appropriate faculty, institutional committees, and administrative officers. Courses offered off-campus shall only be those that are in a discipline or field approved, and at the level approved, by the Commission for offering by the sponsoring institution.

### 6.05.02 CEU Standards

When instruction is offered for Continuing Education Units (CEU) the criteria and guidelines for the offering of CEU as established by the International Association on Continuing Education and Training shall be followed.

### 6.05.03 Award of Certificates for Completion of Non-Credit Courses or Programs

Institutional Extended Studies units may award certificates of completion to students who complete non-credit courses. Certificates indicating accomplishment also may be awarded to students who complete an integrated program of non-credit courses.

### 6.05.04 Holding of Scheduled Classes

When instruction involves regularly scheduled classes, all classes shall be held, or, in the event of an emergency, make-up classes shall be held.

### 6.05.05 Quality Indicators for all Extended Studies Program Courses

#### A. Documents to be Prepared and Kept on File

For each Extended Studies Program class offered, the sponsoring institution's Extended Studies Program administrative unit shall ensure that the following documents are on file at the institution:

- A course syllabus approved by the appropriate academic unit (which should include a listing of all essential learning materials);
- Credentials of all instructors who are not members of the regular faculty;
- A detailed plan for student evaluation of all Extended Studies Program instructors;
- Copies of student evaluations for the preceding term; (evaluations may be turned over to academic units after one term has elapsed);
- Evaluation of adjunct instructors, performed by a member of the regular faculty or by an administrative officer of the institution/campus (which may be the designated Extended Studies Program officer) is desirable. Such evaluations should be performed during one of the first two terms in which the instructor teaches. The reports of these evaluations should be kept on file as long as the instructor continues to teach. Re-evaluation should be performed at a reasonable interval.

#### B. Contact Hour Requirements

Each class offered through the Extended Studies Program shall have the same number of minutes of contact per credit awarded as is required on-campus and comply with "Principle 3.02.02" of the Policy for Reporting Full-Time Equivalent Student Enrollment (Effective July 1, 2001) which states: *The policy recognizes the academic integrity of credit hours assignment, relying on institutions to determine the credit hour assignment based on student outcomes and national standards.* Variations in contact time may be desirable in certain non-traditional formats, but these should be specifically approved by the appropriate academic unit and should conform to Type B instruction as detailed in the Commission's FTE Reporting Policies.

~~• Lecture Classes. State policy stipulates that a minimum of 750 minutes, fifteen 50-minute lecture classes per semester, be held for one semester credit.~~

~~• Field Instruction. A minimum of 1875 minutes or 31 1/4 hours per semester credit.~~

~~• Laboratory. A minimum of 1500 minutes or thirty 50-minute classes per semester credit.~~

~~• Physical Education Activity Course. A minimum of 1500 minutes or thirty 50-minute classes per semester credit.~~

- ~~:- Private Instruction. A minimum of 375 minutes per semester credit.~~
- ~~:- Recitation, Discussion, Seminar. Same as lecture classes.~~
- ~~:- Studio Art. A minimum of 1500 minutes or thirty 50-minute classes per semester credit.~~
- ~~:- Studio Music. A minimum of 1875 minutes or 31 1/4 hours per semester credit.~~
- ~~:- Instructional Lab (individualized instruction using tapes, films, and other media without direct faculty supervision); Independent Study (a student project with minimal faculty direction); and Practicum (work-oriented instruction involving the implementation of classroom or laboratory experience under the direct supervision of a faculty member).~~

~~A minimum of 1500 minutes or thirty 50-minute classes per semester credit.~~

- ~~:- Educational Technology. A course utilizing educational technology for the delivery of instruction. These technologies may include but are not limited to: telecourses, self-paced instruction assisted by educational technologies, ITFS, microwave transmission, telephone lines, satellite transmission, facsimiles, video tapes (U.S. mail), electronic blackboard, and computer based or computer assisted instruction. The institution/campus must keep records to document its decision on how the number of credits to be awarded for these classes was determined.~~

#### 6.05.06 Off-Campus Credit Undifferentiated from Campus Credit

Credit shall be awarded and entered on the student record without distinction between on-campus and off-campus courses. Credits earned in off-campus courses shall be considered to be the same as those earned in on-campus courses for the purposes of meeting residency or other requirements in degree programs of the institution.

#### 6.05.07 Facilities and Resources for Off-Campus Instruction

The institution/campus sponsoring off-campus instruction is responsible for ensuring in every case that appropriate and adequate classroom, laboratory, and library facilities and resources are provided for the instruction prior to announcement of the availability of instruction. Colorado public educational institutions should provide facilities without charge for both on-campus and off-campus credit instruction offered through the Extended Studies Program.

**7.00 INTER-INSTITUTIONAL AGREEMENTS FOR USE OF PHYSICAL FACILITIES AND INSTITUTIONAL SERVICES**

Institutions planning to sponsor programs or classes, either Off-campus State-Funded Programs or Extended Studies classes or programs, in a facility of another Colorado public higher education institution shall use the Institutional Agreement for Use of Physical Facilities and Institutional Services form (included as Appendix J) when negotiating for the use of space, equipment, and the provision of services. Information shall be provided in the completed form that identifies the responsibilities of both sponsoring and host institution/campus and the estimated costs. It shall be signed by the appropriate officers of both institutions and forwarded to the Commission's Director of the Extended Campus Program. Agreements should be negotiated and the forms completed at least 30 days prior to the beginning of classes at the facility.

**TOPIC: CCHE-CAPITAL ASSETS POLICY SECTIONS REPEALS, REVISIONS**

**PREPARED BY: JEANNE ADKINS**

**I. SUMMARY**

The Commission Capital Assets Policies have been in place for more than two decades. In some cases, sections of the policy have not been updated since 1973. In other cases, the policy sections have been in place since 1987 and the reauthorization of the capital policies to reflect new legislative directives.

Staff has read and reviewed all existing policies for conformance with existing statutes, elimination of unnecessary processes and attempted to simplify the policies for ease of implementation and understanding.

**II. BACKGROUND AND STAFF ANALYSIS**

Generally, 23-1-106 C.R.S. establishes the framework for capital asset decision-making for the Commission. In the statute the Commission is charged with establishing the statewide higher education master plan, providing guidelines for space utilization, establishing procedures for program planning, establishing institutional facility and academic master plan guidelines, establishing a five-year rolling capital investment plan for higher education and outlining procedures for developing these plans and projects.

The Commission is also charged with review and approval of individual project requests, prioritization of capital projects, approval of acceptance of gifts and bequests of buildings and lands, authorization of leases and lease-purchases and oversight of bond issues proposed under the Higher Education Facilities Act.

To accommodate the procedures outlined in the capital asset statutes, CCHE staff have incorporated many procedures in policy. Many of these procedures no longer exist. Some have been supplanted by new procedures, others have been discontinued. However, policies were not always altered to reflect these changes in statute and/or process.

Staff undertook an assessment of all 17 sections of Capital Assets policies outlined in Section III of the CCHE Policies.

Several policies have been referred to the commission for amendment over the past year and a half including:

1. Part D – Guidelines for Long-Range Facilities Master Planning, approved as revised by the Commission in April 2001.

2. Part E – Guidelines for Facilities Program Planning, approved as revised by the Commission in June 1999; a 2000 revision incorporated the lease and lease-purchase changes to reflect statutory changes.
3. Part F – Space Utilization Guidelines, approved as revised by the Commission in June 1999.
4. Part Q – Policies for Self-Funded Capital Construction, approved as revised by the Commission in June 1999 to reflect statutory changes.

Staff has completed its review of the remaining sections and at this time proposes the revisions to Part A, B, C, H and L at this time. Staff also proposes the repeal of Part G, a general report to the Joint Budget Committee on enhancing space utilization and efficiency, much of which is incorporated in the Commission's space use guidelines and master plan guidelines. Also recommended for repeal is Part K, which is the annual budget instructions for Higher Education capital project submission. The budget instructions are revised annually by CCHE staff and the Office of State Planning and Budget. Retaining the instructions in policy is an unnecessary duplication. Budget instructions are annually transmitted to institutions and posted on CCHE's website for easy access. Incorporating them annually in policy is not necessary.

Changes in all but Part L are not substantive and reflect changes in statute, changes in practice and/or the simplification of the capital policies.

Changes in Part L reflect the Commission's changes in the statewide master plan to focus capital spending resources on improving existing facilities to make them more efficient, remedy health and life safety conditions and upgrade existing facility infrastructure, including technology. These changes also reflect a decision to use the CCHE/OSPB purpose codes as defined in the annual budget document rather than to redefine those project purposes in CCHE policy. The policy changes reflect Commission Capital Assets Subcommittee practice for the past three prioritization years and greatly simplify the prioritization.

As mentioned in April's policy discussion, staff intends to recommend the repeal of Part I at the point in time when a Memorandum of Understanding is negotiated with the State Buildings Division to accommodate an annual building assessment of non-state-funded facilities at colleges and universities. The current database incorporates building history and conditions of only state-funded buildings for higher education.

Staff will make statutory conforming changes to Part J, M and P following the legislative session. Several bills affecting deadlines and project thresholds are proposed to be changed that will affect those policy sections if adopted by the General Assembly.

Additional legal information on Part N – criteria for gifts of buildings and property – is needed before finalizing changes to conform to existing statute. That policy revision will be submitted to the Commission for review at a later date.

Upon submission of changes to those sections, the Commission will have reviewed and revised or repealed all 17 sections of the Capital Assets Policy and brought them up to date.

### **III. STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

**That the Commission approve the changes in Part A (Purpose/Introduction), Part B (Statewide Postsecondary Education Master Planning), Part C (Guidelines for Site Selection), Part H (Definitions/Abbreviations), Part L (Policies and Criteria for Capital Construction Priority Setting) and repeal of Parts G (Report to the Joint Budget Committee on Recommendations for Enhancing the Efficiency of Classroom Utilization) and K (Instruction Manual for Higher Education Facilities Program Planning and Budgeting), which, if adopted will necessitate re-lettering of the remaining policy sections.**

Attachments:

<a href="#">Attachment A:</a>	Part A – Purpose/Introduction
<a href="#">Attachment B:</a>	Part B – Statewide Postsecondary Education Master Planning
<a href="#">Attachment C:</a>	Part C – Guidelines for Campus Site Selection
<a href="#">Attachment D:</a>	Part H – Definitions/Abbreviations
<a href="#">Attachment E:</a>	Part L – Policies and Criteria for Capital Construction Program Priority Setting

## SECTION III

## PART A PURPOSE/INTRODUCTION

**1.00 Capital Assets Program**

## Description and Authorization/Relationship to other Programs

The Commission prescribes uniform procedures and standards of space utilization, determines whether projections of capital construction needs are consistent with statewide plans, and establishes a five-year capital improvements plan. The Commission reviews and approves facility master plans and program plans for conformity with the Colorado Statewide Master Plan for Postsecondary Education, approved institutional master plans, space utilization standards, and the requirements of other state executive agencies. Capital construction budget requests are reviewed for consistency with approved program plans, appropriate phasing, governing board priority, and timing of need. The Commission makes recommendations on priority for funding of capital construction projects. The Commission administers the distribution of capital outlay appropriations to the Commission, the Council on Arts and Humanities, and the Historical Society according to need-based formulas and equipment replacement schedules.

The Commission is charged with the review and approval of campus master plans and program plans for all higher education capital construction projects in 23-1-106 (3), (4), (5) C.R.S., and the approval of financing for capital construction financed by the Postsecondary Educational Facilities Authority in 23-15-107 (3), C.R.S. Capital construction budgeting and five-year capital improvements programming responsibilities are assigned in 23-1-106 (6), (7), C.R.S. Lease-purchase acquisition and lease utilization of real property are subject to Commission approval in 23-1-106 (8). Responsibility to allocate the centralized capital outlay appropriation is assigned by the Appropriations Bill. Higher Education capital assets programming is coordinated with the State Buildings Division, the Office of State Planning and Budgeting, and governing board staffs to ensure that higher education funding requests are consistent with state policies, plans, and priorities, and to ensure cost effectiveness in space allocations. Capital assets program planning is prerequisite to capital construction budget recommendations, UNLESS A PROGRAM PLAN WAIVER IS SUBMITTED AND APPROVED BY THE DIRECTOR OR DIRECTOR'S DESIGNEE.

SECTION III

PART B STATEWIDE POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION MASTER PLANNING MANUAL

**1.00 Preface**

The purpose of this statewide postsecondary education planning manual is to: (1) describe the higher education planning process pursuant to Colorado statutes; (2) provide the format and content of the statewide postsecondary education and institutional master plans; (3) provide a connecting structure between the statewide postsecondary education and institutional master plans; (4) develop the master planning process so that it is useful as a management tool; and (5) enhance interinstitutional communication through community-wide discussion of role and mission statements.

- Part I, The Statewide Postsecondary Education Master Plan; this section contains a description of the process and format for the revising and the updates of the statewide postsecondary master plan.
- Part II, The Institutional Master Plan; this section contains a description of the process and structure for developing and presenting institutional master plans to the Colorado Commission on Higher Education.
- Part III, The Appendices; this section contains specific statutory references on the purposes of the master planning process and the forms to be used for the statewide and institutional master plans.

The Statutory authority for the Commission on Higher Education to engage in master planning is set forth in Colorado statute:

23-1-108. Duties of the commission with respect to comprehensive planning, research, and statistics.

"(1)(a)... After consultation with the institutions and governing boards, develop and recommend to the governor and the general assembly statewide plans for higher education and maintain a comprehensive plan for public higher education in the state with due consideration of the needs of the state, the role of the individual public and private institutions in the state, and the ability of the state to support public higher education. Such plans shall include the establishment of priorities for initiation of major programs and new institutions; the determination of the roles of institutions and sectors of the higher education system, including institutions size for planning purposes; and the establishment of such relationships with private institutions of higher

education as may strengthen the total higher education resource of the state."

"(2) No later than February 1, 1978, the commission shall develop its statewide plan for higher education pursuant to paragraph (e) of subsection (1) of this section. The commission members shall appear and report annually to the appropriate standing committee of each house of the general assembly, at a regular or special meeting of such committee, concerning higher education and its recommendations concerning such programs. Such plans may be revised from time to time thereafter, and any such revisions shall be reported to the appropriate standing committee."

Pursuant to the statutory requirements of 23-1-107(1)(c), the Commission shall:

"Recommend to the respective governing boards . . . appropriate roles and functions as part of the overall system of higher education in the state. . . ."

Other statutes define how the master plan is to be used in the decision-making functions of the Commission. Those statutes are contained in Appendix A.

## **2.00 Statewide Postsecondary Education Master Plan**

### **2.01 The Statewide Master Planning Process**

#### **2.01.01 The Planning Period**

THE COMMISSION SHALL UPDATE THE PLAN AS APPROPRIATE TO REFLECT CHANGES AS DIRECTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, THE GOVERNOR'S INITIATIVES, COMMISSION INITIATIVES AND ANY ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS RECOMMENDED BY GOVERNING BOARDS. ~~The CCHE Master Plan submitted to the Colorado legislature in February, 1978, was for a five-year planning period, 1978-79 to 1982-83. A commitment was made in the 1978 CCHE master plan to provide to the Legislature and the higher education community an annual Implementation Report, a two-year update and a five-year revision of the plan.~~

AN ANNUAL UPDATE ON THE STATEWIDE MASTER PLAN SHALL BE PRESENTED BY THE DIRECTOR AND THE COMMISSION TO THE JOINT EDUCATION COMMITTEES OUTLINING ANY ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS. ~~The planning period has been changed to four years to streamline the process. The next planning period will be July 1, 1983, to June 30, 1987.~~

2.02.02 The Planning Process

The plan will be updated AS NEEDED TO REFLECT DIRECTIVES FROM THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND THE GOVERNOR'S INITIATIVES. ~~at the end of the second year of each planning period and revised at the end of the planning period (fourth year).~~ The Updated and revised plans will be submitted to the Colorado General Assembly and the Governor. ~~At the end of the first and third years of the planning period, Implementation Reports will be submitted to the Legislature.~~

TABLE I

STATEWIDE POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION MASTER PLAN UPDATE  
AND REVISION SCHEDULE

Planning Period	Update By	Revision By
July 1978-June 1983	June 1980	June 1983
July 1983-June 1987	June 1985	June 1987
July 1987-June 1991	June 1989	June 1991
July 1991-June 1995	June 1993	June 1995
July 1995-June 1999	June 1997	June 1999

A. Revision of the statewide postsecondary education master plan.

Revision of the statewide postsecondary education master plan is initiated by the Commission on Higher Education AS NEEDED TO REFLECT NEW LEGISLATIVE DIRECTIVES, THE GOVERNOR'S INITIATIVES, OR NEW COMMISSION INITIATIVES. ~~approximately twelve to fourteen months prior to the end of each four-year planning period.~~ To initiate the revision activity, the Commission staff WILL NOTIFY GOVERNING BOARDS OF ~~forwards to each governing board for its respective institutions, Form I, (Appendix B) and the role and mission statements and planning assumptions as contained in the current statewide postsecondary education master plan.~~ The governing boards will propose changes or notify Commission staff that no changes are requested.

The governing board's proposed changes and the currently approved role and mission statement and planning assumptions will be circulated within the education community. Commission staff will recommend a role and mission to the Commission based on the needs of the state and an analysis of the governing board recommendation and community comments. Commission approved role and mission statements and planning assumptions (~~Form I~~) will be part of the statewide postsecondary education master plan.

~~Parallel to the above activity, the Commission will prepare for an issues conference on postsecondary education. The issues conference will be a~~

~~one-day meeting held biennially. Leaders of the education, legislative, executive, business, labor, industrial, commercial, and agricultural communities will be brought together to identify and discuss postsecondary educational needs of the state of Colorado. Following the Issues Conference, the Commission staff will review and revise all sections of the statewide postsecondary education master plan.~~

B. Update of statewide postsecondary education master plan.

~~Updating of the statewide postsecondary education master plan is initiated by the Commission on Higher Education AS NECESSARY TO REFLECT LEGISLATIVE DIRECTION, THE GOVERNOR'S POLICY INITIATIVES, OR COMMISSION POLICY INITIATIVES. approximately eight to ten months prior to the end of the second year of the planning period. The update includes reviewing the revising all sections of the statewide postsecondary education master plan except the section on institutional role and mission statements. Only under extenuating circumstances will the Commission consider changes in role and mission statements.~~

~~An Issues Conference will be held during the Update Cycle. Selected issues identified at the Conference will be considered for inclusion in the statewide postsecondary education master plan.~~

~~3.00 The Statewide Master Plan Format and Content\*~~

~~SECTION I: Introduction  
- The Plan and Planning Process~~

~~SECTION II: Colorado Context  
- The Colorado Environment  
- Historical Perspective  
- The Planning Period  
- Demography  
- Economy~~

~~SECTION III: Description of the Postsecondary Education System  
- Overview - history, governance, enrollment  
- Mission Statement of Colorado~~

~~SECTION IV: Goals  
- Goals and Objective~~

~~SECTION V: Issues  
- Delineation of Higher Education Issues~~

~~SECTION VI: The Colorado Response~~

- ~~\_\_\_\_\_ - State Changes in Role and Mission~~
- ~~\_\_\_\_\_ - NCES Taxonomy~~
- ~~\_\_\_\_\_ - Colorado Descriptors~~
- ~~\_\_\_\_\_ - Areas of Emphasis~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_~~ APPENDICES:

- ~~\_\_\_\_\_ - Financial Analysis/Projections~~
- ~~\_\_\_\_\_ - Current Services~~
- ~~\_\_\_\_\_ - Planned Changes~~

~~\*\_\_\_\_\_~~ Some changes in this format may occur in the process of writing and reviewing the Statewide Plan.

SECTION III

PART C GUIDELINES FOR CAMPUS SITE SELECTION

**1.00 General**

The selection of a campus site entails ~~the~~ consideration of many factors ~~which~~ THAT will affect construction and operation in the future. Since no two institutions are alike, the overall requirements for a specific site will vary according to the specific need. What may be extremely important to an urban institution may be quite unimportant to a suburban or rural institution. The relevance of most factors will relate specifically to the major form givers of the institution such as:

- Student Population
- Educational Program
- Community Relationships

The initial development of site acreage requirements thus becomes an outgrowth of:

A. Buildings

Land Coverage  
Circulation  
Access

B. Outdoor Activities

Play Fields  
Parking  
Nature Preserves  
Pedestrian and Automotive Circulation Systems

C. Expansion

The size of a site will vary with the specific concepts and goals for institutional development.

**2.00 Enrollment and Building Space Projections for Site Analysis Purposes**

Enrollment size targets and projections accepted by the Colorado Commission on Higher Education for planning purposes are shown in Section F.

2.01 Building space projections should be those calculated on the basis of procedures set forth in Section D of this planning document. As an alternative, space may be calculated using the procedures set forth in Capital Construction Requirements for Higher Education in Colorado, 1970-1980, Colorado Commission on Higher Education, June 1, 1970. Procedures set forth in that document were developed for purposes of broad statewide projection of space requirements but should be accurate enough for site analysis purposes. Set forth in that document are certain assumed ratios of full-time-equivalent day students to student-station-periods of occupancy of various types of space:

~~However, more recent studies have been made which show the following actual utilization rates:~~

Student-Station-Periods of Occupancy per FTE Student

	Classrooms	Laboratories	Physical Educ Facilities
CU-Boulder	11.64	2.91	0.38
CU-Denver	13.49	2.16	--
CU-Colo. Spgs.	13.09	0.97	--
CSU	12.69	3.23	0.95
CSM	11.47	4.65	1.02
Adams	10.74	3.74	0.57
Metro	12.20	1.38	--
UNC	10.64	1.67	0.33
Western	13.08	1.79	1.30
Lamar	13.94	2.26	--
Otero	10.14	4.01	1.16
Trinidad	9.51	6.29	0.66
Aims	8.17	3.91	--
Mesa	12.28	3.72	0.42
Northeastern	14.07	1.76	0.61
Rangely	8.03	5.21	1.54

2.02 The above utilization statistics should be sufficient to serve as a guide to an institution in the application for site analysis purposes of the following planning guidelines for the areas of classrooms, teaching laboratories, and physical education facilities:

Classrooms and Classroom Service Space	0.75 ASF per SSPO
Teaching Laboratories and Service Space	
A. Schools with engineering (CU-Boulder and CSU)	3.99 ASF per SSPO
B. Schools with substantial	

technical education (MSC, USC, and the community colleges)	4.04 ASF per SSPO
C. Colorado School of Mines	5.84 ASF per SSPO
D. Other institutions	3.30 ASF per SSPO
Physical Education Facilities and Service	10.00 ASF per SSPO
Other Teaching Facilities and Service (music practice rooms, language labs, etc.)	1.50 ASF per FTE Student
Teaching Faculty Offices and Related Secretarial, Clerical, and Office Service Space	168 ASF per FTE Instructional Faculty and Academic Administrative Staff Member
Other Instructional Space (any other Instruction related space not covered by 1 through 5 above, such as art exhibit space, etc.)	5.00 ASF per FTE Student
Research Faculty Offices and Related Secretarial, Clerical and Office Service Space	168 ASF per FTE Research Faculty
Other Research Space	No general guideline available
Extension Administrative Office	No general guideline available
Public Service Space	No general guideline available
Library Space	
A. Stacks	0.0833 ASF per Volume
B. Readers	6.25 per FTE Student (Total) for universities; 5.00 ASF per FTE Student (Total) for other institutions
C. Service	25 percent of stack and reader space
Administrative and General Office Space	
A. Universities	
First 2,000 FTE Students	6.0 ASF per FTE Student
Next 3,000 FTE Students	4.0 ASF per FTE Student
Next 5,000 FTE Students	3.0 ASF per FTE Student
Next 5,000 FTE Students	2.5 ASF per FTE Student

	All over 15,000 FTE Students	2.0 ASF per FTE Student
B.	Other Institutions	
	First 2,000 FTE Students	5.0 ASF per FTE Student
	Next 3,000 FTE Students	3.0 ASF per FTE Student
	Next 5,000 FTE Students	2.5 ASF per FTE Student
	Next 5,000 FTE Students	2.0 ASF per FTE Student
	All over 15,000 FTE Students	1.5 ASF per FTE Student
	Other Administrative and General Space	No general guideline available
	Physical Plant Service Space	7.5 per cent of all other educational and general space

2.03 The most recent student/professional staff ratios (calculated by dividing the total student credits for an entire fiscal year by 30 or 45, depending upon whether the credits are semester or quarter credits, and dividing the result by the total number of professional staff in resident instruction) in the area of resident instruction which have been calculated by the CCHE are as follows (based on guidelines described in Section F):

	CU-Boulder	17.8/1
	CU-Denver	18.2/1
	CU-Colorado Springs	20.4/1
	CSU	17.2/1
	CSM	14.6/1
	Fort Lewis	19.2/1
	Adams	18.3/1
	Metro	20.4/1
	USC	18.1/1
	UNC	17.2/1
	Western	18.4/1
	Arapahoe	20.0/1
	CCD	17.8/1
	El Paso	16.5/1
	Lamar	18.4/1
	Morgan County	18.0/1
	Otero	18.9/1
	Trinidad	16.0/1

2.04 In order to apply the library guideline numbers indicated above, it is necessary to have data on the number of volumes to be housed in the library over future years. The following guidelines are used by the CCHE for determining library book needs:

Criteria for determining the number of volumes for four-year colleges and universities as follows:

a.	Basic Collection	85,000 volumes
b.	Allowance per FTE Faculty Member	100 volumes
c.	Allowance per FTE Student	15 volumes
d.	Allowance per Masters Field	6,000 volumes
	Doctorate in offered in Field:	
e.	Allowance per Masters Field when Doctorate IS offered	3,000 volumes
f.	Allowance per Doctoral Field	25,000 volumes
g.	Allowance per Undergraduate Major or Minor Field	350 volumes
h.	Allowance per Sixth Year Specialist Degree Field	6,000 volumes

Criteria for determining the number of volumes for two-year colleges are as follows:

a.	Basic Collection	28,000 units
b.	Allowance per FTE Faculty	50 units
c.	Allowance per FTE Student	5 units
d.	Allowance per Subject Field of Study (i.e., number of academic programs)	165 units

Both sets of criteria above assume that when basic collection levels are met, an annual growth rate of five percent should be a minimum level of acquisition. Anticipated deletions should not exceed three percent annually.

Note: Fields of Study are identified in CCHE annual reporting of Degree Programs Offered and Certificates and Degrees Conferred in Colorado Colleges and Universities.

Estimates of assignable square feet arrived at through application of the above criteria (supplemented with estimates of space for categories not covered by the above, such as auxiliary enterprises) should be converted to gross square feet through use of building efficiency factors set forth in Section F.

### 3.00 Review, Publication, Approvals

3.01 During the site selection study, CCHE staff review should accomplish:

At completion of preliminary site analysis and choice of specific sites to study in detail, and

At completion of detailed site analysis draft (prior to reproduction for final distribution).

These informal reviews will permit site selection to be coordinated between the institution and CCHE staff and will assist in avoidance of wasted effort.

~~3.02 Use and storage of the published document would be enhanced if it was 8 1/2 x 11 in size, bound either as a vertical or horizontal book. It is suggested the final document be bound with plastic bindings.~~

3.03 The final ~~published document~~ SITE SELECTION DECISION must have the following approvals prior to becoming official:

- Institution
- Governing Board
- Commission on Higher Education
- Governor of the State

#### 4.00 Preliminary Site Analysis

Where many different sites are available, preliminary review and evaluation of each site should be made in order to determine the most likely ones for which detailed studies should be made. Factors to be considered should include the following (but not preclude others which might be unique to the institution.

1. Proximity to population center
2. Usable acreage required
3. Buildable area of site
4. Most desirable site shape
5. Appreciation value of real estate
6. Zoning adjacent to site
7. General soil conditions and general structural stability (using Geological Survey data, etc. -- no testing)
8. Site preparation costs (cut/fill)
9. Surrounding noise factors
10. Proximity to police and fire protection
11. Proximity to public transportation
12. Proximity to UTILITY SERVICES AND AVAILABLE INFRASTRUCTURE water
- ~~13. Proximity to sewer~~
- ~~14. Proximity to electricity~~
- ~~15. Proximity to telephone~~
- ~~16. Proximity to gas or heating fuel~~
17. Access to and from site (including adjacent freeways)
18. View to site
19. View from site
20. Location in relation to flood plane
21. Cost of operation and maintenance (due to site factors)
22. Approximate cost of property, total (no appraisals to be obtained)
23. Approximate cost of property, per acre (no appraisals to be obtained)

A general rating system should be used to allow comparisons and analysis. Careful study will allow a reasonable and rational selection of the most likely sites.

## 5.00 Detailed Site Analysis

Preliminary analysis should indicate the two or three most likely sites for which a detailed analysis should be made

Factors considered in the preliminary analysis should be expanded to provide more detail. It will now be necessary to obtain:

- A. Detailed topography -- United States Geological Survey (USGS) maps and details combined from observation and/or photography
- B. Utilities -- Detailed information from utility companies and districts or possible exploratory work if self contained utilities are to be developed
- C. Soils investigation -- Study to determine feasibility of constructing facilities on site. Look for possible expansive soils and explain their effect on foundations.
- D. Site appraisal -- Costs of land to be included in site.

## ~~6.00 Final Report~~

~~The following outline of data sets forth basic information required to understand the site and its feasibility for development. Variations from and additions to this outline are expected as required for individual sites.~~

### ~~I. INTRODUCTION~~

### ~~II. SERVICE AREA~~

~~A. Boundary and land area~~

~~B. Demographic data (namely student population and population centers, student projections)~~

~~C. Geographical center~~

~~D. Socio-economic conditions~~

~~E. Climate considerations~~

### ~~III. PLANNING ASSUMPTIONS~~

~~A. Program -- policy~~

~~B. Space Requirements~~

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Total area of academic buildings
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Total area of dormitories and student housing on the sites
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Parking requirements
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Playing fields
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. Open space

\_\_\_\_\_ C. Site access -- existing roads, etc.

\_\_\_\_\_ D. Estimate of gross land area requirements

\_\_\_\_\_ IV. THE GENERAL SITE

\_\_\_\_\_ A. Auxiliary service and cost to the college as follows:

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Fire protection
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Police protection
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Snow removal
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Waste disposal (garbage and solid waste)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. Mail service
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. Food service
- \_\_\_\_\_ 7. Student recreation
- \_\_\_\_\_ 8. Maintenance of roads

\_\_\_\_\_ B. Utilities

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Water
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Sewage
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Gas
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Electricity
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. Storm Drainage

\_\_\_\_\_ C. Transportation

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Air
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Railroad
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Bus
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Automobile

\_\_\_\_\_ D. Emergency Health Care

\_\_\_\_\_ E. Relationship to Community and Community Services

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. High schools
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Business and industry
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Night use of facilities
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Public relations

~~\_\_\_\_\_~~ 5. ~~Student supervision~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_~~ V. ~~SPECIFIC SITE~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_~~ A. ~~Topographic and area maps with net to gross land use calculated~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_~~ B. ~~Drainage~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_~~ C. ~~Subsurface Soil Conditions~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_~~ D. ~~Site clearing -- tree and rock removal~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_~~ E. ~~Site Acquisition~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_~~ 1. ~~Title~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_~~ 2. ~~Easements~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_~~ 3. ~~Zoning~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_~~ VI. ~~RECOMMENDATIONS~~

## SECTION III

## PART H DEFINITIONS/ABBREVIATIONS

Over the years, there have been many and conflicts and misunderstandings which have arisen during planning efforts which would have been avoided if there had existed appropriate understanding and consistency in connection with the "planning language." This listing of definitions includes the most frequently used terms, setting forth the term itself, its abbreviation in parenthesis, and the definition of the term. In order to facilitate its use, the listings is divided into THE FOLLOWING related categories: ~~Terms falling into a specific category are then alphabetized. The related categories are as follows:~~

1. Instructional Program
2. Students
3. Faculty/Staff
4. Facilities

---

~~Abbreviations have not been developed for all terms contained in the listing of definitions.~~

**1.00 Instructional Program****Academic Year**

The academic year is ~~a unit of time made up of either two semesters or three quarters extending generally from fall through spring and including any time periods during that term~~ THE TWELVE MONTH PERIOD BEGINNING JULY 1 AND INCLUDES SUMMER TERM AND THE SUBSEQUENT FALL, SPRING AND INTERIM TERMS.

**Class**

A class is a unit of one or more students organized for formal instruction in a specific course under the supervision of an instructor or instructors. A "class" is a division of a course and would be the same as "section." A "class" generally would be the same as "activity" as used in the CAMPUS system.

**Contact Hour**

A contact hour is a programmed class period of not less than 50 minutes nor more than 60 minutes. Generally, in lecture situations one contact hours equals one student credit and in laboratory situations 2-3 contact hours equal one student credit.

## **Course**

Course is a term which denotes a unit of instruction, normally carrying a credit value, which constitutes a part of the curriculum.

## **Course Credits**

Course credit is the numerical credit value, described in semester or quarter credits, which is awarded upon successful completion of a course. A course credit normally is awarded for: (1) a lecture meeting one hour per week for a term, (2) a recitation or laboratory activity meeting two hours per week, or (3) a laboratory meeting three hours per week, or combinations of these, depending primarily upon the kind of instruction and material covered in the course. Quarter credits are converted to semester credits by multiplying the number of quarter credits by two-thirds. Semester credits are converted to quarter credits by multiplying the number of semester credits by one and one-half.

## **Maximum Term Enrollment**

The maximum term enrollment is that quarter or semester which generates the largest student FTE for the entire institution. In most cases this will be fall term.

Once the maximum term has been determined, it should be used for all space requirement calculations even though the maximum enrollment for a particular course may occur during a different quarter or semester.

An exception to this could occur in an instance where a very specialized space was required for a particular course offering. Here the space requirements might be generated by a maximum term enrollment different than that for the remainder of the institution. When this occurs, it should be noted and explained.

## **Period**

A period is a unit of time of approximately one hour. Generally, a class period consists of 50 minutes of instruction, with an allowance of ten minutes for changing classes. A class meeting scheduled for two consecutive hours, possibly a total of 110 minutes, should be considered as two class periods in a space utilization study. A class meeting scheduled for an hour and a half, which in most colleges would amount to 75 to 80 minutes of actual instruction, should be processed at 1.5 class periods in a space utilization study. The terms, "period," "class period," and "contact hour" are used synonymously. See contact hours.

## **Section**

See "class."

## **Semester**

A semester is a subdivision of the academic calendar, normally consisting of 16 to 18 weeks. Two semesters constitute one academic year.

## **Student Credits**

A figure which represents the credit value of a course multiplied by the number of students enrolled in the course. Total student credits for an institution would be the sum of the student credits for each course.

## **Quarter**

A quarter is a subdivision of the academic calendar, normally consisting of 10 to 12 weeks. Three quarters constitute one academic year.

## **2.00 Students**

### **Full-Time Equivalent (FTE)**

One full-time equivalent student (FTE) is represented by the amount of instruction undertaken by one student in a "normal" program of 15 credits of instruction in a quarter or semester. Thus, during a full academic year, each 45 hours of quarter credits or 30 hours of semester credits are equal to one FTE student. In addition to the formally awarded credits used as a basis for calculating FTE students, a factor should be added for doctoral dissertations. In the term in which any doctoral degree is awarded for which it is presumed that the dissertation subject requires approximately one year of full-time work, one FTE (30 semester or 45 quarter credits) should be added. If any credits are awarded to doctoral research or dissertations, such credits must be deducted from the one FTE (30 semester or 45 quarter credits) added upon completion of the doctorate. Computation of institutional workload in terms of FTE student (or student credits produced) removes distinctions between full-time and part-time students.

---

#### ~~FTE Day Student~~

---

~~The FTE day student is the FTE student computed on the basis of credits taken in classes beginning during the day up to 5:00 p.m.~~

---

#### ~~FTE Evening Student~~

---

~~The FTE evening student is the FTE student computed on the basis of credits taken in classes beginning during the evening, 5:00 p.m. or after.~~

## **Head Count (HC)**

Head count is the measure of the total number of different individual students enrolled in an institution. Head count includes full-time students, part-time students, day students, evening students, credit earning students, and student taking courses for no credit. Head count number are normally used in computing space requirements for facilities related to number of individual students regardless of how many credits each is taking; i.e., housing, food service, parking, health center facilities, admissions counselors, etc.

## **Level of Student**

Level of Student denotes the extent of progress toward a degree. It is divided into the following categories:

Lower Division.--Freshmen and Sophomores (students with fewer than 60 semester credits or 90 quarter credits)

Upper Division.--Juniors and Seniors (students with 60 or more semester credits or 90 or more quarter credits who have not earned a baccalaureate degree)

Beginning Graduate I.--~~Students holding bona fide bachelor's degrees~~ WHO HAVE COMPLETED UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE REQUIREMENTS AND HAVE EARNED LESS THAN 30 GRADUATE CREDITS, but not master's degrees (or equivalent by institutional criteria) who have been admitted to the graduate college or division either as candidates for advanced degrees or certificates, or as unclassified graduate students. Students enrolled in the first year of professional program in law or veterinary medicine are ~~to be~~ considered as first-year graduate students.

Advanced Graduate II.--~~Students holding bona fide master's degrees, or equivalent, who have been admitted to the graduate college or division or certificate program beyond the master's degree~~ WHO HAVE EARNED 30 OR MORE GRADUATE CREDITS AND ARE ADMITTED INTO A DOCTORAL DEGREE PROGRAM. ~~Students~~ OR ARE enrolled in the second and succeeding years of professional programs in MEDICINE, PHARMACY, DENTISTRY, law and veterinary medicine. ~~are to be considered advanced graduate students. If a distinction of first-year graduates and advanced graduates cannot be made, consider all graduates as first-year.~~

## **3.00 Faculty and Staff**

### **Full-Time Academic Administrators--Academic Year Equivalents**

All academic deans, deans of faculty, deans of graduate schools, the provost, summer school deans, and divisional and department heads (to the extent they perform administrative functions).

### **Full-Time Instructional Faculty Member--Academic Year Equivalents**

A full-time instructional faculty member is defined as a person whose contract of employment provides that his primary obligation to the college or university of the academic year shall be teaching, INCLUDING THOSE FACULTY ON SABBATICAL LEAVE. ~~Included should be those faculty on sabbatical leave.~~ The responsibility will normally extend to the determination of course content, the monitoring of school progress and the assignment of grades upon completion of required work. This definition is intended to exclude teaching assistants and fellows who may do some teaching but have only a limited responsibility for a laboratory or class section.

### **Full-Time Resident Instruction Professional Staff--Academic Year Equivalents**

Includes both academic administrative staff and instructional staff as shown above, as well as other professional staff whose functions relate directly to the on-campus instructional process.

Here, and for the two preceding categories, staff who are employed full-time during any term of the year should be equated to 9-10 month FTE's and shown as full-time for the term or terms during which ~~he~~ STAFF teaches full-time. Thus, faculty member teaching full-time during a summer quarter and half-time during each of the other three quarters would be counted at 1/3 FTE in the full-time category (for summer teaching) and 1/2 FTE in the part-time category (for academic teaching). The summer load of a faculty member teaching at an institution whose summer session is the equivalent of 1/2 a semester would be counted as 1/4 FTE.

Payment for sabbatical leaves should be included on the basis of the academic year **and** the amount of time for which individuals are being paid. For example, if an individual is granted a sabbatical leave for one academic year at one-half his regular pay, he should be reported as 1/2 FTE.

Faculty who are employed on a 11-12 month basis should be converted to 9-10 monthly FTE's by dividing the total number of 11-12 month personnel by 0.833.

### **Part-Time Professional Instructional Faculty--Academic Year Equivalents**

This category may include any of the following:

- a) Graduate students assigned responsibility for teaching undergraduate classes.
- b) Administrative, student counseling, or any other such personnel who have accepted responsibility for teaching a class.
- c) Retired faculty members, or faculty members approaching retirement, who have accepted a reduced teaching load.
- d) Community resource people and honorarium faculty specifically retained to teach on a part-time basis.

The full-time equivalency designation for a part-time faculty member should be made on the basis of the contractual agreement with the faculty member. Presumably this would be determined on the basis of the service which the part-time faculty member agrees to

provide as related to service expected of a full-time faculty member. If, for example, (1) faculty members generally teach 12 credits is considered to be about 80 per cent of a faculty member's total contribution to the institutions (a total of 36 credits for three quarters), (2) the teaching of the 12 credits is considered to be about 80 per cent of a faculty member's total contribution to the institution, and (3) a part-time faculty member is hired to teach 3 credits for one quarter and provide no additional service beyond the teaching, the FTE designation for the part-time faculty should be computed as follows:  $3/36 \times .80 = .067$ . If the faculty member teaches 3 credits for three quarters, the FTE would be .20.

Graduate teaching assistants should be included in this category if they are responsible for teaching classes even if they are under nominal supervision of senior faculty.

### **FTE Instructional Faculty--Academic Year**

The number of FTE instructional faculty is determined by adding the number of full-time faculty and full-time equivalencies of all part-time faculty. Thus, if there are 100 faculty employed on a full-time basis and 50 faculty employed on a half-time basis, the FTE count would be 125.

### **Professional Staff**

The term "professional staff" when used for classification of personnel, should be used in the generally accepted usage or sense of the term, to designate personnel who have attained some special degree of education or competence and who are charged with a major responsibility, or the supervision of some phase of the institutional program.

Professional staff should be those institutional employees who are exempt from the state personnel system (Section 16, Article 25-5-34, Colorado statutes) as follows:

- a) Officers of an educational institution and their professional staff assistants.
- b) Heads of administrative units directly responsible to officers ~~of an educational institutional.~~
- c) Heads of administrative units, and their professional staff assistants, ~~which~~ WHOSE RESPONSIBILITIES relate directly to the educational function of an ~~educational~~ institution and whose qualifications include comparable training and experience as that required for a faculty member.
- d) The heads of those functions of an educational institution WHOSE POSITIONS ARE ~~which are~~ supported primarily by student fees and charges, including heads of residence halls.
- e) ~~The head of an~~ Professional staff members of departments of intercollegiate athletics.

### **Student/Professional Staff Ratio--Main Campus**

The ratio is computed by dividing the FTE student enrollment for a given term, academic year, or fiscal year (main campus) by the FTE resident instruction professional staff (full

and part-time) for the term, academic year, or fiscal year. Extension FTE should be excluded in computing this student/professional staff ratio.

### **Support Staff**

Defined as personnel of varying skills whose responsibilities are limited to specific tasks or assignments and who generally will have limited supervisory responsibilities.

### **Assistants**

Defined as graduate students (and occasionally undergraduate students) who may assist the faculty in teaching and research, although they are not directly responsible for class or laboratory sections. Assistants who have major responsibility for the teaching of classes should be reported as part-time faculty.

## **4.00 Facilities**

### **Assignable Area (ASF)**

Assignable area is measured in square feet and consists of all areas assigned to, or available for assignment to, an occupant, including every type of space functionally usable by an occupant except those spaces included in "non-assignable area" defined in a following paragraph. Areas are measured from inside face of exterior walls and inside face of interior partitions and walls.

### **Building Cost**

The cost of a building is measured in dollars and is the sum of the cost of the structure, built-in equipment, and utilities out 5 feet from the building.

### **Building Cost Per Gross Square Foot**

The building cost per gross square foot is measured in dollars and is computed by dividing the total gross square feet into the building cost.

### **Building Efficiency Ratio**

The building efficiency ratio is measured in percentages. It compares the assignable area against the gross area of the building. Thus, a building efficiency ratio of 68:100 would indicate that 68 per cent of the gross area is made up of assignable areas. The remaining 32 per cent of the gross area is the sum of the building's construction area and non-assignable area.

### **Construction Area (CSF)**

Construction area is measured in square feet and consists of the area of the building which THAT is occupied by exterior walls, fire walls, permanent partitions, and demountable

partitions. Generally, the construction area is the residual after assignable and non-assignable areas have been subtracted from gross area.

### **Construction Cost**

The construction cost of a building is measured in dollars and is the sum of the costs of the structure, including ~~built-in~~ BUILT-IN equipment and utilities out 5 feet from the building, architectural and engineering fees, program planning, surveys and site investigation, construction supervision, material tests, and contingencies. For completed buildings, construction cost is based upon actual amounts. For buildings under construction, construction cost is based upon current contract amounts. For proposed buildings, construction cost is based upon estimated amounts plus a contingency, WHICH SHOULD BE CALCULATED BASED ON THE DEFINITION IN THE CURRENT YEAR'S OFFICE OF STATE PLANNING & BUDGET/CCHE BUDGET INSTRUCTIONS. ~~computed by multiplying construction cost items times 3 percent.~~

### **Construction Cost Per Gross Square Foot**

The construction cost per gross square foot is measured in dollars and is computed by dividing the total gross square feet into the construction cost.

### **Construction Cost Per Cubic Foot**

The construction cost per cubic foot of a building is measured in dollars and is computed by dividing the volume into the construction cost.

### **Gross Area (GSF)**

The gross area of a building is the square foot measurement including the area taken up by structural elements such as exterior and interior walls and columns. It should be the sum of the areas of all floors of the building, including basements, mezzanines, and roofed loading or shipping platforms. Such features as pope trenches, exterior terraces or steps, chimneys, roof overhangs, covered walkways, porches, and open roofed-over areas that are paved should be excluded from the measurements.

Generally, the gross area of a building shall be the total area exclusive of covered walkways, open roofed-over areas that are paved, porches, and similar spaces.

### **Non-Assignable Area**

Non-assignable area is measured in square feet and is the sum of all areas used for custodial services, corridors, elevators, escalators, stairways, lobbies, mechanical equipment, utility services, public toilets, and loading platforms (except when required for operational reasons and thus, includable in assignable area). Areas are measured from the inside face of exterior walls and the inside face of interior partitions and walls.

## **Project Cost**

The project cost of a building is measured in dollars and is the sum of the construction cost, landscaping, utilities from supply to 5 feet from the building, movable equipment, and land acquisition.

## **Fixed Equipment**

Fixed equipment is the equipment which is attached to the building; i.e., AV blinds, venetian blinds, draperies WINDOW COVERINGS, carpeting, fixed auditorium seating, bleacher NON-MOVABLE seating, demountable partitions, coil walls, lockers, permanent benches, basketball backstops, fixed casework attached and not attached to the utility systems, etc.

## **Movable Equipment**

Movable equipment is that equipment not attached to the building, such as chairs, tables, desks, rolling storage units, portable projection screens and tables, partitions on wheels, etc.

## **Room Capacity**

The room capacity denotes the number of student stations an instructional space is designed to accommodate, the number of office stations an office is designed for etc.

## **Room Utilization**

Room utilization denotes the number of hours per week a room is occupied by regularly scheduled classes. This number varies among institutions and will vary with different types of teaching spaces.

## **Student Station**

A student station consists of those facilities necessary to accommodate one student for one class period in a particular teaching space. The area required for one student station will vary with the type of teaching space and, in the cases of classrooms and lecture halls, with the number of student stations in the teaching space.

## **Student Station Utilization**

Student station utilization is the number of hours student stations are occupied when the room is in scheduled use. This percentage varies among institutions and also varies among institutions and also varies with different types of teaching spaces.

## **Total Area**

The total area of a building is measured in square feet. It is the sum of the areas of the several floors of the building, including basements, mezzanine and intermediate floored tiers and penthouses of headroom height, measured ~~format~~ FROM the exterior faces of exterior walls or ~~form~~ FROM the center line of walls separating buildings. Covered walkways, open roofed-over areas that are paved, porches and similar spaces shall have the architectural area multiplied by an area factor of 0.50.\* The total area does not include such features as pope trenches, exterior terraces or steps, chimneys, roof overhangs, etc.

\*These spaces are understood to include entrance canopies, window canopies and overhanging portions of buildings. Roof overhangs projecting more than 3 feet from face of exterior wall shall be considered as "similar spaces" and shall have the total area multiplied by an area factor of 0.50.

(Source: American Institute of Architects, Document D101)

## **Volume**

The volume of a building is measured in cubic feet and is the product of the total area defined herein and the height from the under side of the lowest floor construction system, to the average height of the surface of the finished roof above for the various parts of the building.

(Source: American Institute of Architects, Document D101)

## **Work Station**

A work station is office-type space in either single occupancy or multiple occupancy area used by faculty, professional OR SUPPORT PERSONNEL. (~~e.g., president, vice-president; dean, chairman, director; research personnel; accountant; teaching assistant; supporting technical, including laboratory research assistants and data analyst, supporting clerical, including secretaries, office manager, clerks, typists, graduate students, etc.~~)

SECTION III

PART L POLICIES AND CRITERIA FOR CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM PRIORITY SETTING

**1.00 Policies and Criteria**

1.01 Projects included in the ranking must have Commission approved Facility Program Plans, consistent with:

- ~~HB 1187 Commission directives~~ ALL STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS;
- State Postsecondary Education Master Plan policies and designated campus role and mission;
- Campus Long-Range Facilities Master Plan;
- Approved Space and Utilization Standards.

1.02 Both state funded and non-state funded projects will be reviewed for financial feasibility, conformance with established planning guidelines, and consistency with the approved Facilities Program Plan. In reporting non-state funded projects, the Commission is recommending legislative authorization.

1.03 Capital construction requests will be categorized BY THE COMMISSION BASED ON THE ASSESSMENT OF THE PROJECT AND THE PROJECT'S PURPOSE. THE COMMISSION WILL CONSIDER THE PURPOSE CODE ASSIGNED TO THE PROJECT BY THE INSTITUTION USING THE APPROVED PURPOSE CODE DEFINITIONS IN THE ANNUAL CCHE/OFFICE OF STATE PLANNING AND BUDGET HIGHER EDUCATION ANNUAL BUDGET INSTRUCTIONS. STAFF MAY RECOMMEND ASSIGNMENT OF AN ALTERNATE PURPOSE CODE FOR A PARTICULAR PROJECT TO THE COMMISSION FOR CONSIDERATION IN PRIORITIZATION OF PROJECTS. (5.00) into one of three<sup>+</sup> mutually exclusive spending plans:

- ~~Spending Plan I — Current Educational Programs and Facilities Commitments~~
- ~~Recommendations reflect the need for — 1) funds to complete current projects; — 2) elimination of existing instructional deficiencies; and — 3) discretionary enhancement of physical plant.~~

<sup>+</sup>A fourth plan, "Newly Approved Educational Programs and Facilities Commitments," may be used in the future. Newly approved programs are those approved by CCHE during the four fiscal years preceding the Budget Request Year. No projects have yet been requested in that category.

~~Spending Plan II – Capital Construction Consultant Services~~

~~Recommendations include campus physical facilities master plan updates and detailed life cycle cost analyses and program planning for complex projects, as provided for by statute and Long Bill headnotes.~~

~~Spending Plan III – Preservation of Public Property and Safety of Occupants~~

~~Recommendations reflect the need for 1) renovation to bring many campus buildings into compliance with more stringent health and safety codes; 2) utility and site improvements responsive to demands for more efficient physical plant operation or responsive to the increasing costs of energy; 3) compliance with changing codes, regulations, and standards not otherwise rectified through space renovation projects. Deferred maintenance and energy conservation funds are occasionally duplicated in these capital construction fund requests, but CCHE recommendation for each project indicate an appropriate funding category.~~

~~The use of the three spending plans furthers balanced development of public higher education facilities. The plans permit value judgments to be made on the relative importance of preservation of existing facilities and ensuring occupant safety, construction/remodeling to meet program needs, and facilities planning.~~

1.04 Criteria for Project Ranking

Three broad areas are important to the evaluation<sup>2</sup> and ranking of relative urgencies among individual capital projects within statewide capital construction investment categories.

A. Consistency with ~~HB 1187 Commission~~ GENERAL ASSEMBLY directives, State and Institution Master Plans

~~The state budget is the implementation plan for accomplishing mission-oriented goals, objectives, and policies. State investments in capital assets should be directly supporting adopted objectives for the System of Higher Education, while responding to Colorado's population, economic and labor force needs for higher education services, yet recognizing the explicit roles, missions, and uniquely designated degree programs at specific institutions which provide special services important to the State Plan. LEGISLATIVE, CCHE AND GOVERNING BOARD HIGHER EDUCATION GOALS.~~

B. Institutional Program Workload and Performance

State investments in capital assets primarily support the educational enterprise, its workload, and its performance. Therefore, governing board priorities,

---

<sup>2</sup> Specific evaluation measures are provided in Appendix B.

program enrollment, and degrees conferred are indicators of the related state and student commitments in the educational enterprise.

#### ~~Facilities Utilization and Condition~~

The quality of space and the relationship of people and programs to space is vital to the quality of the educational enterprise. ~~QUALITY CONSIDERATIONS~~ ~~Consideration of space quality~~ include the condition ~~of the space~~, the efficiency of the scheduling ~~of space~~, and the intensity ~~OF USE or crowding in the~~ occupancy of space.

- C. The ranking of capital construction requests must be done on three levels:
- ~~first~~ by institutional administrators who set institutional priorities and assess the urgency of each project;
  - ~~next~~ by governing boards which set priorities among campuses;
  - ~~next~~ by the Commission, which coordinates project phasing and funding reviews with OSPB and the State Buildings Division, sets statewide priorities, giving broad consideration to consistency with existing policy, program workload, and facility condition.

Finally, the Governor and legislature determine actual funding in relation to other state needs.

## **2.00 CCHE Priorities Within Categories of Capital Construction Needs**

~~2.01 Within each spending plan, the Commission considers several factors in determining priorities:~~

~~High priority is given to projects that have both prior CCHE approved program plans and prior legislative authorization.~~

~~Institutional self-assessment of urgency for funding and governing board priority for funding is given substantial weight.~~

~~2.02 Within Spending Plan I Current Educational Programs and Facilities Commitments, the following factors are considered with each factor given more weight than the following one:~~

~~A. HB 1187 Commission directives, CCHE State Plan policies and Special Role and Mission/Unique degree programs impacted;~~

~~B. Current and projected enrollment level of program affected; degrees conferred in programs affected;~~

~~C. Space/Equipment condition — 1) projects correcting current deficit space/equipment; 2) consolidating programs from current functionally obsolete or congested space; 3) refurbishing space for major instructional/public service program workloads; and 4) replacing space terminated for operating or economic reasons;~~

~~D. Discretionary Physical Plant enhancement not directly related to the role and mission of the institution, nor to correct code violations or comply with regulations.~~

~~2.03 Within Spending Plan II — Capital Construction Consulting Services, the following factors are considered with each factor given more weight than the following factor.~~

~~A. HB 1187 Commission directives, CCHE State Plan policies and Special Role and Mission/Unique Degree Programs impacted;~~

~~B. Facilities Condition and Space Capacity;~~

~~C. Current and projected enrollment level of programs affected.~~

~~2.04 Within Spending Plan III — Preservation of Public Property and Safety of Occupants, the following factors are considered<sup>3</sup> with each factor given more weight than the following one.~~

~~A. Facility condition — 1) projects correcting extreme hazards to life and health; 2) serious hazards to building and program safety; 3) moderate hazards to people and property;~~

~~B. HB 1187 Commission directives, CCHE State Plan policies and Special Role and Mission/Unique Degree Program impacted;~~

~~C. Current and projected occupancy of facilities affected.~~

### **3.00 CCHE Priorities Among Capital Construction Funding Requests**

The Commission recommends balanced investments for three purposes:

- ~~1) to meet the urgent current needs of approved higher education programs that are unique resources and planned responses to Colorado's major population, economic development, and labor force needs;~~
- ~~2) to assure a safe and healthful physical environment conducive to learning; and~~
- ~~3) to plan for major decisions about facilities of major importance to campus operations. The Commission sets priorities among the three CATEGORIES spending plans to advance these goals.~~

---

<sup>3</sup>~~These projects are referred to the State Buildings Division for technical evaluation. That technical evaluation is used in the CCHE rankings which are based on the criteria shown here.~~

To assist the legislature in determining PROJECT PRIORITIZATION FOR FUNDING ~~which spending plan to fund first, and how much of that plan to fund before proceeding to projects in another plan,~~ THE COMMISSION WILL ASSESS THE STAFF'S PROGRAM PLAN EVALUATION, THE PROJECT PURPOSE AS IDENTIFIED USING THE MOST CURRENT CCHE/OSPB PURPOSE CODE DEFINITIONS AND THE PROJECT'S RANKING AGAINST ALL OTHER REQUESTS SUBMITTED IN A PARTICULAR FUNDING YEAR. THE COMMISSION WILL CONSIDER THE URGENCY OF THE PROJECT, THE GOVERNING BOARD'S PRIORITIES AND THE SCOPE OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT. ~~following guidelines are applied:~~

~~3.01 Funding priorities with each spending plan are grouped according to campus self-assessments of timing of need.~~

~~Urgent current needs (shutdown or seriously disrupting program)~~

~~Urgent need in immediate future (prevents loss of experiments, experimental or educational time)~~

~~Desirable at present time (improves facilities that are below an acceptable operating condition)~~

~~Desirable when funds available (improves appearance, conditions, and general morale).~~

~~3.02 Within each of the Spending Plans, all urgent current needs with approved facility program plans and high governing board priorities should be placed in funding priority, if consistent with HB 1187 Commission directives.~~

~~3.03 The appropriation sequence among the Spending Plans should support actions that:~~

~~A. Complete CURRENTLY APPROPRIATED PROJECTS with prior legislative authorization and CCHE approved program plans; and~~

~~B. Assure a safe and healthy physical environment conducive to learning, correcting those MAXIMUM RISKS TO LIFE SAFETY and PUBLIC HEALTH which, if deferred, threaten the suspension of major program activities; then~~

~~C. Correct MODERATE RISKS TO PEOPLE which, if deferred, are likely to result in personal injury and state liability exceeding the cost of corrective action; then~~

~~D. Correct SERIOUS RISKS TO UTILITIES VITAL TO CAMPUS OPERATIONS which, if deferred, threaten the suspension of major program activities; then~~

- ~~E. Acquire or replace major instructional or scientific equipment, or remodel existing State space, for CCHE designated CRS 23-1-118 Programs of Excellence; then~~
- ~~F. Correct MODERATE RISKS TO PROPERTY which, if deferred, are likely to result in destruction of personal property or loss of educational use; then~~
- ~~G. Correct major instructional space DEFICITS, renovate OBSOLETE space, or replace TERMINATED space or equipment for programs vital to the role and mission of a campus; then~~
- ~~H. Prevent MODERATE RISKS TO CAMPUS OPERATIONS which, if deferred, are likely to result in disruptions of utilities in critical areas; then~~
- ~~I. Authorize planning funds for FACILITIES DECISIONS important to the elimination of hazards to people and property, and facilities of major importance to campus operations and state higher education system objectives.~~

~~This implementation sequence places high priority on those academic programs and campus operations that the Commission is confident will remain an integral part of the future mission of the institution, and where early action will correct serious health and life safety hazards identified in the state facilities inventory. Thus, immediate capital investment decisions are to be consistent with and supportive of long term decisions for the system of higher education, as recommended by the Commission.~~

~~No building or environment can be absolutely safe. The degree of safety must be considered in relation to the cost of safety. The principle of risk management, which underlies the health and life safety priorities, balances the severity of a hazard and the number of people exposed to it with the cost of lessening the risk that the hazard would likely cause loss of life, serious injury, or damage to equipment or the building itself. Potential hazards have been previously evaluated in facility program plans according to severity, exposure, and cost of code compliance.~~

~~3.04 Urgent current needs occur in all sectors of the higher education system. MOST URGENT are those capital construction projects that have been ranked according to the evaluation criteria shown in 6.00 and are:~~

- ~~A. Actions to implement HB 1187 and other specific legislative intent and Commission policy objectives (e.g., rural access; unique degree programs of state excellence), or are planned responses to Colorado's major population growth, economic development and labor force needs; and~~

~~Among the top priorities of each governing board; and~~

- ~~\_\_\_\_\_ Completions of current projects authorized by the legislature.~~
- ~~\_\_\_\_\_ B. Next: New projects that eliminate extreme hazards to the public health or life safety of students which, if not corrected, demand suspension of vital program operations, and are hazards validated by the State Buildings Division; then~~
- ~~\_\_\_\_\_ C. New projects among the top priorities of each governing board that correct serious building and program safety hazards to occupancy and educational use, threatening to disrupt or discontinue vital program operations, as validated by the State Buildings Division; then~~
- ~~\_\_\_\_\_ D. New projects that correct moderate risks to people which, if deferred are likely to result in personal injury and state liability exceeding the cost of corrective action; then~~
- ~~\_\_\_\_\_ E. New projects that correct serious risks to utilities vital to campus operations which, if deferred, threaten the suspension of major program activities, and are hazards validated by the State Buildings Division; then~~
- ~~\_\_\_\_\_ F. New projects that acquire or replace major instructional or scientific equipment, or remodel existing State space, for CCHE designated CRS 23-1-118 Programs of Excellence; then~~
- ~~\_\_\_\_\_ G. New projects that correct moderate risks to property which, if not reduced, are likely to result in destruction of personal property or loss of educational use, and are hazards validated by the State Buildings Division.~~

~~3.05 Other urgent capital construction projects are those which have been ranked according to the evaluation criteria shown in 6.00, and are:~~

- ~~\_\_\_\_\_ A. New projects among the first quartile priorities of each governing board that correct current major instructional space deficits, or consolidate major programs from obsolete and congested space, but only if applicable CCHE campus wide space utilization guidelines are met; then~~
- ~~\_\_\_\_\_ B. New projects among the first quartile priorities of each governing board that refurbish space or replace obsolete equipment for major instructional/public service programs, or replace deteriorated space to be demolished, according to CCHE space utilization guidelines, then~~
- ~~\_\_\_\_\_ C. Prevention of moderate risks to the adequacy, reliability, and serviceability of campus utilities which, if deferred, are likely to result in disruptions of campus operations in critical areas, as validated by the State Buildings Division; then~~
- ~~\_\_\_\_\_ D. Planning funds for major decisions about the elimination of hazards to people and property and for facilities of major importance to campus operations and~~

~~state higher education system objectives; and are projects consistent with institutional master plans or facility master plans approved by CCHE since 1982.~~

~~3.06 For FY 1986-87, or until State academic and enrollment policies are adopted by the Commission, or the Colorado State Postsecondary Education Master Plan is formally revised in accord with HB 1187 Commission directives, the following policy will apply:~~

~~Capital construction projects that directly conflict with Commission policies and criteria for~~

- ~~• discontinuance of academic or vocational programs;~~
- ~~• educational degree programs reduction;~~
- ~~• enrollment, academic admission and program standards or;~~
- ~~• distinctive role and mission determinations among graduate offerings of UC Boulder, CSU, UNC, and graduate program phase outs at ASC, and WSC;~~

~~will not be recommended for appropriation.~~

#### **4.00 Process for Recommending Funding Priorities**

Higher education capital construction needs require balanced state investments that eliminate extreme health and safety hazards, complete unfinished construction projects, relieve the most severe space deficits in specialized facilities, renovate functionally obsolete and congested space of major programs, and provide for prompt technical studies for major campus construction decisions.

~~4.01 CCHE staff AND THE COMMISSION ADVISORY COMMITTEE WILL MEET WITH GOVERNING BOARD REPRESENTATIVES TO DISCUSS RECOMMENDATIONS AND ISSUES RELEVANT TO PRIORITIZATION PRIOR TO THE OCTOBER COMMISSION MEETING AT WHICH THE PRIORITIZATION OF CAPITAL PROJECTS WILL BE CONSIDERED. staff will consult with a Staff Advisory Committee on Capital Construction Priorities, composed of central administration staffs of each governing board, in preparing both preliminary recommendations (November CCHE Discussion Item) and Recommended Priorities of Funding (December CCHE Action Item). The Staff Advisory Committee will~~

- ~~A. Evaluate the validity of campus self-assessments of Urgent Current Needs;~~
- ~~B. Counsel on educational service priorities among governing board systems in ranking capital construction projects within each spending plan;~~

~~C. Counsel on which spending plan to fund first, and how much of that plan to fund before proceeding to projects in another plan.~~

## ~~5.00 Higher Education Capital Construction Categories for Appropriated State General Fund Dollars~~

~~Four broad categories of state capital construction investment purposes are important to the balanced development of the system of higher education as a whole. The categories are not listed in order of priority.~~

- ~~I. Current Programs and Facilities Commitments~~
- ~~II. Newly Approved Programs and Facilities Commitments~~
- ~~III. Capital Construction Consulting Services~~
- ~~IV. Preservation of Public Buildings and Safety of Occupants.~~

~~Deferred maintenance and energy conservation measures are appropriated to the State Department of Administration for allocations according to an established project ranking system; therefore, they are not included in these Higher Education capital construction priorities.~~

~~Categories of Need are described for comparing similar needs among institutions. The category of need described within each of these four broad investment categories reflects the relative urgencies for capital construction appropriations for the programs of the statewide system of higher education. Each individual Capital Construction Project Request document identifies the institution's designation of the project purpose and relative priority. This designation is similar to the categories of needs for the statewide system and affects the placement of the project in the statewide categories of needs.~~

~~Commission funding priorities, together with an approved five-year building requirements plan, will be recommended for each of these four broad categories.~~

### ~~5.01 Current Programs and Facilities Commitments Category of Need~~

~~A. Completion of Projects with Prior Construction or Purchase Authorizations~~

~~Each of these projects received recent authorization from the legislature and the Appropriation Report indicated legislative intent to fund subsequent construction or movable equipment phases~~

~~B. Elimination of Existing Instructional Deficiencies~~

~~Recommendations include:~~

- ~~1. The renovation of existing space for revised academic programs, the consolidation of programs from existing functionally obsolete space, or of~~

~~obsolete existing facilities when renovation or remodeling is not practical or feasible; or~~

~~2. Basic acquisition or replacement of specialized instructional, hospital, or scientific equipment, with item costs exceeding \$50,000; or~~

~~3. Additional space to meet the needs of increased enrollments, or to consolidate expanding programs from congested space, but only if applicable CCHE campus wide space utilization guidelines are met.~~

~~C. General Enhancement of Physical Plant~~

~~These discretionary projects include actions not directly related to role and mission of the institution, nor to correct code violations or comply with regulations. For example, air conditioning for comfort, campus pedestrian malls, and storage buildings.~~

~~5.02 Newly Approved<sup>4</sup> Programs and Facilities Commitments — Category of Need~~

~~A. Elimination of Existing Instructional Deficiencies for Newly Approved Programs~~

~~Projects in this category involve:~~

~~1. renovation of existing space for new academic programs approved by CCHE; or~~

~~2. basic acquisition of specialized sets of instructional or scientific equipment essential to the initial four years of operation of newly approved programs; not included in major renovation or new construction projects, and too costly to be accomplished through outlay; or~~

~~3. construction of additional space essential to accommodate newly approved programs; but only if CCHE campus wide space utilization guidelines are met.~~

~~5.03 Capital Construction Consulting Services~~

~~Recommendations are for purchase of professional consultant services to prepare master plans, program plans, building life-cycle cost studies and feasibility studies associated with capital construction.~~

---

<sup>4</sup>Newly approved programs are those approved by CCHE during the four fiscal years preceding the Budget Request Year.

~~Hospital patient care projects must include Certificate of Need authorization from the State Health Facilities Review Council.~~

~~Recommendations exclude Physical Planning architectural engineering services integral to capital construction or renovation projects.~~

#### ~~5.04 Preservation of Public Property and Safety of Occupants Category of Need~~

##### ~~A. Completion of Projects With Prior Construction or Purchase Authorizations~~

~~Each of these projects received authorization from the legislature and the Appropriation Report indicated legislative intent to fund subsequent construction phases.~~

##### ~~B. Elimination of Hazards to Health, Life and Safety~~

###### ~~1. Extreme Hazards to Life and Health~~

~~These emergency projects are maximum risks which, if deferred, require closure of vital program operations.~~

###### ~~2. Serious Hazards to Building Occupancy and Program Safety~~

~~Funding for these projects is urgently required to rectify grave risks which, if deferred, seriously threaten to disrupt or discontinue vital program operations.~~

###### ~~3. Moderate Hazards to People and Property~~

~~These projects are urgently needed to reduce moderate risks which, if deferred, are likely to result in personal injury, loss of education time, or destruction of personal property and State liability comparable to the cost of corrective action.~~

##### ~~Utility and Site Improvements~~

##### ~~C. Utility Improvements~~

~~1. These projects are intended to preserve the operating reliability of utility systems or reduce institutional operating costs (within a maximum 10 year payback period). Excluded are projects eligible for categorical funding from the Department of Administration as Controlled Maintenance, or Energy Conservation Measures.~~

###### ~~2. Site Improvements~~

~~These projects serve or enhance real property and protect physical plant assets.~~

~~D. Code Compliance~~

~~These projects correct violations of changing codes, regulations, and standards not otherwise rectified through space renovation or utility and site improvement projects.~~

**6.00 Criteria for Project Ranking**

~~Three broad areas are important to the evaluation and ranking of relative urgencies among individual capital projects within statewide capital construction investment categories.~~

~~1. Consistency with State and Institution Master Plans;~~

~~2. Institutional Program Workload and Performance;~~

~~3. Facilities Utilization and Condition.~~

~~The following criteria and evaluation measures are relevant and decisive in ranking "mission-oriented" capital improvement projects within each of the broader system-wide categories. Alternative evaluation measures are provided, where applicable, to the varied purposes and capital projects. None of these measures are to be applied in isolation.~~

**6.01 Consistency with State and Institutional Master Plans**

~~The state budget is the implementation plan for accomplishing mission-oriented goals, objectives and policies. State investments in capital assets should be directly supporting adopted objectives for the System of Higher Education while responding to Colorado's population, economic and labor force needs for higher education services, yet recognizing the explicit roles, missions, and uniquely designated degree programs at specific institutions which provide special services important to the State Plan.~~

~~A. State Higher Education Goals and Objectives (State Plan Section II)~~

~~Individual projects contribute to higher education system goals for quality, efficiency and effectiveness. Judgments as to the successful implementation of those goals are relevant to the capital improvements project ranking.~~

~~B. State Planning Projections for the 1980's (State Plan Section III)~~

~~Population, economic sector and labor force demand and supply projections are considerations in capital investment decisions for public institutions. Enrollment projections, by campus, are indicators of relative growth in demands for higher education services.~~

~~C. Institution Role and Mission Designations (State Plan Section IV)~~

~~Roles for specific institutions, together with specific "unique degree programs" are designated in the State Plan, which represent programs of state excellence or special services which should be recognized in capital investment priorities.~~

~~6.02 Institutional Program Workload and Performance~~

~~State investments in capital assets primarily support the educational enterprise, its workload and its performance. Therefore, governing board priorities, program enrollment, and degrees conferred are indicators of the related state and student commitments in the educational enterprise.~~

~~A. Governing Board Priorities~~

~~The "values" of elected and appointed public officials are vital considerations in prioritizing individual capital projects. The relative priority to the governing board's system of educational services is an important criterion for the state priority ranking.~~

~~B. Program Enrollment~~

~~Credit hours of production (or SFTE), by HEGIS disciplines for which the capital investment is supportive, provide measures of institutional and statewide workload. Operating Budget Format 50M provides for consistent reporting of program enrollment workload for HEGIS disciplines and is the measure used in staffing and operating budget decisions. Five year projected trends in HEGIS discipline enrollment, institution and statewide, are relevant to state priorities in capital asset investments.~~

~~This ranking factor distinguishes those projects which benefit the greatest number of people.~~

~~C. Degrees Conferred~~

~~Student commitment to an educational discipline is reflected in the successful completion of the educational process—degrees granted, or community college students successfully transferring to a baccalaureate institution. For community college occupational programs, degrees or certificates granted or students leaving the program and obtaining employment in their occupational field are annually reported to the U.S. Department of Education by the State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education.~~

~~The annual CCHE "Green Book" of Degrees Conferred by Program provides time series data indicative of relative student commitments to program~~

~~completion among four-year institutions for comparable programs. This perspective is relevant to judgments of the relative benefits obtained from relative capital investment decisions to spend public monies.~~

~~Facilities for academic units that support degree programs, interdisciplinary programs, and other academic units such as institutes, should not be evaluated and ranked according to this criterion.~~

~~D. Timing of Need~~

~~Alleviation of identified operating problems or program deficiencies is a major causes for capital budget requests. The needs among scheduled programs vary in terms of the timing of need.~~

~~A. Urgent current need (shutdown or seriously disrupting program);~~

~~B. Urgent need in immediate future (prevents loss of experiments, experimental or educational time);~~

~~C. Desirable at present time (improves facilities that are below an acceptable operating condition);~~

~~D. Desirable when funds available (improves appearance, conditions, and general morale).~~

~~The Timing of Need and the impact of not funding the project in the Request Year, are identified in each institution's capital construction budget request document (CCHE Supplement to Schedule 9).~~

~~6.03 Facilities Utilization and Condition~~

~~The quality of space and the relationship of people and programs to space is vital to the quality of the educational enterprise. Considerations of space quality include the condition of the space, the efficiency of the scheduling of space, and the intensity or crowding in the occupancy of space.~~

~~A. Quality of Condition of Space~~

~~Assessments of remodeling, renovation, or termination of space are established in A-2 facility inventory reports by building. The relative condition of space is often a result of the programs which occupy the assigned space.~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ B. \_\_\_\_\_ Efficiency of Space Utilization<sup>5</sup>~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ Room utilization data (B-1 and A-1 inventory reports) provide for assessments of the efficiency of the scheduling of contact hours in a weekly basis. The data are reported by HEGIS disciplines~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ C. \_\_\_\_\_ Capacity of Space Occupied~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ Assignable square feet per SFTE provides an assessment of relative crowding of space by room type within the HEGIS disciplines for which the capital project is intended.~~

---

<sup>5</sup> Improved reliability of A-1 facility space inventories and B-1 room utilization data reporting is essential for capital improvements planning and programming. Submissions of institutional reports range from 1974 to 1981 as the most recent information. Data discrepancies exist which necessitate a thorough reexamination of the accuracy of the computer programs and the instruction manual for data reporting. When facility space and room utilization reporting becomes current and reliable, these criteria for evaluating and prioritizing capital budgets can be implemented.

~~Guidelines for Projects Ranking~~

- ~~1. Complete Currently Authorized Projects~~
- ~~2. Governing Board Priority~~
- ~~3. Campus Timing of Need~~

~~Within each Spending Plan, each factor is weighted more than the following one:~~

<del>SPENDING PLAN I</del>	<del>SPENDING PLAN II</del>	<del>SPENDING PLAN III</del>
<del>CURRENT PROGRAMS</del>	<del>CONSULTANT SERVICES</del>	<del>PROPERTY AND SAFETY</del>

- ~~4. Policy Consistency~~
  - ~~— CCHE Plan Policies/Projections~~
  - ~~— Campus Role/Mission~~
  - ~~— Unique Degree Programs~~

- ~~4. Policy Consistency~~
  - ~~— CCHE Plan Policies/Projections~~
  - ~~— Campus Role/Mission~~
  - ~~— Unique Degree Programs~~

- ~~4. Policy Consistency~~
  - ~~— Extreme Hazard~~
  - ~~— Serious Hazard~~
  - ~~— Moderate Hazard~~

- ~~5. Program Workload~~
  - ~~— Enrollment Trends~~
  - ~~— Degrees Conferred~~

- ~~5. Facility Condition~~

- ~~5. Policy Consistency~~
  - ~~— CCHE Plan Policies/Projections~~
  - ~~— Campus Role/Mission~~
  - ~~— Unique Degree Programs~~

- ~~6. Facility Condition~~
  - ~~— Current Space Deficit~~
  - ~~— Consolidate Programs from Obsolete/ Congested Space~~
  - ~~— Refurbish/Update for Major Programs~~
  - ~~— Replace Terminated Space~~

- ~~6. Program Workload~~
  - ~~— Enrollment Trends~~

- ~~6. Program Workload~~
  - ~~— Enrollment Trends~~

~~Project ranking criteria are implemented in consultation with an advisory committee of governing board staffs.~~

**TOPIC:                   TEACHER EDUCATION AUTHORIZATION:  
METROPOLITAN STATE COLLEGE OF DENVER  
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT BOULDER  
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN COLORADO**

**PREPARED BY:   DIANE LINDNER**

**I.     SUMMARY**

CCHE, in conjunction with Colorado Department of Education, has reviewed the teacher education programs offered by fifteen Colorado colleges and universities. The protocol for the public colleges and universities is somewhat different from that of the private institutions. While the six statutory performance standards are the same, the Colorado Commission on Higher Education had the primary legislative responsibility for the analysis and summary of the findings for the public colleges and universities. The Colorado Department of Education reviewed e) mastery of skills and professional knowledge while CCHE analyzed (a) admission standards, (b) advising, (c) content of the major, (d) the quality of the field experience, and (f) assessment. The CDE had the primary responsibility for review of the private institutions while CCHE reviewed (d) the quality of the field experience. The Commission is responsible for the final approval authority for both public and private institutions.

Based on the recommendations from the teacher education review team, staff is recommending approval for teacher education programs offered by the following three public institutions:

- University of Southern Colorado
- Metropolitan State College of Denver
- University of Colorado at Boulder

**TOPIC: TEACHER EDUCATION AUTHORIZATION:  
METROPOLITAN STATE COLLEGE OF DENVER**

**PREPARED BY: DIANE LINDNER/SHARON M. SAMSON**

**I. SUMMARY**

CCHE, in conjunction with Colorado Department of Education, has been reviewing teacher education programs offered by Colorado colleges and universities. The staff has completed the site reviews and is forwarding the final teacher education program authorizations to the Commission for approval in May and June.

The agenda item provides an in-depth look at Metropolitan State College of Denver's (MSCD) teacher education programs and an evaluation of the quality of the program design and capacity to become a performance-based model. MSCD not only offers baccalaureate level programs at different licensure levels, but also offers post-baccalaureate programs.

The staff recommends approving teacher education authorization for Metropolitan State College of Denver's teacher education programs, including:

**LICENSURE LEVEL**

**DEGREE PROGRAM**

Elementary

Behavioral Sciences  
English  
History  
Speech Communications

Early Childhood

Behavioral Sciences  
English  
History  
Speech Communications

Secondary Education

Biology  
Behavioral Science  
Chicano Studies  
Chemistry  
Economics  
English  
Environmental Science  
History  
Mathematics  
Modern Language  
Political Science

K-12 Education

Art  
Music  
Physical Education

Special Education

Individual Degree Program\*\*  
Behavioral Science  
Speech Communications

**Note:** Post-baccalaureate in Elementary, Secondary, Early Childhood, Special Education.

\*\*The Individual Degree program is approved for six months for Special Education only to allow sufficient time for MSCD to submit a new degree proposal for Special Education with the understanding that the students will be counseled into the new Special Education degree program if the Commission should approve the degree.

**II. BACKGROUND**

The on-site visit occurred on February 12, 13 and 14, 2001. David Whaley, an education administrator from Colorado State University, read curriculum materials. The curriculum reviewer read the material and developed questions and areas needing investigation. The site review team met with the reader to discuss his findings and prepare for the visit. The site review team spent three days on the campus of Metropolitan State College of Denver. The review team included:

Carrie Ekey –	Lead Literacy Resource Specialist, Jefferson County School District
Dakota Hoyt –	Professional Development Director, Pueblo 60 School District
Jan Jensen –	Professional Development Coordinator, Northwest Regions
David Whaley –	Director of Teacher Licensure, CSU
Ray Kieft –	Senior Academic Officer, CCHE
Bill Ottey –	Assistant to the Commissioner, CDE
Diane Lindner –	K-16 Officer, CCHE

**III. STAFF ANALYSIS**

After careful review of the curricular materials submitted to support MSCD's request for teacher authorization and subsequent meetings to discuss preliminary findings, the review team has recommended authorization for four degree programs that lead to early childhood or elementary licensure, eleven degree programs leading to secondary licensure, three for special education and three for K-12 licensure. The reviewers looked for evidence of change and leadership, focusing on content, field experience and assessment. The Report of MSCD's Teacher Education Site Review (Attachment A) provides additional detail and it is accompanied by content analysis of MSCD's general

education curriculum and the degree programs that MSCD proposed for teacher education authorization.

The major elements supporting reauthorization include:

### Content

- Metropolitan State College of Denver has approached the implementation of the requirements of SB 99-154 in a comprehensive and thorough manner. The institution-wide nature of the reform is impressive, and the support of the entire college is a key to successful implementation. MSCD takes seriously its mission to provide quality teachers, particularly in urban areas. School district administrators expressed their satisfaction with the preparation of MSCD graduates hired to work in their schools
- The new computer assisted faculty advising system with the CAPP student academic plan allows a higher quality screening to occur.
- MSCD has designed a focused academic program for teacher education candidates, including its general education, the selected majors, and the field experiences. The curriculum is well planned and well paced. The program design should reduce the need for advising since the pathway to teacher education is clear.
- The student-centered approach to developing advising tools -- the electronic system designed to record student advising sessions -- demonstrates Metro's investment in improving the quality of advising.
- The innovative use of technology -- e.g., implementation of the *Virtual Professional Educator's Community* created by Drs Marion and Heuwinkel -- serves Metro's working student population and shares information among faculty and school/field experience sites. The student has access to this information when they are on campus, on-line, or in the field.
- MSCD's Secondary Education, Elementary Education, Early Childhood and Special Education have a focused curriculum, well-defined learning expectations, and opportunities to assess knowledge and skills. Strong emphasis is placed on writing, computing, and mathematics within the core competencies. The general education courses are carefully selected to ensure that all undergraduate students have a broad liberal arts foundation. The strengths of MSCD's general education program are in its oral and written communication as well as the integrated science mathematics and art/music courses.
- Content area faculty assisted in the redesign of the general education curriculum for the teacher education program and continue to work with the education faculty to complete the new programs. This faculty shows good understanding of the model content standards.

- The Provost formed a Leadership Team to focus on reforming the teacher education program to meet the CCHE/CDE requirements. This team focused on drawing together leaders from campus to give direction and provide institutional support. She also spearheaded “Well Educated Teacher” forums that allowed faculty from all disciplines to work on course content to ensure they included performance-based standards and their definitions of a well-education teacher. A team member described MSCD as an institution that is at the “end of the beginning,” reflecting the general understanding that the true tests of the quality of the teacher education programs are student performance and implementation.

### **Field Experience**

- MSCD has increased field experience hours and the quality of faculty interaction regarding the students’ performance in the classroom.
- The addition of Letters and Science faculty to field experience supervision will assure teacher candidates enter the profession able to teach content.
- MSCD has developed a professional development school model to serve approximately one-third of its teacher candidates. MSCD professors spend a day per week at each professional development school. Each professional development school has a coordinator overseeing the student teachers and field experiences at their schools.
- MSCD has developed two other kinds of partnerships with P-12 schools: Project and Host schools. These models offer solid experiences in classrooms for MSCD students. They provide opportunities for action research for students placed in Project schools and for a variety of experiences with diverse classroom learners throughout the Host schools in the metropolitan area. MSCD has developed strong placement options to fill the gap in the number of Professional Development School partnerships it has been able to place.
- MSCD has implemented training for its cooperating K-12 classroom teachers to focus on appropriate feedback and evaluation in a standards-based classroom.
- The elementary literacy program is strong, emphasizing student assessment and individualization of instruction.

### **Assessment**

- MSCD has worked in close collaboration with Dr. Del Shalock, Western Oregon State University, in developing Teacher Work Samples that will be piloted spring 2001. The work sample project has a strong assessment foundation and involves MSCD’s Letters, Arts, and Science faculty in the assessment of samples.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**That the Commission approve the reauthorization for Metropolitan State College of Denver's degree programs seeking teacher education licensure in Early Childhood, Elementary Education, Secondary Education, and Special Education with the understanding that all undergraduate teacher education candidates will be assessed in general education and that candidates to the post-baccalaureate program will pass a content test prior to admission.**

**TOPIC:                   TEACHER EDUCATION AUTHORIZATION:  
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT BOULDER**

**PREPARED BY:       DIANE LINDNER/SHARON M. SAMSON**

**I.       SUMMARY**

The agenda item provides an in-depth look at the University of Colorado at Boulder (UCB) teacher education programs, an evaluation of the quality of the program design, and its capacity to become a performance-based model. UCB offers baccalaureate and post-baccalaureate programs in elementary, secondary, and K-12 Music. In its materials, UCB describes the primary characteristic of its education program – ability to prepare teachers in (a) pedagogy, (b) education of students in a diverse society, and (c) professional obligations and dispositions of teachers in a democracy. UCB recommends approximately 225 teachers for licensure each year with approximately half in secondary education and half in elementary.

The strengths of the program are its field experience and professional knowledge courses. Its weakness is the slow transition to a performance-based model in which teacher education programs are content based and allow students to graduate in four years. This situation is partially attributed to a lack of leadership. Leadership and a common vision are particularly critical at a large institution when numerous departments are involved in preparing teachers. The Provost has recently assumed a leadership role in the design of teacher education, and consequently UCB has taken significant steps in making this transition.

After review of the submitted materials and the revised curriculum of degree programs, CCHE staff recommend approving the University of Colorado at Boulder's request for authorization in the following degree programs:

**LICENSURE LEVEL**

Elementary

**DEGREE PROGRAM**

Anthropology  
Biology (Distributive Studies)  
Chemistry (Distributive Studies)  
Communication  
Economics  
English  
Geography  
History  
Humanities  
Linguistics  
Mathematics

Secondary Education

Biology EPO  
Chemistry  
Communications  
English  
Geography  
History  
Humanities  
Linguistics  
Mathematics  
Political Science

Classics (Latin) French  
German  
Italian  
Japanese  
Russian  
Spanish

K-12

Music

Post-baccalaureate programs in elementary, secondary, and music education.

**II. BACKGROUND**

The on-site visit occurred November 27<sup>th</sup> through the 29<sup>th</sup>, 2000. Ann Foster, Poudre School District, and Janine Rider, Mesa State College, read curriculum materials. The curriculum reviewers read the material and developed questions and areas needing investigation. The site review team met with one of the readers to discuss his findings and prepare for the visit. The site review team spent three days on the campus of the University of Colorado at Boulder. The review team included:

Florence Arellano – Retired DPS principal  
Carrie Ekey – Literacy specialist, Aurora Public Schools  
Ann Foster – Poudre School District curriculum specialist  
Dick Keppe – Retired school superintendent  
Dorothy Snozek - Literacy Consultant, CCHE  
Bill Ottey – Assistant to the Commissioner, CDE  
Diane Lindner – K-16 Officer, CCHE

### **III. STAFF ANALYSIS**

After review of the curricular materials submitted to support UCB's request for teacher authorization and subsequent meetings to discuss preliminary findings, the review team has recommended authorization for eleven degree programs that lead to elementary licensure, sixteen degree programs leading to secondary licensure, and a K-12 Music program. The reviewers looked for evidence of change and leadership, focusing on content, field experience and assessment. The Report of UCB's Teacher Education Site Review (Attachment A) provides the findings and is accompanied by content analysis of UCB's general education curriculum and the degree programs that the review team recommended teacher education authorization.

The factors supporting reauthorization include:

#### **Content**

UCB has identified and prescribed the general education course requirements that provide prospective elementary education candidates with breadth of knowledge in writing, mathematics, science, and social studies.

UCB has introduced strong technology in its professional knowledge courses.

The professional knowledge courses are a solid balance of theory, methods, and field experiences. UCB has revised its courses to provide blocks where students learn about standards, instruction and assessment and have opportunities to test this knowledge in the K-12 classroom.

#### **Field Experience**

The core strengths of UCB's education program are its partner school network and its continuing efforts to establish professional development school sites. These provide teacher candidates with a comprehensive experience of all activities that classroom teachers need to know about classroom instruction and management and opportunities to test and refine these skills. Each student has the opportunity to deliver instruction, demonstrate how to adapt content knowledge to content standards, develop assessment tools to evaluate achievement of content standards and diagnose learning difficulties. They also work and communicate with parents about student progress, identify deficiencies, and must modify instruction to respond to student learning needs.

UCB, in its own review, identified that K-12 cooperating teachers may not be prepared to serve as master teachers. To address this weakness, UCB defined selection criteria and expectations for cooperating teachers. However, the School of Education recognizes that despite clear expectations, the school district culture may prevail for a short period of time and affect how cooperating teachers are chosen. UCB has piloted a course for

teachers to prepare them to function as effective cooperating teachers in a standards-based environment. If this summer's pilot program is successful, UCB plans to implement this course in other districts as a requirement for cooperating teacher selection and student placement.

### **Assessment**

Beginning in 2001-02, undergraduate students will be required to take and pass the PLACE content test prior to the student teaching. UCB will analyze PLACE content test sub-scores to identify students with insufficient content knowledge and counsel these students into the appropriate "leveling" courses. Modification to UCB's advising system will identify students who failed the PLACE exam on the first attempt and provide appropriate support.

Students understand assessment and assessment practices. They have many opportunities to apply assessment knowledge in the K-12 classroom.

The components that are still in transition include:

### **Student Issues**

The teacher education advising forms, teacher education checklists, and the college catalog provided different information. The mixed information is somewhat attributed to the fact that UCB had not redesigned its teacher education programs to meet the standards at the time of the site review. The mixed information made the content analysis a complicated process. The reviewers concluded that if professionals have difficulty dealing with conflicting information, students will be similarly confused. Interviewed students confirmed that the advising was very confusing and that even faculty advisors were unsure of the course requirements under the old system. To alleviate this problem, UCB has agreed to (1) republish its advising forms and teacher education checklists after June 2001 when the authorization is concluded, and (2) identify the general education required courses in bold in its 2002-2003 college catalog (catalogs go to print in February of each year).

### **Assessment**

UCB has not developed a comprehensive assessment plan for its teacher education candidates. The areas that UCB must address prior to fall 2001 are as follows:

- select a general education assessment tool (e.g., ETS Academic Profile, CAAP)
- UCB does not assess content knowledge of its post-baccalaureate or masters' candidates prior to admission. UCB must require that prospective candidates pass a content exam prior to admission.

**IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**That the Commission approve the reauthorization for the University of Colorado at Boulder's degree programs seeking teacher education licensure in Elementary Education, Secondary Education, and K-12 Music Education with the understanding that all undergraduate teacher candidates will be assessed in general education and that candidates to the post-baccalaureate program will pass a content test prior to admission.**

**TOPIC: TEACHER EDUCATION AUTHORIZATION:  
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN COLORADO**

**PREPARED BY: DIANE LINDNER/SHARON M. SAMSON**

**I. SUMMARY**

The agenda item provides an in-depth look at the University of Southern Colorado's (USC) teacher education programs and an evaluation of the quality of the program design and capacity to become a performance-based model. USC not only offers baccalaureate level programs at different licensure levels, but also offers post-baccalaureate programs. It licenses approximately 100 teacher education candidates per year students, with the majority seeking licensure at the elementary level.

The staff recommends approving teacher education authorization for the University of Southern Colorado's teacher education programs, including:

<b>LICENSURE LEVEL</b>	<b>DEGREE PROGRAM</b>
<u>Elementary</u>	Liberal Studies**
<u>Secondary Education</u>	English Mathematics Biology Chemistry Physics History Political Science Spanish
<u>K-12 Education</u>	Art Music Physical Education

\*Post-baccalaureate in all of the above

\*\*Pending Commission review in June

**II. BACKGROUND**

The on-site visit occurred on January 18 and 19, 2001. The curriculum reviewers, Ann Foster (serving a joint appointment with Colorado State University and Poudre School District) and Bill Wiener (Metropolitan State College) read curriculum materials and developed questions and areas needing investigation. The site review team met with one of the readers to discuss his findings and prepare for the visit. The site review team spent two days on the campus of the University of Southern Colorado. The review team included:

Jan Henwood – retired assistant superintendent  
Bill Wiener – MSCD/Director, Lab School at Lookout Mountain

Carol Wilson – Executive Director, Colorado Partnership for Educational  
Renewal  
Dorothy Snozek – CCHE  
Bill Ottey – Assistant to the Commissioner, CDE  
Diane Lindner – CCHE

### **III. STAFF ANALYSIS**

The outstanding characteristic of USC teacher education program is that is not a redesign of an old program but a complete design around the six statutory performance standards. The detailed analysis of each standard and the evidence supporting it is contained in the Report of the Teacher Education Review Team ([Attachment A](#)). The report is supported by content analysis of USC's General Education curriculum and its degree programs that are seeking teacher education authorization. The actions and evidence that support USC's authorization request include:

#### **Content**

- USC designed a Liberal Studies degree program to address the content requirements for elementary education candidates. This degree replaces the fifteen degree programs that students formerly used to meet elementary education licensure.
- USC selected eight degree programs for secondary licensure in English, Mathematics, three science degree programs, three social studies degree programs and one foreign language degree program.
- USC has exemplary technology integrated in the curriculum. It has received numerous grants to develop the technology.
- USC's has implemented a proficiency-based admission system and remedial screening early in the students' academic career.
- The University of Southern Colorado's education faculty's advising plan assures that all students have selected a major, have been assigned advisors as appropriate, and have a defined academic plan. The student data management system electronically documents and monitors student progress in program completion, field experience, and records advisement issues and recommendations.
- USC has three advising checkpoints during the education program, which means that students are knowledgeable on required proficiencies and curricula. These systems help students plan their program of study enough in advance to graduate in the four year time period specified under the statute.
- If a student is identified as needing special assistance, an *Intervention Plan* is co-developed by the student and faculty advisor that identifies the standards/benchmarks the student is not meeting and sets goals, action steps and a date for the next progress review.

- USC has developed a successful collaboration between the liberal arts and sciences and education faculty and administration. The Teacher Education Board, consisting of faculty from across the institution, provides for ongoing dialogue and exchange of information across academic disciplines. In addition, the K–12 faculty and administration are supportive of and demonstrate a continued desire to provide quality and meaningful experiences for the teacher education candidates of the University of Southern Colorado.

#### **Field Experience**

- Interviews with faculty and administrators from partner and professional development schools indicated that a significant training effort has been made in the K-12 partner schools to assure consistent supervision of teacher candidates in the field, teacher work sample development and CDE performance-measures for teachers.

#### **Assessment**

- Within each of the teacher education programs of the University of Southern Colorado, the curriculum addresses the assessment of student content mastery. The assessment piece is student-centered and, although still in pilot testing, shows the commitment of the institution to a performance-based program.

#### **The areas that need development**

USC needs to continue to focus on the assessment practices and assessment results. The PLACE pass rates will be critical performance indicators of the new program design. A recent change in leadership means that USC has a new Provost. To implement the new integrated program design, USC will need the full support of the institution for its students to master content knowledge and apply it in the K-12 classroom.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**That the Commission approve the University of Southern Colorado's request for teacher education authorization in elementary, secondary and K-12 licensure with the understanding that teacher education candidates will be assessed in general education and that candidates to the post-baccalaureate programs pass the content examination prior to admission.**

# **COLORADO COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION**

## **Report of On-Site Review Team Teacher Education**

### **UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN COLORADO**

#### **Statutory Performance Measure:**

##### **a. Admission System**

**(Comprehensive admission system, which includes screening and counseling for students who are considering becoming teacher candidates.)**

#### **General Comments:**

- (1) The University of Southern Colorado has defined the admission criteria for undergraduate teacher education students. The admission criteria include:
  - a minimum 2.60 grade point average of all postsecondary work
  - completion of English 101 and 102 with grades of C or better
  - completion of math 109 or a math course required by the major field with a grade of B or better (math prerequisites may also be satisfied with higher level coursework)
  - completion of Speech Communication 103 with a grade of B or better, or, with a grade of C and satisfactory completion of an oral proficiency exam
  - completion of Education 301 with a grade of C or better
  - a portfolio showing materials developed in university classes which demonstrate proficiency on specific education standards
  - recommendations and evaluations from teachers
  - materials used in field experiences and videos of teaching
  - essays on teaching as a career that pinpoint issues students have identified during their early field experiences
  - a passing score on the ETS Academic Profile
- (2) Admitted students receive a handbook identifying steps to complete the program.
- (3) USC has negotiated a transfer agreement with Pueblo Community College. It has developed a transfer policy to support the agreement.
- (4) Post baccalaureate students are required to complete and pass the long form of the Academic Profile as a requirement for admission. The PLACE content exam must be passed prior to student teaching.
- (5) Students entering the post-baccalaureate program must complete the core coursework prescribed by one of USC's majors authorized for teacher education.
- (6) Student records are kept and maintained. Records include documentation for formal admission, deficiencies, incomplete status and successful completion. Standards for

each process are documented and evidence has been provided that students are treated equitably. Each degree program has published a planning document that describes the specific academic and professional expectations of its teacher candidates..

(7) USC has published the graduation requirements for its teacher education programs.

**Sources of Evidence:**

Student file review, meetings with current and past students, meetings with faculty and administrators. Program planning sheets, demonstrating the four-year graduation plan. Students have verified that the counseling system for education candidates is in place.

**Strengths:**

USC has set a high standard for admission to teacher education. The admission system is proficiency-based and helps assure that students are prepared to begin the professional knowledge sequence.

**Weaknesses:**

There are no weaknesses identified in this area.

**Statutory Performance Measure:**

**b. Ongoing Screening and Counseling of teacher candidates by practicing teachers or faculty members.**

**General Comments:**

- (1) The counseling process includes individual advisement and monitoring of teacher candidates. An academic advisor and a teacher education advisor are assigned to each student.
- (2) All education courses with admissions prerequisites require the signature of a faculty member in education. Because of this requirement, students must see advisors each semester to plan their next semester's schedule.
- (3) To facilitate the monitoring of student academic progress, the university has designed an online advising system; implementation began in January, 2001.
- (4) USC has defined the graduation requirements for each teacher preparation program. These requirements are listed in academic advisement and long term planning sheets.

- (5) USC has developed an advising system with checkpoints at three stages of the program. An early warning system and response plan is in place to assist students having difficulty with the curriculum.
- (6) Advising records, when online, will be kept and maintained in a central program area with specific reference to advice provided and actions taken throughout the student's program.
- (7) USC's post-baccalaureate program is designed to address content deficiencies using content area exams and transcript reviews. Post-baccalaureate students must have comparable coursework to the core required in the USC's approved teacher education majors. If a student's transcript shows a gap in necessary content, leveling coursework is required.
- (8) To facilitate each student's academic progress, online systems and faculty advisors monitor students' progress including unmet programmatic requirements. Advising records are kept and maintained in a central program area and in the teacher education program offices.

**Sources of Evidence:**

Student file review, meetings with current and past students, meetings with faculty and administrators. Academic advising sheets, long term planning guides and a demonstration of the on-line advising/student data system provided additional evidence.

**Strengths:**

The University of Southern Colorado's education faculty's advising plan assures that all students have selected a major, have been assigned advisors as appropriate, and have a defined academic plan. Noted above is a successful admission and counseling process that was evidenced by the on-site team members and the follow-up verification with students.

To maintain the level of processing necessary for the admissions and advising system, an on-line monitoring system is designed and implementation of the system is expected this semester. A careful analysis of records on site and discussions with students verified that a precise process is used for admission to teacher education, information is published within the student handbook for teacher education and that students are aware of the policies.

USC's two-part advising system assures that students receive the counseling necessary for success.

USC's three checkpoints during their education program means that students are knowledgeable on required proficiencies and curricula.

The student data management system electronically documents and monitors student progress in program completion, field experience, and records advisement issues and recommendations.

If a student is identified as needing special assistance, an *Intervention Plan* is co-developed by the student and faculty advisor that identifies the standards/benchmarks the student is not meeting and sets goals, action steps and a date for the next progress review.

**Weaknesses:**

Advising sheets are not maintained consistently except for post-baccalaureate students.

The number of students assigned each advisor is uneven – between 29 and 123 advisees are assigned to advisors.

Student data information is difficult to track. The implementation of an automated system will be helpful to students and faculty.

**Statutory Performance Measure:**

**c. Course work and field based training that integrates theory and practice (i.e. early field experience) and educates teacher candidates in the methodologies, practices and procedures of teaching standards-based education.**

**General Comments:**

(1) Teacher education programs in elementary, secondary, art, and physical education are designed so that students can complete them within four years or eight semesters. Students in music education must adhere to the plan as well as monitor all prerequisites and general education requirements. Music program hours range from 131-135 semester hours.

(2) Program completion plans were submitted and reviewed; students received plans directly from an academic advisor or from the advising center. However, some students were uncertain of specific program changes or course substitutions. This uncertainty was evident with students who were in the midst of program changes from old to new.

(3) A new interdisciplinary liberal studies major has been submitted for program approval and will be utilized as the only major permitted for undergraduate students in elementary education. To date, that program has not received approval and remains in process. Specific analysis has been completed for each of the remaining majors in secondary and K-12 art, music and physical education. Content analyses are included within the appendices to this report.

(4) The liberal arts and sciences faculty have redesigned many courses to meet the Colorado Department of Education Performance Based Standards in elementary, secondary, music, art and physical education. The Teacher Education Board was formed to ensure that content is taught appropriately. The involvement of the arts and science faculty in the teacher education program will assist the USC in improving the PLACE content scores of its students as well as align curriculum with the K-12 model content standards.

The curricula of the following degree programs are designed to align with the content knowledge needed by K-12 teachers:

Elementary: Liberal Studies  
Secondary: English  
Mathematics  
Biology

- K-12
- Chemistry
  - Physics
  - History
  - Political Science
  - Spanish
  - Art
  - Music
  - Physical Education

\* The Liberal Studies major will be considered by the Commission on Higher Education at their June meeting.

On the content performance measure, the areas are identified by program in the following table.

<b>Teacher Education Authorization</b>	<b>Degree Program</b>	<b>General Education</b>	<b>Content of Major</b>	<b>Professional Knowledge</b>
Elementary	Liberal Studies*	See general education analysis	See content analysis	<p>The professional knowledge courses each contain a field experience component that provides a structured and developmental progression of experiences: observation of effective learning to teach experiences focused on specific topics; opportunities to participate in field experiences working with children; preparing and teaching lessons; classroom teaching; and assessment, diagnosis and parent communication.</p> <p>Class instructors supervise early field experiences. As field experiences move to teaching lessons, the field experience teacher and class instructor supervise the planning and teaching. USC is piloting a model in which content faculty and education faculty supervise student teaching; these faculty also have public school teaching experience; they integrate into content methods courses. Supervision occurs through on-site teaching, mentoring and web-based discussions as well as videotapes and written analysis.</p>
	Post-	NA	NA – see	Post-baccalaureate professional

	baccalaureate		admission assessment	knowledge follows the undergraduate program sequence.
Secondary	English Mathematics Biology Chemistry Physics History Political Science Spanish		See content analysis	Every professional education course includes a standards-based field experience. Training is being conducted for cooperating teachers to assist them in supervising students in their field experiences. Content and education faculty have public school teaching experience that they integrate into content methods courses. District 60 staff are housed at USC and participate heavily in design and supervision of field experiences. During student teaching, candidates are required to participate in professional development activities outside the formal classroom instruction including faculty in service and workshops. Supervision occurs through on-site teaching, mentoring and web-based discussions, as well as videotapes and written feedback.  Field experience placement structures provide teacher candidates with an opportunity to teach in and understand diverse educational settings. Candidates have semester-long experiences within the partner schools that provide experiences working within the classrooms of trained cooperating teachers.
K-12: Art	Art	See general education analysis	See content analysis	The K-12 professional knowledge component closely imitates the secondary sequence except there is a wider range of course work and field experience as is practical for the increased number of grade levels.
K-12: Music	Music	See general education analysis	See content analysis	
K-12: Physical Education	Physical Education	See general education analysis	See content analysis	

**Weaknesses:**

USC has been diligent in the redesign of their program to integrate theory and practice through new curriculum reflected in revised syllabi and redesigned field experiences. Field experiences, while integrated into every professional knowledge course, should include assignments that are more directly aligned with the course content and standards.

USC Teacher Education On-Site Review Team Report  
Page 8  
Date 4/30/01

**Statutory Performance Measure:**

**d. Each candidate completes a minimum of 800 hours of field experience that relates to predetermined learning standards.**

**General Comments:**

- (1) In the elementary, secondary and K-12 licensure areas, consistency was evident for the program design as a whole. Hours were clearly defined, predetermined learning standards were identified and lessons taught and the faculty follow through into the classroom was evident in the discussions with the students and faculty. Students are prepared on-campus prior to the experience with easily identifiable goals transferred to the classroom settings. All performance-based teacher education standards are addressed during student teaching, where a teacher Work Sample is being developed as a requirement. Student teachers are expected to be on-site, working a teacher's schedule for a minimum of 590 consecutive hours.
- (2) Criteria have been established for both the selection of the field site and of the cooperating teacher. USC has established formal partnerships with Pueblo District 60, which is an urban school district and Pueblo District 70, which rings the city of Pueblo and serves the rural areas of Pueblo County. In fall, 1999, USC formed additional partnerships with school districts in southeastern Colorado, creating the Southern Colorado Teacher Education Alliance with seventeen school districts supporting a regional model for teacher education. A distance education network has been developed to facilitate supervision of student teachers and provide development opportunities for beginning teachers and other K-12 faculty.
- (3) The University recently became a member of the Renaissance Group, a consortium of universities noted for teacher education programs and designed to improve the education of teachers on member campuses. The University has also received funding for development of partner relationships with K-12 schools that allows the K-12 schools to be active participants in redesigning the teacher education program, supervising student teachers, and assisting in the integration of Teacher Work Samples into field experiences.
- (4) District 60 involves a stronger alliance in that the curriculum directors from the district are housed at the University. District staff participate as members of the teacher education faculty and plan joint activities for education students. The Pueblo School for Arts and Science, a District 60 charter school, is housed on the USC campus and the university holds the school's charter.
- (5) Each student has the opportunity to deliver instruction, demonstrate how to adapt content knowledge to content standards, develop assessment tools to evaluate achievement of content standards and diagnose learning difficulties. They also work

and communicate with parents about student progress and deficiencies and must change teaching styles to respond to student learning needs.

Following are the identified licensure areas, required field experience hours and student dispositions. Each teacher education program meets or exceeds the 800 required field experience hours with defined student expectations. On site visitations to K-12 partner schools verified active and quality participation by faculty.

Teacher Education Authorization	Level of Field Experience	Frequency	Scope	Intensity
Elementary	Freshmen	0 Hours		
	Sophomore	60 Hours	Observations	Early observations allow students to examine the reality of teaching as a profession. They also see different schooling structures, administrative processes and models.
	Junior	150 Hours	Developing lessons	The student begins individual and small group instruction in a partner school that could be a charter, public or private school in the Pueblo area. Teacher candidates work with students on literacy skills including reading, writing, speaking, listening and mathematics. Teacher candidates will tutor, provide resource materials, instruct and prepare students for CSAP tests.
	Senior	590 Hours of Student Teaching  80 Hours of Literacy and Language Arts in the first semester prior to student teaching	Large Group instruction and assessment and Student teaching	The student is the primary instructor and the focus is on classroom management, assessment of students, instruction, post assessment and modification of instruction techniques.  Student teachers are expected to be on site, working a teacher's schedule for eight weeks in a pre-school setting and eight weeks in an elementary (K-3) setting. Teacher work samples tied to student learning are used extensively during this experience.

Total		880 Hours		
Secondary and K-12	Freshmen	0 Hours		
	Sophomore	60 Hours	Observation, Tutoring	Observation and tutoring
	Junior	90-120 Hours	Developing lessons, direct Experience	Teacher candidates provide individual and small group instruction in a Pueblo partner school that could be a charter (on campus), public or private school in the Pueblo area. Teacher candidates work with students on literacy skills including reading, writing, speaking, listening and mathematics. Teacher candidates will tutor, provide resource materials, instruct and assist in preparing students for CSAP tests.
	Senior	590 Hours in Student teaching  30 Hours in Teaching Diverse Learners the semester prior to student teaching	Student Teaching	The student is the primary instructor. Field sites are in High School professional development schools that have formal partnership arrangements with the University. Candidates focus on teacher work samples related to student learning, classroom management, delivery of instruction, assessment and modification of instruction techniques to fit student learning.  Student teachers are on site, working a teacher's schedule for an entire semester.
Total		800 Hours		
	Post-Baccalaureate Project Promise	800 Hours to 880Hours	Observation, Direct Experience	Individual instruction, group lessons, student primary instructor. The quality of the field experience mimics those in the undergraduate program but can be accelerated for the non-traditional student.

- (6) In meetings, observations and discussions with K-12 faculty and administrators at each licensure level, it is evident that positive role models are present for student teachers and students within the field experience components. Criteria are in place and strong role models available to students in most field experiences.

- (7) All early field experiences are a component of an education course at USC. Elementary licensure program students complete a minimum of 260 early field experience hours and secondary and K-12 licensure program students complete a minimum of 220 hours. Because the early field experiences are all tied to coursework, the student has the opportunity to link practice to theory.
- (8) One goal of the field experience program is that students complete field experiences in different environments, with students at the variety of levels at which they will become certified. The classroom teachers supervise early field experiences and complete a formal evaluation at the end of the field experience. Some faculty require midterm evaluations; all evaluations become part of the student's permanent record.

### **Sources of Evidence:**

A review was completed of the field experience requirements for each teacher preparation area as they related to pre-determined learning standards. Syllabi provided the basis for analysis of student experiences with many specifically defining how that is to occur. Sample formats were available in many with the direct alignment to content standards. Preparation of students for the field experiences was completed at a variety of levels for student transitions within the programs.

### **Strengths:**

Noted above is a successful collaboration between the liberal arts and sciences and education faculty and administration. The Teacher Education Board provides for an appropriate dialogue and exchange of information across academic disciplines. In addition, the K-12 faculty and administration are supportive of and demonstrate a continued desire to provide quality and meaningful experiences for the teacher education candidates of the University of Southern Colorado.

Interviews with faculty and administrators from partner and professional development schools indicated that a significant training effort has been made in the K-12 partner schools to assure consistent supervision of teacher candidates in the field, teacher work sample development and CDE performance-measures for teachers.

The proficiency of students in the standard elements is assessed throughout the program assuring that the candidate is proficient at time of entry into the profession. These assessments continue to be designed and pilot tested.

### **Weaknesses:**

University faculty are not actively involved in the supervision of early field experiences.. A better connection between K-12 staff and university faculty for supervision of these field experiences would benefit the student.

USC Teacher Education On-Site Review Team Report

Page 14

Date 4/30/01

The initial work with partner schools is promising, and a vision for well developed partner schools exists. USC is encouraged to continue the developmental process, moving to full partner schools/professional development schools. Engaging the schools in the development ensures understanding and collaborative implementation.

**Statutory Performance Measure:**

**e. Demonstrate the skills required for licensure as specified by the State Board.**

**General Comments:**

- (1) A curriculum review of each degree program by CCHE/CDE Review Team was completed to ensure that the curriculum provides sufficient preparation in the professional content standards with the students and faculty.

**LITERACY** – Teacher candidates testified to the significant interaction with USC faculty during this field experience. Teacher candidates are tested on phonology and linguistic processes. Best practices are an integral part of courses which appear to successfully transfer to the teacher candidates' field experiences. Training in instructional strategies in language arts that emphasize writing, vocabulary and spelling, as well as reading, are important. USC should strive to provide these field experiences in schools in the area that are making good progress in literacy achievement, and that make extensive use of data to drive and improve instruction.

Also available for USC candidates is a reading minor which provides in-depth analysis and development in literacy. One-third of elementary candidates typically pursue a reading minor.

**MATHEMATICS AND MATH LITERACY** – The elementary mathematics sequence includes twelve hours of mathematics, with a statistics course and two courses targeted specifically to the elementary mathematics concepts of the model content standards. There are no waivers from the mathematics requirement. A placement test is given in mathematics and those who are not proficient are assigned to a leveling course.

**CONTENT STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT** – USC curriculum uses standards consistently in coursework. Assessment techniques are infused throughout the professional education coursework and field experience. Standards and assessments are introduced early in the Frameworks of Teaching course.

**CONTENT** - In the professional knowledge curricula, the knowledge base was evident through syllabi and course descriptions. Content analyses have been completed for each degree program requested for teacher education authorization. These analyses are attached to this report.

**CLASSROOM AND INSTRUCTIONAL MANAGEMENT** - On site review and discussions with students and faculty and administrators of the participating

schools provided a clear understanding that these areas were appropriately met via university preparation and the concomitant work within the school setting.

**INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION** – The knowledge and application of the assessment components within licensure areas supports the individualization of instruction. USC infuses skills for dealing with diverse learners throughout the curriculum. Teacher candidates and graduates serve a diverse population of students. English language learners make up a significant portion of the K-12 enrollment in the partner school districts. The USC graduates frequently teach in the Pueblo area and need skills to effectively teach English language learners.

**TECHNOLOGY** – USC has made great progress in the area of technology. All faculty members are trained in using the Electronic Blackboard, which can be reached by any modem having Internet access. The university has over twenty multimedia classrooms and fourteen multimedia carts. Laptop computers are available for wireless Internet access in the classrooms. There is technology equipment available for teacher candidates to take to the field. USC is connected to the seventeen school district partners. USC models the use of technology by infusing it throughout the teacher preparation program.

**EDUCATIONAL GOVERNANCE** – The Foundation of Education and the Frameworks of Teaching courses address the elements of this standard. Professional ethics, including the honoring of contracts, are important aspects of this standard.

#### **Sources of Evidence:**

Verification of the strength and breadth of understanding of the curriculum to successfully teach in the Colorado standards based classroom was determined by review of student materials, syllabi, individual meetings with current and past students, faculty and the K-12 classroom teachers and administrators

#### **Strengths:**

Evident throughout the review of plans, portfolios and meetings was preparation of students to meet the Colorado professional content standards. The Elementary, K-12 and Secondary education licensure components have successfully addressed each of those components.

#### **Weaknesses:**

USC should ensure that field experiences tied to literacy coursework occurs in schools that have made good progress in literacy achievement and that make extensive use of data to drive and improve instruction.

Teacher candidates need to learn diagnostic testing methods and how to use that data to improve instructional strategies. Additional attention in using assessment data to design individual student plans would be helpful to candidates.

School district personnel could do more work with teacher candidates on coping skills, particularly time and stress management.

PLACE content test scores are low for students exiting the USC teacher preparation program. The redesign of the teacher education program focusing on content standards should improve student scores. Careful monitoring of scores and immediate response by faculty to improve weak areas will assist faculty make appropriate curriculum changes.

#### **Statutory Performance Measure:**

#### **f. Comprehensive assessment of candidate's knowledge of subject matter.**

##### **General Comments:**

The team examined the assessment of subject matter in three settings – general education, content knowledge of the teacher candidate demonstrated in the college classroom, and the ability to apply the knowledge in the K-12 classroom. In some cases, the information provided in the binders was supplemented with faculty interviews.

The PLACE content test is required prior to student teaching to ensure content knowledge. Ongoing course content analysis allows the teacher education program faculty to assess the content through course syllabi and student grades. Students must have a 2.6 grade point average for entry to the teacher education program. Entry to the teacher education program also mandates that students complete mathematics and English coursework.

The program standards and evaluation inventory for each standard are included as part of the Program Portfolio on teacher education's web site. The Program Portfolio provides students with a model for their work. It also provides samples for faculty as they evaluate student work.

USC's evaluation process is designed with in-depth evaluations at three points in the student's career: at application for admission to teacher education, at application for student teaching and at program completion. These assessments are included in the on-line student information system.

USC also does a one-year follow up of teachers who graduated from the institution and use their response to evaluate teacher education program curricula and field experience.

**Sources of Evidence:**

Student work samples, meetings with current and past students, meetings with university faculty and administrators, university class visitations, and PLACE exam scores.

**Strengths:**

- Within each component of the teacher education programs of the University of Southern Colorado, the curriculum defines and addresses the assessment of student content mastery. The assessment piece is student-centered and, although still in pilot testing, shows the commitment of the institution to a performance-based program.
- The site team visited the field experience locations and saw how the teacher candidates demonstrate knowledge of content during the field experiences.
- The Teacher Education Board provides for an appropriate dialogue and exchange of information across academic disciplines. In addition, the K–12 faculty and administration are supportive of and demonstrate a continued desire to provide quality and meaningful experiences for the teacher education candidates of the University of Southern Colorado.

**Weaknesses:**

USC needs to develop an assessment plan that tracks a teacher candidate through the teacher preparation program from admission to recommendation for licensure.

The following chart identifies assessment strengths and weaknesses in the program design. If not noted as excellent or missing, the assessment is acceptable.

Teacher Education Authorization	Degree Program	General Education	Content of Major	Professional Knowledge
Elementary Secondary	Liberal Studies*	ETS Academic Profile long form	PLACE content exam prior to student teaching and course assessments	<p>The USC uses the following assessments to evaluate the students' mastery of teaching skills and knowledge:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teacher Work Samples</li> <li>• Student Teaching Observations and Evaluations</li> <li>• Portfolio Assessment</li> <li>• Course Assessment</li> </ul> <p>Assessments will be part of the electronic student data management system currently being piloted.</p> <p>USC faculty assess teacher education candidates in the field, guide their learning, and provide feedback on ways to improve the quality of teaching. Pre-student teaching field experiences are monitored and supervised by faculty. Student teachers are observed and evaluated four times by the cooperating teacher and four times by the university supervisors (content and education). Further, an assessment seminar and a professional relations seminar guide students to better understand assessments and professional careers in teaching.</p> <p>A record of each student's progress toward proficiency in the performance-based teacher education standards will be maintained on CSU's electronic inventory.</p>

K-12: Art	Art			<p>USC uses the following assessments to evaluate the students' mastery of teaching skills and knowledge:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teacher Work Samples</li> <li>• Student Teaching Observations and Evaluations</li> <li>• Portfolio Assessment</li> <li>• Course Assessment</li> </ul> <p>USC faculty assess students in the field, providing feedback and consultation to improve the quality of their teaching.</p> <p>Pre-student teaching field experiences are monitored and supervised by the classroom teacher.</p> <p>Student teachers are observed and evaluated four times by the cooperating K-12 teacher and four times by the university supervisors (content and education).</p> <p>USC's electronic inventory system will maintain a record of each student's progress toward proficiency in the performance-based teacher education standards.</p>
K-12: Music	Music Education			

**TOPIC:                   TEACHER EDUCATION AUTHORIZATION:  
                              COLORADO CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY  
                              COLORADO COLLEGE  
                              UNIVERSITY OF DENVER  
                              REGIS UNIVERSITY**

**PREPARED BY:       DIANE LINDNER**

**I.       SUMMARY**

CCHE, in conjunction with Colorado Department of Education, has reviewed the teacher education programs offered by fifteen Colorado colleges and universities. The protocol for the private colleges differs somewhat from that of the public colleges and universities. While the six statutory performance standards are the same, the Colorado Department of Education had the primary responsibility for the analysis and summary of the findings for the private colleges. The Commission reviewed (d) the quality of the field experience while CDE analyzed (a) admission standards, (b) advising, (c) content of the major, (e) mastery of skills and professional knowledge, and (f) assessment. The four-year completion rule was not applicable to students enrolled in private colleges.

CCHE in its review of the supervised field experience, ensured that each institution had the mandatory 800 hours of field experience during the program and that the field experience incorporated the learning required for teacher candidates to be successful in their teaching career. Attached are the analyses of performance indicator (d) -- the field experience within the teacher education programs for:

1. The Colorado Christian University
2. Colorado College
3. University of Denver
4. Regis University

The Commission is responsible for the final approval authority for both public and private institutions. Final recommendation for teacher education authorization is pending receipt of the site review findings.



Faculty supervision and practical teaching should occur on-site with involvement of the university and school district. The 800 hours of field experience must relate to predetermined learning standards.

### **III. STAFF ANALYSIS**

#### **General Comments:**

- (1) In the elementary, secondary and K-12 licensure areas, hours were clearly defined, predetermined learning standards were identified with lessons taught and the education faculty involvement in the classroom was evident in the discussions with the students and faculty. Students are prepared on-campus prior to the experience with easily identifiable goals transferred to the classroom settings. All performance-based teacher education standards are addressed during student teaching, where a teacher candidate must demonstrate competence in the Performance-Based Standards. Student teaching is designed to encompass Teacher Work Samples. Student teachers are expected to be on-site, working a teacher's schedule for 560 hours.
- (2) Colorado Christian University has three early field experiences that tie theory to practice: Field I, Field II and Field III. The university upgraded the activities in those experiences during the redesign of their program to make them more aligned with standards.
- (3) Prior to student teaching, students must take the PLACE content examination and complete all degree requirements while maintaining a GPA of 2.75.
- (4) Professional education coursework integrates theory and practice with field experiences in many professional knowledge courses. Field experiences in the program constitute a total of 850 hours for elementary, 806 for secondary and 806 hours for LPE, Licensing Program for Educators.
- (5) Colorado Christian University has defined criteria to identify and select K-12 teachers as cooperating teachers for the field experience assuring that each classroom placement fosters the type of field experiences that teacher candidates need. Colorado Christian has a very strong relationship with the Jefferson County School District.
- (6) During the field experiences, students have the opportunity to deliver instruction, demonstrate how to adapt content knowledge to content standards, develop assessment tools to evaluate achievement of content standards and diagnose learning difficulties. They also work and communicate with parents about student progress and deficiencies and must change teaching styles to respond to student learning needs.

Following are the identified licensure areas, required field experience hours and student dispositions. Each program is at or above the 800 required field experience hours and has defined student expectations. On site visitations to K-12 partner schools verified active and quality participation by education faculty. Discussions with existing students and

alumni indicated an enthusiastic response to the preparation for the teaching they received (or are receiving) at Colorado Christian University.

Teacher Education Authorization	Level of Field Experience	Frequency	Scope	Intensity
Elementary	Freshmen	60 Hours	Early mentoring; observation. Developing lessons and small group instruction	<p>A cooperating teacher trained by CCU supervises this Field I experience. The student is expected to interact with children and school personnel. The student assists reading groups, provides assistance to students one-on-one, prepares bulletin boards and teaching materials and is encouraged to teach the total class at least one of the two lessons required for the first field experience.</p> <p>University faculty are in the classroom twice to observe and provide feedback to the student.</p>
	Sophomore	70 Hours	Instruction of small group, design and assessment of student learning goals and some classroom responsibility.	<p>The Field II experience provides students the opportunity to make a "final" career decision. The student is asked to take a more active role in the class and reflect upon the theory and practice as they observe cooperating teachers and practice theory. To reinforce this, two seminars are held during this experience; these seminars focus on theories regarding preparation of lesson plans, instructional sequence, class management, and interviewing techniques.</p> <p>Students are expected to teach two lessons to the total group and are observed by the faculty supervisor. Lessons must be in a content area such as literacy, mathematics, science or social studies. A video is made of one lesson taught.</p> <p>Both the supervising faculty and the cooperating teacher uses a standard-based and dispositional evaluation form. This evaluation is used to assist the student in making a decision on whether teaching is the</p>

			best career choice.
Junior	80 Hours in Field III  40 Hours with Course-work	Teach lessons to small groups and full classroom	Field III requires forty hours in two-week blocks immediately preceding student teaching. The experiences are in the classroom within which they will student teach. Students teach their own lesson plans under close guidance from the cooperating teacher. Students function as part of the teaching team. The faculty supervisor observes and provides evaluative feedback at least once during the field experiences. The cooperating teacher, trained by CCU, provides an important link between the supervising faculty and student S/He evaluates the student on standards-based and dispositional evaluation forms provided by CCU.  The seminar integrated with Field III introduces legal issues including child abuse and how to keep current with the profession including web search ideas.
Senior	560 Hours in Student Teaching  40 Hours with Course-work	Team teaching and individual teaching/responsibility for an entire classroom	The student teacher plans and delivers standards-based lessons. S/He measures student progress by conducting a pre-test to find out what the students know about the objective, delivers instruction, conducts a post-test to determine whether learning objectives were met and refines instruction techniques to best meet student needs based on the assessment of learning. Student is responsible for the entire classroom including managing the class, planning and teaching and communicating with parents and other school personnel. Formal evaluations occur through face-to-face discussions on standards-based and dispositional evaluation forms. Supervising faculty visit field experience sites every other week and spend time on-site providing feedback to the students.

Total Secondary K-12 Music	Freshmen	850 Hours 0 Hours		
	Sophomore	65 Hours	Faculty and school personnel instruction and seminars; mentoring; observation; organization of the portfolio and Teacher Work Sample; developing lessons and classroom instruction	The field experience places students on site in middle and high school settings accomplishing structured observations, and interaction with youth, parents and teachers. The student practices communication skills, works with students one-on-one and in groups and prepares an analysis of the school and classroom. They develop teaching and assessment materials using content standards and are introduced to Teacher Work Samples. They lead a total class at least one of the two lessons required. Cooperating teachers present seminars and supervise the individual field experiences..

The University trains K-12 cooperating teachers who supervise all field experiences.

Junior	97 Hours	Developing lessons, Teacher Work Samples, Direct Experience emphasizing instruction, individualization and assessment	<p>In Field II, students continue to learn and hone their skills in designing lessons around the model content standards, teaching lessons and assessing student learning. Students must also design assessment instruments to determine student learning and diagnose and assess student needs and abilities. Teacher work samples are introduced and become a major method of evaluation. Formal observation of teaching by a student, conducted by a professional, trained supervisor is documented and immediate feedback is given the student. Parent contact is expected to communicate progress toward the child(s)' learning goals.</p>
Senior	644 Hours	Planning, teaching, evaluating, adjusting instruction, applying content knowledge, methodology and management skills	<p>Field III requires forty hours in two-week blocks immediately preceding student teaching. The experiences are in the classroom within which they will student teach. Students teach their own lesson plans under close guidance from the cooperating teacher. Students function as part of the teaching team. The faculty supervisor observes and provides evaluative feedback at least once during the field experience. The content faculty teach methods classes and supervise that field experience. Content faculty assure students are teaching content appropriately and accurately. Many content faculty have had K-12 experience during their career. The cooperating teacher, trained by CCU, provides an important link between the supervising faculty and student. S/He evaluates the student on standards-based and dispositional evaluation forms provided by CCU. The supervisor visits the classroom every other week to provide assistance and feedback as well as formal evaluation based on teaching standards.</p>

		Student Teaching	The student has direct responsibility for a classroom of students. They must design and teach lessons, assess student learning and modify instruction to better assist students in meeting the learning objectives. The student teaching experience is in a school with a commitment to standards-based education and a well-established relationship with Colorado Christian University. Teacher work samples are used throughout the experience and document pre-and post-assessment of students, samples of student work, and student learning. Students are responsible for communication with parents and for classroom management. Students maintain a portfolio evidencing and verifying proficiency in all teacher performance standards.
Total	Post-baccalaureate in elementary and secondary	806 Hours	A Licensing Program for Educators' program is offered as part of a professional licensure program. The field experience sequence is similar to that of the undergraduate secondary program. These students move through the program in cohorts that begin twice per year. They must have 12 or less credits to complete for their undergraduate degree to be admitted.

**Sources of Evidence:**

- Visit to the K-12 schools to observe field experiences
- Interviews with student teachers
- Interviews with alumni

**Strengths:**

Noted above is a successful collaboration between the liberal arts and sciences and education faculty and administration during the restructuring of the major area curriculum to align with Colorado Model Content Standards and the Performance-Based Standards for Teachers. The K-12 faculty and administration are supportive of and demonstrate a continued desire to provide quality and meaningful experiences for the teacher education candidates of Colorado Christian University. The proficiency of students in the standard elements is assessed throughout the program assuring that the candidate is proficient at time of entry into the profession.

Colorado Christian University has developed an excellent record with K-12 schools in the Jefferson County School District. The field experiences are good in scope and intensity, providing positive interaction between the university and the schools. Colorado Christian gives back to the K-12 schools in different ways, as indicative of a professional development school model. Most recently, teacher candidates spent time in the evenings to work with children and parents on literacy and mathematics as part of a parents' night at school program.

**Areas for Improvement:**

Colorado Christian should continue to develop partner schools. They are currently recruiting partner schools, especially with Denver Public Schools. The goal is to arrange partnerships with two schools each year. These goals should continue to be a priority for CCU.

**IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

**Full authorization pending receipt of site review findings.**

**TOPIC: TEACHER EDUCATION AUTHORIZATION: COLORADO COLLEGE**

**PREPARED BY: DIANE LINDNER**

**I. SUMMARY:**

Colorado College recommends approximately sixty four students per year for teaching licensure. Approximately one-half of their students are seeking licensure in elementary education and the remainder are seeking secondary licensure. Colorado College has developed strong partnerships with the school districts in and around the Colorado Springs area where it is located. The field experience begins at the freshman level and is integrated into the entire college program for teacher education candidates. Colorado College offers both undergraduate and graduate level teacher education programs for elementary and secondary licensure.

Colorado College ensures their students have experiences in diverse school districts; students are able to integrate learning theories in a variety of environments that include students from diverse demographic backgrounds. Colorado College holds student teaching seminars that provide the opportunity for the student teachers to interact with their peers from across the spectrum of endorsement areas as well as with student teachers in their specific content areas.

**II. BACKGROUND:**

The on-site review for Colorado College occurred on November 20 and 21<sup>st</sup>, 2000. The curriculum reviewers read the material submitted by Colorado College and developed questions and areas needing investigation. The curriculum readers were Kathy Nutting from Regis University and Bill Wiener from Metropolitan State College of Denver. The site review team consisted of:

Diana Walcher – Elementary/Special Education Teacher

Bill Wiener - MSCD and Director of Lookout Mountain Alternative School

Diane Lindner - CCHE

Dorothy Snozek – CCHE

Sunny Duvante – CCHE

Bill Ottey – CCHE

The team was on-site for two days and spent their time meeting with faculty, college administrators, teacher candidates, student teachers, supervisors, cooperating teachers, recent graduates and school district administrators. The team also visited schools where students were placed in field experiences and student teaching.

The CCHE focus during the review was on CC's field experience component: the capacity for students to apply content and professional knowledge in authentic school

Action

settings with teacher and faculty supervision. Field-based experiences must account for at least 800 hours and must be associated with teaching in supervised settings. Faculty supervision and practical teaching should occur on-site with involvement of the cooperating teacher. The 800 hours of field experience must relate to predetermined learning standards.

**III. STAFF ANALYSIS:**

**General Comments:**

- (1) In the elementary and secondary licensure areas, hours were clearly defined, predetermined learning standards were identified with lessons taught and the education faculty involvement in the classroom was evident in the discussions with the students and faculty. Students are prepared on-campus prior to the experience with easily identifiable goals transferred to the classroom settings. All performance-based teacher education standards are addressed during student teaching, where a teacher candidate must demonstrate competence in the Performance-Based Standards. Student teaching is designed to encompass Teacher Work Samples. Student teachers are expected to be on-site, working a teacher's schedule for 560 hours in elementary and 640 hours in secondary.
- (2) During student teaching, Education department faculty holds weekly seminars. Many of the seminar topics deal with the Performance-Based Measures for Teachers.
- (3) Professional education coursework integrates theory and practice with field experiences in all professional knowledge courses. Field experiences in the program constitute a total of 896 hours for elementary, 852 for secondary, 1,376 for MAT in elementary and 1,256 hours for MAT in Secondary.
- (4) Colorado College has defined criteria to identify and select K-12 teachers as cooperating teachers for the field experience assuring that each classroom placement fosters the type of field experiences that teacher candidates need.
- (5) There is an institutional commitment to K-12 schools demonstrated by several programs the college has implemented including Teachers as Scholars, NSF grants and a Teaching and Learning Center.
- (6) During the field experiences, students have the opportunity to deliver instruction, demonstrate how to adapt content knowledge to content standards, develop assessment tools to evaluate achievement of content standards and diagnose learning difficulties. They also work and communicate with parents about student progress and deficiencies and must change teaching styles to respond to student learning needs.

Following are the identified licensure areas, required field experience hours and student dispositions. Each program is above the 800 required field experience hours and has defined student expectations. On site visitations to K-12 partner schools verified active and quality participation by education faculty. Discussions with existing students and alumni indicated an enthusiastic response to the preparation for the teaching they received (or are receiving) at Colorado College.

Teacher Education Authorization	Level of Field Experience	Frequency	Scope	Intensity
Elementary	Freshmen	0 Hours		
	Sophomore	80 Hours	Early mentoring; observation. Developing lessons and small group instruction	These experience hours are part of the first Education course sequence and are required prior to admission to the program. The student observes, writes an observational narrative of teaching and learning practices occurring in that field setting and writes a personal reflective essay on their experiences. The student also designs and teaches a short lesson that includes specific learning objectives, alignment with Model Content Standards, evaluates student learning and peer/course evaluation.
	Junior	256 Hours	Instruction of small group, design and assessment of student learning goals and some classroom responsibility.	Students continue to learn and hone their skills in designing lessons around the model content standards, teaching lessons and assessing student learning. Students must also design assessment instruments to determine student learning and diagnose and assess student needs and abilities. Teacher work samples are introduced and become a major method of evaluation. Formal observation of teaching by a student, conducted by a professional, trained supervisor is documented and immediate feedback is given the student.
	Senior	560 Hours	Direct Experience	The student has direct responsibility for a classroom of students. They must design and teach lessons, assess student learning and modify instruction to better assist students in meeting the learning objectives. The student teaching experience is in a

Action

school with a commitment to standards-based education and a well-established relationship with Colorado College. Teacher work samples are used throughout the experience and document pre-and post-assessment of students, samples of student work, and student learning. Students are responsible for communication with parents and classroom management.

Total Secondary	Freshmen	896 Hours 0 Hours		
	Sophomore	80 Hours	Observation Tutoring and small group instruction	These experience hours are part of the first Education course sequence and are required prior to admission to the program. The student

Action

observes, writes an observational narrative of teaching and learning practices occurring in that field setting and writes a personal reflective essay on their experiences. The student also designs and teaches a short lesson that includes specific learning objectives, alignment with Model Content Standards, evaluates student learning and is involved in a peer/course evaluation.

Junior

132

Developing lessons, direct Experience

Students continue to learn and hone their skills in designing lessons around the model content standards, teaching lessons and assessing student learning. Students must also design assessment instruments to determine student learning and diagnose and assess student needs and abilities. Teacher work samples are introduced and become a major method of evaluation. Formal observation of teaching by a student, conducted by a professional, trained supervisor is documented and immediate feedback is given the student.

		<u>Action</u>	
Senior	640	Student Teaching	The student has direct responsibility for a classroom of students. They must design and teach lessons, assess student learning and modify instruction to better assist students in meeting the learning objectives. The student teaching experience is in a school with a commitment to standards-based education and a well-established relationship with Colorado College. Teacher work samples are used throughout the experience and document pre-and post-assessment of students, samples of student work, and student learning. Students are responsible for communication with parents and for classroom management.
Total	852Hours		
	Post-baccalaureate in elementary and secondary	Elementary 1376 Hours Secondary 1256 Hours	A post-baccalaureate program is offered as part of a Master of Arts degree in Teaching. The field experience sequence is similar to that of the undergraduate program. The post-baccalaureate students are expected to demonstrate and evaluate a specific theory and/or teaching strategy (ies) among peers.

**Sources of Evidence:**

- Visit to the K-12 schools to observe field experiences
- Interviews with student teachers
- Interviews with alumni

**Strengths:**

Noted above is a successful collaboration between the liberal arts and sciences and education faculty and administration during the restructuring of the major area curriculum to align with Colorado Model Content Standards and the Performance-Based Standards for Teachers. The K–12 faculty and administration are supportive of and demonstrate a continued desire to provide quality and meaningful experiences for the teacher education candidates of Colorado College. The proficiency of students in the standard elements is assessed throughout the program assuring that the candidate is proficient at time of entry into the profession.

The relationship Colorado College has developed with K-12 schools is one in which students thrive while learning the skills necessary to teach. The field experiences are good in scope and intensity, providing excellent interaction between the university and the schools. School teachers and administrators are highly complementary of the Colorado College students and hope to hire them as they graduate.

The College shows commitment to the teaching profession through the summer session tuition remission policy for contracted teachers and the financial aid policy directed toward teacher education students.

**Areas for Improvement:**

LAS faculty could be more involved in the K-12 school evaluation of student teachers. LAS faculty are currently involved in community/college/K-12 partnerships and the extent to which resources can be devoted to additional fieldwork needs consideration at Colorado College.

**IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

The staff recommendation is pending the site review findings.

**TOPIC: TEACHER EDUCATION AUTHORIZATION: REGIS UNIVERSITY**

**PREPARED BY: DIANE LINDNER**

**I. SUMMARY**

Regis University recommends approximately one hundred forty students per year for licensure with the majority from elementary and the remainder from middle, secondary and K-12 art and music programs. The university utilizes K-12 classrooms from Denver, Aurora, Jefferson County, Adams and Westminster areas. Faculty from Regis College and Regis University observe, supervise and mentor teacher candidates in the field experiences of every student. Placements for initial and continued field experiences occur regularly through faculty and administrative channels to select cooperating teachers based on the teacher's strengths and the student's career goals.

The findings from the on-site review team's analysis of Regis College and Regis University field experience is presented in more depth in the staff analysis section of the agenda item.

**II. BACKGROUND**

The Regis University site visitation occurred on October 30-31, 2000 with a preliminary curriculum review completed by Pat Hagerty, CU Denver and Cliff Brookhart, University of Northern Colorado. A summary of questions from the initial review identified areas needing investigation by the review team. Site team members were:

Florence Arellano – retired principal  
Karen Durica – Literacy Specialist  
Pat Hagerty –University of Colorado at Denver  
Coleen Rickert – Title, I, Literacy Specialist  
Diane Lindner – CCHE  
Dorothy Snozek – CCHE  
Bill Ottey – CDE

Team visitation began at the Lowell Campus of the university meeting with the Regis College and Regis University, School of Professional Studies faculty, students, K-12 administrators and cooperating teachers. Regis University Southeast Campus on Orchard Road was the site of the second day visitation with added discussions and opportunities for analysis of the multifaceted program experiences. The CCHE focus during the review was on the field experience component: utilization of a minimum of 800 clock hours assisting teacher candidates in applying theory to practice in authentic school settings

with classroom teacher and university supervision. The 800 hours of field experience must relate to predetermined learning standards.

Regis University has two approaches to field experience within the teacher education program. Some Regis teacher candidates pursue a traditional approach, finding a different school for each required field experience. Other Regis teacher candidates choose to spend most of their field placement time in one partner site. Regis clusters students at their partner schools, which allows candidates to form peer groups and understand the school's organizational structure and climate. These students may also have opportunities for paid substitute teaching under very structured supervision.

### **III. STAFF ANALYSIS**

#### **General Comments:**

(1) A review was completed of the field experience requirements for each licensure area of the Regis University, School for Professional Studies teacher education programs and the Regis College, undergraduate teacher education program as they relate to predetermined learning standards.

Syllabi provided the basis for initial analysis of student experiences; hours were clearly defined; predetermined learning standards were identified and lessons taught and the faculty follow through into the classroom was evident in the discussions with faculty and students from the School of Professional Studies Programs of Regis University. Syllabi are treated as contracts as the students begin their teacher education preparation at the undergraduate and graduate levels and throughout the program. Specific field experience hours are defined; expectations related to predetermined learning standards are delineated for the student and the cooperating teachers. Handbooks for teacher candidates and cooperating teachers provide the roles and expectations for all involved within the process. Assessment tools and guidelines are provided from inception to program completion yielding a thorough analysis of student performance. Hands-on opportunities to deliver instruction, adapt content to standards, and develop assessment tools were addressed by students and cooperating teachers with only positive comments; the early and consistent field experiences were recognized as the vehicle for their success. Students and cooperating teachers felt they were extremely well prepared to enter the classrooms. A close working relationship with schools is evident with Regis University faculty providing on-going observation, supervision and accessibility for teacher candidates and K-12 schools.

The newly developed Partner School (PDS) model, as evidenced by Dr. Russell Henderson's work at Sable Elementary in Aurora Public Schools, is proceeding according to CCHE policy design. Dr. Henderson serves as the site coordinator and is employed by Regis University to integrate theory to practice. There are now twelve Partner Schools which comprise the program at the elementary, middle, and secondary

level. The curriculum development and assessment of university student needs in this program is exemplary. This has been identified as the model Regis University will use of the PDS system.

Regis College of Regis University provides a continuous process of field experiences for teacher education candidates. Although the number of students involved in this program is more limited, the opportunities for hands-on delivery of instruction, adaptation of instruction to content standards, assessment and ability to change teaching methods to meet student needs remains the same. Again, a close working relationship exists with the K-12 schools; faculty and administration of Regis and the K-12 schools are supportive of and demonstrate continued desire to provide quality and meaningful experiences for to program completion. Observation, supervision and support by Regis College faculty to students and K-12 schools are well received and valued. The criterion for 800 hours of field experience is met or exceeded at Regis College. Following this narrative is a chart delineating specific program experiences and levels of opportunity. A guide for students and cooperating teachers facilitates the continued process for Regis College students with accompanying assessment forms.

(2) Applicable state law information and applications that pertain to health and safety of students are presented within varied program components in the classroom and in the field for Regis College and Regis University, School of Professional Studies teacher candidates. Syllabi review and discussions with students, faculty and co-operating teachers provided support to this required component.

(3) Criteria for the selection of co-operating teachers for field experience and student teaching are provided and utilized by Regis College and the School of Professional Studies, Regis University. Assessment tools are provided for continuous feedback and support.

**Sources of Evidence:**

Interviews with students enrolled at varying stages of the programs  
Interviews with alumni  
Interviews with co-operating teachers and K-12 school administrators  
Syllabi and materials review prior to visit and on-site

**Strengths:**

Co-operating teachers and administrators provided numerous positive examples of the quality preparation received by students from Regis University. Included within the discussion were lesson preparation, knowledge of standards, assessment and ability to adjust teaching methods to respond to student needs.  
K-12 school personnel also were pleased that the expectation of extended field experience extended to all candidates at all institutions preparing teachers within the state

of Colorado. The opportunity to be a part of the Regis University teacher education preparation programs was valued by all currently involved. They were anxious to continue to be a part and extend the level of involvement.

When the opportunity arose, K-12 schools indicated that they sought Regis University graduates for position openings.

Presented within the discussions with school personnel was Regis University's commitment to field experience –prior to the required 800 hours. In addition, the integration of theory to practice was constantly evident in the K-12 setting.

**Weaknesses:**

Although the demonstrated working relationships with the K-12 schools are excellent, only a very small number of students are able to participate in field experiences (including student teaching) at professional development schools. The work on professional development schools should move quickly. The number of schools has already grown from 7 to 12 during the course of the school year. Legal contracts are in place between the University and the Partner Schools.

REGIS UNIVERSITY-SCHOOL OF PROFESSIONAL STUDIES

Teacher Education Authorization	Level of Field Experience	Frequency	Scope	Intensity
Early Childhood	Freshmen	0 Hours		The student completes course requirements in the General Studies/Core.
	Sophomore	0 Hours	Strong content preparation	Students strongly emphasize their content preparation during this time. Early Childhood candidates focus on Liberal Arts studies required by the 8.0 Content Standards.

	Junior	100 Hours	Developing lessons, teaching small groups, interviewing various professionals in the field, tutoring one-on-one, volunteering in various service-learning opportunities.	Students complete field hours in each course in the Professional Sequence. Field hours are focused upon specific outcomes as designated in the Colorado Performance Standards for Teachers. (e.g., in the course "Literacy Development" the teacher candidate will observe a classroom teacher writing an Individualized Literacy Plan (ILP); teacher candidate will write another plan under teacher direction. The student's ability to perform this task will be observed and a comprehensive observation record maintained.) Technology is widely used in creative ways to enhance student learning and teaching.
--	--------	--------------	--	---

	Senior	Students complete another 200 Hours during their Methods courses and 640 Hours during Student Teaching for a total of 840 Hours.	Direct Experience	<p>Students are present in both pre-school and primary classrooms during the content area presented by each Methods class. During this time, students translate theory into practice. Candidates begin by briefly observing the teacher; then are mentored by their course consultant (teacher) as they work individually with children, in small groups, and eventually with the whole class. Their ability to perform tasks is noted on their observation record by their course consultant and faculty advisor. A video of the candidate teaching a lesson is submitted as final evidence of their accomplishments during Methods. Students meet monthly with Regis faculty to discuss these experiences, as well as "Best Practices" for teaching each Content area. Students pass the PLACE Content exam.</p> <p>During Student Teaching, the student plans standards-based lessons based upon the Colorado Content Standards for K - 12, interprets and analyzes longitudinal assessment data and has direct responsibility for a classroom of children. The student meets with parents and is directly responsible for student progress. Students are assigned a Regis Supervisor who works closely with the Cooperating Teacher. The faculty advisor also monitors the individual progress of each student. as the observation record continues to be maintained.</p>
Total		940 Hours		
Elementary	Senior	840 Hours		The field experiences mimic those of Early Childhood, while the total number of Methods hours is decreased to 100 due to the requirements taking place at a single level (elementary). Students work in both primary and intermediate classrooms in both urban and suburban settings while focusing on specific Content standards.
Middle OR Secondary OR	Freshmen	0 Hours		The student completes requirements in the General Studies/Core.

Art/Music K-12	Sophomore	0 Hours	Strong content preparation	Students strongly emphasize their Content preparation during this time. They fulfill the requirements in the 8.0 Content Standards and pass the PLACE Content Exam.
	Junior	100 Hours	Developing lessons, teaching small groups, interviewing various professionals in the field, tutoring one-on-one, volunteering in various service learning opportunities.	Students complete field hours in each course in the Professional Sequence. Field hours are focused upon specific outcomes as designated in the Colorado Performance Standards for Teachers. The student's ability to perform certain tasks (such as integrating Mathematics literacy into their content area) will be observed by the course consultant and recorded on a comprehensive observation record. Technology continues to be widely used in creative ways to enhance student learning and teaching.
	Senior	100 Hours during Methods and 640 Hours during Student Teaching for a total of 740 Hours.	Direct experience	<p>Students may only count their Methods hours during student contact within their specific content area to be taught. During this time students translate theory into practice. They begin by briefly observing the teacher and then are mentored by their course consultant (teacher) as they work individually with children, in small groups and with the whole class. Their ability to perform tasks is duly noted on their observation record by their course consultant and faculty advisor. A video of the student teaching a lesson is submitted as final evidence of their accomplishments during Methods. Students meet monthly with Regis faculty to discuss these experiences, as well as "Best Practices" for teaching each Content area.</p> <p>During Student Teaching, the student plans standards-based lessons, interprets and analyzes longitudinal assessment data and has direct responsibility for a classroom of children. The student meets with parents and is directly responsible for student progress. Students are assigned a Regis Supervisor who works closely with the Cooperating Teacher. The faculty advisor also monitors the individual progress of each student as the observation record continues to be maintained.</p>

Total		840 Hours		
-------	--	-----------	--	--

*REGIS UNIVERSITY: School of Professional Studies*

<b>Teacher Education Authorization</b>	<b>Level of Field Experience</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Scope</b>	<b>Intensity</b>
Early Childhood (Graduate Only)	Graduate: Foundations Courses EDFD 600, 603, 620, 630, 610, 641	101 Hours	Early mentoring; observation  Emphasis on theory and models	Utilizing classroom teachers trained in standards based education as mentors, students complete a total of 101 hours observing students and teachers regarding teaching styles, classroom management, and dealing with diversity, assist with reading/writing for ESL students, review assessment instruments, create classroom activities to assist with different learning styles
	Graduate: Methods Courses  EDEC 650, 660, 661	170 Hours	Developing Lessons  Taught by on-site and school-site instructors.  Emphasis on models	Students tutor one on one then small group; lessons for total group instruction are completed as standards based for each of the methods courses with observations by classroom teacher and Regis University supervisor; feedback from classroom teacher occurs consistently. Regis faculty confers and supervises. At the conclusion of the experience students would have assessed, analyzed results and redefined next learning paradigm.

	Graduate: Student Teaching  EDEC 690	600 Hours	Direct Experience	<p>The student develops, teaches and modifies standards based lessons, interprets and analyzes assessment results from daily and long term development and modifies instruction based upon student need and progress.</p> <p>Student teacher is responsible for student progress and provides feedback to parents as needed. University supervisor provides direct feedback after observing a minimum of 7-8 visits per semester, meets with student teacher and classroom cooperating teacher and defines student teacher progress against inventory of standards and performance based instruction model.</p>
Total		871 Hours	EDFD 601 (optional) 15 hours	Technology is widely used in creative ways to enhance student learning and teaching.
Elementary (middle childhood education) Graduate Only	Graduate: Foundations Courses EDFD 600,603,620, 610, 641, 630	101 Hours	Early Mentoring; Observation; Emphasis on theory and models	Utilizing classroom teachers trained in standards based education as mentors, students complete a total of 101 hours observing students and teachers regarding teaching styles, classroom management, and dealing with diversity, assist with reading/writing for ESL students, review assessment instruments, create classroom activities to assist with different learning styles.
	Graduate: Methods Courses EDEL 650, 660, 661	190 Hours	Developing Lessons  Emphasis on models	Students tutor one on one then small group, lessons for total group instruction are completed as standards based for each of the methods courses with observations by classroom teacher and Regis University supervisor; feedback from classroom teacher occurs consistently. Regis faculty confers and supervises. At the conclusion of the experience students would have assessed, analyzed results and redefined next learning paradigm.

	Graduate: Student Teaching EDEL 690	600 Hours	Direct Experience	The student develops, teaches and modifies standards based lessons, interprets and analyzes assessment results from daily and long term development and modifies instruction based upon student need and progress. Student teacher is responsible for student progress and provides feedback to parents as needed. University supervisor provides direct feedback after observation for a minimum of 7-8 visits per semester, meets with student teacher and classroom cooperating teacher and defines student teacher progress against inventory of standards and performance based instruction model.
Total		891 Hours	EDFD 600 (optional) 15 Hours	Technology is widely used in creative ways to enhance student learning and teaching.
Middle, Secondary and K-12 Graduate Only	Graduate: Foundation Courses EDFD 600, 603, 620, 630, 610,	91 Hours	Early mentoring; observation; Emphasis on theory and models	Utilizing classroom teachers trained in standards based education as mentors, students complete a total of 91 hours observing students and teachers regarding teaching styles, classroom management and dealing with diversity, assist with reading/writing for ESL students, review assessment instruments, create classroom activities to assist with different learning styles
	Graduate: Methods Courses EDMS or EDSC 650, 651, 662-669, 652,	130 Hours	Developing Lessons  Emphasis on Models	Individual instruction, group lessons; design/teach a lesson for each of five models, teach three lessons of an integrated plan using a variety of techniques and methods. Content faculty are in the K-12 classroom with the students. The teacher education faculty assist evaluate and respond to the student teacher, cooperating teacher and determine cooperatively the level of current performance and plan the anticipated next steps to develop mastery.

	Graduate: Student Teaching	600 Hours	Direct Experience	<p>The student plans, teaches and modifies standards-based lessons, interprets and analyzes assessment results from daily and long term development and modifies instruction based upon student progress and need.</p> <p>Student teacher is responsible for student progress and provides feedback as needed to parents. University supervisor provides direct feedback after observation for a minimum of 7-8 visits per semester, meets with student teacher and cooperating teacher and defines student teacher progress against inventory of standards and performance based instruction model.</p>
Total		821 Hours	EDFD 600 (optional) 15 Hours	Technology is widely used in creative ways to enhance student learning and teaching. Consistent use of e-mail and on-line support assists student teachers in communicating with university supervisor and other student teachers.
Fine Arts: Art K-12 Fine Arts: Music K-12 Graduate Only	Graduate: Foundations Courses: EDFD 600, 603, 610, 620, 630	91 Hours	Early mentoring, observation  Emphasis on Theory and Models	Utilizing classroom teachers trained in standards based education as mentors, students complete a total of 91 hours observing students and teachers regarding teaching styles, classroom management, and dealing with diversity, assist with reading/writing for ESL students, review assessment instruments, create classroom activities to assist with different learning styles.
	Graduate: Methods Courses EDFA 650, 660, 662, 661, 663 EDSC 652	200 Hours	Developing Lessons  Emphasis on models	Students tutor one on one then small group; lessons for total group instruction are completed as standards based for reach of the methods courses with observations by classroom teacher and Regis University supervisor; feedback from classroom teacher occurs consistently. Regis faculty confers and supervises. At the conclusion of the experience students would have assessed, analyzed results and redefined next learning paradigm.

	Graduate: Student Teaching	600 Hours	Direct Experience	<p>The student plans, teaches and modifies standards-based lessons, interprets and analyzes assessment results from daily and long term development and modifies instruction based upon student progress and need.</p> <p>Student teacher is responsible for student progress and provides feedback as needed to parents. University supervisor provides direct feedback after observation for a minimum of 7-8 visits per semester, meets with student teacher and cooperating teacher and defines student teacher progress against inventory of standards and performance based instruction model</p>
Total		891 Hours	EDFD 601 (Optional) 15 Hours	Technology is widely used in creative ways to enhance student learning and teaching.
Elementary, Middle School, Secondary	Post- Baccalaureate	810 hours	Observation, Direct Experience	<p>Since the post-baccalaureate student has a prior degree, foundations courses, methods courses and student teaching occur sequentially with defined field experiences. Foundations courses require the same development and operation as the graduate proficiency levels; methods courses identify the post-baccalaureate experiences with observation, tutoring with one on one and small group and total group instruction. Assessment, planning and changing instruction to match student progress needs are monitored, evaluated and redefined to match proficiency levels. Student teaching is direct experience with student teacher responsible for all teaching responsibilities in a standards based classroom. Feedback from classroom cooperating teacher and university supervisor is consistent and maintained at least once per week. Meetings are held to define progress in alignment with performance based standards.</p>
Total		810 Hours		

Teacher Education Authorization	Level of Field Experience	Frequency	Scope	Intensity
Elementary	Freshmen	30 Hours	Early mentoring; observation	Each student enrolled in ED 204(Introduction to Education) must complete 30 hours field experience in elementary classrooms within approved Regis College partner schools. Students observe children and teachers regarding teaching styles, classroom management, and dealing with diverse needs. A Regis College faculty member monitors student involvement in all placements.
	Sophomore	40 Hours	Mentoring, Observation, participation	Each student in ED 302(The Learning Process) and ED 306(Assessment of Learning) must complete 40 field experience hours in partnership schools. Focus is on connecting theory to practice; e.g. in assessment, students will create SBE unit plans in alignment with classroom curriculum needs and construct assessments for classroom use. The Professional Program staff at Regis College evaluate the student performance through written work related to course objectives
	Junior	100 Hours	Mentoring, creating instructional units, SBE lessons for small group and total group instruction, developing concomitant assessments.	During the junior year, the student plans and engages in limited teaching, e.g. individual, small group and total group. Methods courses are team taught on site by partner school faculty and Regis College faculty. Instructor supervision occurs on-site and through communication with a trained mentor teacher. Students begin development of proficiencies in 45 standards elements and Regis College Teacher Work Sample.

	Senior	640 Hours	Direct Experience	Students assume full classroom responsibility for 16 weeks, including planning of SBE lessons and units, assessment and analysis of student progress, reporting of student progress and changing instruction to meet student needs. Placements are made in partner schools with teachers trained in supervision and the development and evaluation of the Teacher Work Sample. Regis faculty make a minimum of 10 visits and evaluations; students must attain a minimum of proficiency rating in all categories.
Total		810 Hours		
Secondary	Freshmen	30 Hours	Early Mentoring, Observations	Each student enrolled in ED 204(Introduction to Education) must complete 30 hours field experience in secondary classrooms within approved Regis College partner schools. Students observe middle and high school students and teachers regarding teaching styles, classroom management, and dealing with diverse needs. A Regis College faculty member monitors student involvement in all placements.
	Sophomore	40 Hours	Mentoring, Observation, Participation	Each student in ED 302(The Learning Process) and ED 306(Assessment of Learning) must complete 40 field experience hours in partnership schools. Focus is on connecting theory to practice; in assessment, students will create SBE unit plans in alignment with classroom curriculum needs and construct assessments for classroom use. A Regis College faculty member monitors and evaluates student involvement in all placements.

	Junior	100 Hours	Mentoring, creating instructional units, SBE lessons for individual and total class instruction, developing concomitant assessments.	In the junior year, students engage in methods classes taught in a partnership school by both Regis College and secondary faculty. Students observe, plan, engage in limited teaching, and assess instructional outcomes. Regis College are on-site, facilitating communicating and collaboration. Students begin development of proficiencies in 45 standard elements as identified within the Teacher Work Sample.
	Senior	640 Hours	Direct Experience	Students assume full classroom responsibility for 16 weeks, including planning of SBE lessons and units, assessment and analysis of student progress, reporting of student progress and changing instruction to meet student needs. Placements are made in partner schools with teachers trained in supervision and the development and evaluation of the Teacher Work Sample. Regis faculty supervise, making a minimum of ten visits and evaluations; students complete Teacher Work Sample with proficient or advanced ratings in all categories.
<b>Total</b>		<b>810 Hours</b>		



The CCHE focus during the review was on DU's field experience component: the capacity for students to apply content and professional knowledge in authentic school settings with teacher and faculty supervision. Field-based experiences must account for at least 800 hours and must be associated with teaching in supervised settings. Faculty supervision and practical teaching should occur on-site with involvement of the cooperating teacher. The 800 hours of field experience must relate to predetermined learning standards.

### **III. STAFF ANALYSIS:**

#### **General Comments:**

- (1) In the elementary, secondary and K-12 licensure areas, hours were clearly defined, predetermined learning standards were identified with lessons taught and the education faculty involvement in the classroom was evident in the discussions with the students and faculty. Students are prepared on-campus prior to the field experiences with easily identifiable goals transferred to the classroom settings. All performance-based teacher education standards are addressed during student teaching, where a teacher candidate must demonstrate competence in the Performance-Based Standards. Student teaching is designed to encompass Teacher Work Samples. Student teachers are expected to be on-site, working a teacher's schedule for 13 weeks (65 days). For at least eight weeks of that time teacher candidates are fully responsible for all instruction.
- (2) During student teaching, the Observation/Evaluation form that is tied explicitly to Performance-Based Standards for Colorado Teachers is (with the Teacher Work Sample) one of the primary assessment tools. The Observation/Evaluation form is completed at the end of fall and winter quarters; the university supervisor, cooperating teacher, and teacher candidate complete the form at the mid-term and final evaluation conferences held during student teaching.
- (3) Professional education coursework integrates theory and practice with field experiences in all professional knowledge courses. Field experiences in the program constitute a total of 800 hours for elementary, secondary, and K-12. The Teacher Education Program has increased their number of hours from 624 hours required prior to the redesign of the program to 800 hours required by statute.
- (4) The University of Denver has defined criteria to identify and select K-12 teachers as cooperating teachers for the field experience assuring that each classroom placement fosters the type of field experiences that teacher candidates need. DU relies heavily on adjunct faculty to supervise the field experiences. These faculty are typically employed by school districts and knowledgeable in the Model Content Standards and in the Performance-Based Measures for Teachers.
- (5) The use of adjunct faculty as the primary teaching and supervisory faculty raises institutional commitment issues. Involvement of liberal arts and sciences faculty in

the DU teacher education program is minimal. Continued utilization of part time faculty may impact program quality and sustainability.

- (6) During the field experiences, students have the opportunity to deliver instruction, demonstrate how to adapt content knowledge to content standards, develop assessment tools to evaluate achievement of content standards and diagnose learning difficulties. They also work and communicate with parents about student progress and deficiencies and must change teaching styles to respond to student learning needs.

Following are the identified licensure areas, required field experience hours and student dispositions. Each program includes the 800 required field experience hours and has defined student expectations linked with content standards. On site visitations to K-12 partner schools verified active and quality participation by education faculty. Discussions with existing students and alumni indicated an enthusiastic response to the preparation for the teaching they received (or are receiving) at Denver University.

<b>Teacher Education Authorization</b>	<b>Level of Field Experience</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Scope</b>	<b>Intensity</b>
Elementary	Post-baccalaureate	96 Hours divided equally between an elementary and middle school	Early mentoring; observation. Developing lessons and small group instruction	The first field experience includes four students who are placed together for one full day each week in an urban classroom for twelve weeks. The teacher candidate observes and works with a small group of students; they also assist with grading. Toward the end of the experience the candidate teaches a class segment and finally teaches two full lessons, one in literacy and one in mathematics. The cooperating teachers in this early experience involve the teacher candidate in planning curriculum, instruction and/or assessments. The cooperating teacher also observes the teacher candidate's interactions with students and provides feedback and communicates concerns with the university supervisor. The university supervisor makes four visits during this internship to observe the TEP teacher candidate in the classroom as h/she interacts with children.

184 Hours	Observation and Supported Teaching	The teacher candidate is placed into the classroom in which they will do their student teaching. The candidate is expected to learn from the cooperating teacher and gradually assume some teaching responsibilities. The cooperating teacher confers with the candidate regarding the teaching assignments and learning needs of individual students in the classroom. The candidate is expected to work one-on-one with students, perform extra tasks such as hall and lunch duty and teach small groups of students. During the last four weeks of the experience the candidate must teach one full lesson each week that should be tied to the on-campus instruction the student is receiving.
520 Hours	Direct Experience	The student has direct responsibility for a classroom of students. They must design and teach lessons, assess student learning and modify instruction to better assist students in meeting the learning objectives. The student teaching experience is in a school with a commitment to standards-based education and a well-established relationship with Denver University. Teacher work samples are used throughout the experience and document pre-and post-assessment of students, samples of student work, and student learning. Students are responsible for communication with parents and classroom management.

Total

800 Hours

Secondary K-12 Music and Art	Post- baccalaureate	96 Hours	Observation, Tutoring and small group instruction	A cohort of four students is placed at each school site. The teacher candidate spends one full day each week in an urban classroom for twelve weeks. Six weeks are at the middle school level and six are at the high school level. The teacher candidate observes, assists with grading and works with a small group of students. During the last three weeks of the experience, the candidate teaches a class and one full lesson each week. The cooperating teacher also observes the teacher candidate's interactions with students and provides feedback and communicates concerns with the university supervisor. The university supervisor makes four visits during this internship to observe the TEP teacher candidate in the classroom as h/she interacts with children. The K-12 students are placed at an elementary school, middle school and high school for equal amounts of time.
		184 Hours	Observation and Supported Teaching	This phase of the field experience prepares the student for student teaching by placing them in the classroom in which they will student teach and providing structured gradual assumption of teaching responsibilities. The candidate observes and assists with special tasks such as hall or lunch duty. The candidate works with students on a one-to-one basis and with small groups of students. In week four of the assignment, the candidate teaches a class segment that they have designed. A triad conference is held to assess candidate progress; the conference includes the teacher candidate, cooperating teacher and university supervisor.
		520 Hours		The student teaching phase allows teacher candidates to assume increasing responsibility for planning, instruction, and assessment and other teacher duties. The teacher candidate may take responsibility for one class or a portion of the day in the first week. By the fifth week the teacher candidate must solo teach. At this point, the teacher candidate is responsible for planning, carrying out, and assessing all instruction including literacy and math-based instruction. The teacher candidate is

Total

**Sources of Evidence:**

Visit to the K-12 schools to observe field experiences  
Interviews with student teachers  
Interviews with alumni

**Strengths:**

K-12 cooperating teachers and administrators remarked on the excellent training that DU provides in the area of assessment. Students come into the school prepared to begin assessments with very little assistance from the cooperating teachers.

The relationship Denver University has developed with K-12 schools is one in which students thrive while learning the skills necessary to teach. The field experiences are good in scope and intensity, providing excellent interaction between the university and the schools. Schoolteachers and administrators are highly complementary of the Denver University students and hope to hire them as they graduate.

The student teaching seminar meets twice each week to review and discuss issues; student teachers can receive advice from their instructor and their peers about classroom management and instructional issues. This seminar provides integration of theory as students learn to teach and supports students as they teach solo for the first time.

The field experience design that places students in the classroom in which they will student teach for an early experience is a good way to transition students into solo teaching.

The Special Education program is quickly redesigning its program to ensure implementation for fall, 2001. Program design work continues to be submitted to the CCHE and CDE that shows steady progress toward standards-based education with strong assessment components.

**Areas for Improvement:**

Liberal Arts and Science faculty could be more involved in the observation and evaluation of student teachers.

The Special Education program has recently started reforming its program to meet the intent of Senate Bill 99-154. The program had a late start with reform efforts and must continue intensive redesign work to implement the program in fall, 2001.

**IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Recommend full approval pending the on site review report.

**TOPIC: TEACHER EDUCATION GRANTS**

**PREPARED BY: SHARON M. SAMSON**

**I. SUMMARY**

CCHE's role is both evaluator of the quality of teacher education programs and facilitator of the transition process. Consequently, the reauthorization of teacher education programs is only one strategy in CCHE's teacher education initiative. While the design of the new teacher education programs provides indications of quality, the real evidence of quality relies on expedient implementation of new courses, new approaches, and new assessments.

To facilitate the transition, CCHE issued a Request for Proposal for the 2001-2002 higher education grant competition using federal funds available under Title II of the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994. This year's RFP emphasized teacher preparation programs that meet the following criteria:

- CCHE-approved teacher preparation program (required).
- Strong content knowledge for prospective teachers that is tied to state content standards.
- The curriculum is designed as a "learner" curriculum, i.e., the program has embedded assessments that evaluate a student's mastery of content knowledge, support systems for students that experience academic difficulties, and college faculty who guide student experiences in the classroom and in the field.
- Field experiences that occur early in the student's college degree program are intense, and experiential.
- Assessment of teacher performance, including preliminary assessment studies that relate CSAP scores to teacher candidates.

Approximately \$600,000 will be distributed to a Colorado public or private four-year institution of higher education with a state-approved teacher education program. Institutions submitted proposals on April 2, 2001.

The recipients of the teacher education grants will be announced at the May Commission meeting.

**TOPIC:                   REPORT ON OUT-OF-STATE INSTRUCTION**

**PREPARED BY:       ANDREW BRECKEL III**

**I.       SUMMARY**

The Commission holds statutory responsibility to approve instruction offered out-of-state beyond the seven contiguous states. By action of the Commission in 1986 the Executive Director may act for the Commission to approve or deny requests from governing boards for approval of courses and programs to be offered by their institutions. This agenda item includes additional instruction that the Executive Director has certified as meeting the criteria for out-of-state delivery. It is sponsored by the Board of Regents of the University of Colorado.

**II.      BACKGROUND**

Prior to 1983, instruction out-of-state was offered at will by Colorado institutions, primarily through the Extended Studies Program, but an Attorney General opinion of July 3, 1980, concluded that there was no authorizing legislation and out-of-state programs were discontinued. In 1983, the General Assembly enacted legislation that authorized non-state-funded out-of-state instruction but also required governing board approval. When the instruction is beyond the contiguous states, Commission approval is required as well.

At its meeting of May 2, 1986, the Commission delegated authority to the Executive Director to determine when out-of-state instruction beyond the contiguous states complies with statutory requirements. In June 1986, the Commission received the first notification of out-of-state instruction certified by the Executive Director. Additional approved out-of-state instruction is reported to the Commission as it is received and reviewed.

**III.     ACTION**

The Executive Director has approved the following out-of-state instruction.

The Board of Regents of the University of Colorado has submitted a request for approval for a course to be delivered out-of-state by the University of Colorado at Denver.

**Developing Leaders for School Improvement** offered by the University of Colorado at Denver in cooperation with the National Institute for Urban School Improvement in Washington, D.C. and Boston, MA on dates beginning January 24, 2001 and ending May 17, 2001.

The Board of Regents of the University of Colorado has submitted a request for approval for a course to be delivered out-of-country by the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center.

**1<sup>st</sup> IAS Conference on HIV Pathogenesis and Treatment** to be delivered in Buenos Aires, Argentina on July 8-11, 2001.

**STATUTORY AUTHORITY**

The Commission is given responsibility for approval of out-of-state instruction beyond the contiguous states in C.R.S. 23-5-116.

**TOPIC: CCHE-CAPITAL ASSETS QUARTERLY REPORT**

**PREPARED BY: JEANNE ADKINS**

**I. SUMMARY**

The Commission has delegated authority to the executive director, who has subsequently delegated authority to the director of policy and planning, to approve program plans, approve waivers and authorize cash-funded projects within Commission guidelines and statutory authority. Since adoption of the lease review policy, this delegation extends to review and approval of leases and lease-purchase agreements.

This written report outlines those projects for which the director of policy and planning has waived the requirement for a program plan in the first quarter of 2001.

**II. BACKGROUND**

Statutes and CCHE policy require that CCHE may waive the requirement for a program plan on capital construction projects, regardless of the source of funding, for projects under \$500,000.

Projects under \$250,000 do not require referral to the General Assembly for inclusion of spending authority within the Long Bill fiscal year in which the institution plans to spend the funds as long as those funds are cash and/or federal funds. CCHE approval, however, is necessary before those funds can be encumbered. Generally, institutions submit the significant financial information relating to the project and a conceptual analysis of the proposed scope of work. Staff then reviews the proposal and determines whether the information is sufficient to recommend a waiver or whether additional information is needed.

Waivers granted are outlined in Attachment A for the first quarter.

The General Assembly has directed the Commission to review and approve program plans for cash-funded projects, defined as those projects where institutional funds are used for renovation and/or construction, but which might involve a combination of state capital funds for either construction purposes or maintenance. CCHE also is directed to review and approve program plans for externally-funded projects where all costs, including maintenance, are cash funds.

All approvals of cash-funded program plans granted in the first quarter of 2000 are included in the report in Attachment A.

Finally, the Commission in 1999, upon the recommendation of the Attorney General's office, redrafted its review and approval policies to conform to the statutory requirement to review higher education leases. The Commission has adopted a policy conforming with the statutory requirements. Lease information for the quarter is reported in Attachment B, which includes renewals, new leases and waivers from program plan requirements for leased facilities. With the exception of four leases awaiting additional information, those listed as pending at the end of the quarter have all subsequently been approved.

### **III. STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

No formal action is required. The report is submitted for Commission review.

Attachments:     A.   Quarterly Report Waivers, Capital Cash-Funded Program Plan Approval  
                      B.   Spreadsheet review of Quarterly Lease Projects, 2001

### CCHE Approvals of Program Plan Waivers, Cash-Funded, and SB 97-202 Projects, First

CCHE	Project	Type	Institution	Total Project Cost	Funding Sources	Notes
12-Jan-01	Purchase of 1302 Grandview Engineering Center Lobby	Waiver	University of Colorado-Boulder	\$485,000	CFE	0.16 acres, 1,649 gsf
6-Feb-01	Expansion Drainage	Waiver	University of Colorado-Boulder	\$249,999	CFE	1,400 gsf
26-Mar-01	Improvement-South Campus	Waiver	University of Colorado-Boulder	\$240,000	CFE	
26-Mar-01	Willard Administrative Center	Waiver	University of Colorado-Boulder	\$175,000	CFE	Improves entrance for disabled
<b>University of Colorado System Total</b>				<b>\$ 1,149,999</b>		
16-Jan-01	Student Program Consolidation	Waiver	Adams State College	\$381,795	CFE	11,883 gsf CCHE letter confirms no roll-forward funds used
6-Feb-01	Acquisition of Store Property in Grand Junction	Waiver	Mesa State College	\$240,000	CF	
<b>State Colleges in Colorado System Total</b>				<b>\$621,795</b>		
26-Feb-01	Ag Diesel Program Storage Building	Waiver	Northeastern Junior College	\$19,435	CF	1,200 gsf
3-Jan-01	Multi Purpose Fields	SB 202	Red Rocks Community College	\$805,250	CFE	4 acres
<b>Community Colleges of Colorado System Total</b>				<b>\$824,685</b>		
15-Feb-01	Colorado History Museum Public Enhancement Project	Waiver	Colorado Historical Society	\$261,294	CFE	25,000 gsf
21-Feb-01	Regional Museum Preservation Project	Waiver	Colorado Historical Society	\$250,000	CFE	23,252 gsf

	Ft. Vasquez			\$18,250		
	Museum		Colorado Historical	CFE,		
21-Feb-01	Renovation	Waiver	Society	\$91,250	\$73,000 FF	21,500 gsf
<b>Colorado Historical Society Total</b>				<b>\$602,544</b>		
	Cancer					
	Rehabilitation		University of Northern			
3-Jan-01	Institute	SB 202	Colorado	\$2,200,000	FF	8,500 gsf
<b>University of Northern Colorado Total</b>				<b>\$2,200,000</b>		

## Lease Proposals CCHE Received December 15, 2000, through March 31, 2001

Lease Status	Last Action	Institution	Address of Lease	Lease Description	Date To	Date From	Cost	New Square Footage
Approved	1-Mar-00	Colorado State University	15055 S. Golden Rd. Golden, CO	Office	30-Jun-05	1-Jan-01	\$0.00	-
Approval recommended - pending		Colorado State University	no address - land only -	Office	14-Mar-02	15-Mar-01	\$0.00	-
Approval recommended - pending		Colorado State University	300 D Street, S.W. Washington, D. C.	Office	30-Jun-01	1-Feb-01	\$18,016.20	160
Approved	1-Mar-01	Colorado State University	2850 Youngfield St., Lakewood	Office	31-Dec-01	1-Jan-01	\$8,630.00	500
Approved - Notification pending	1-Mar-01	Colorado State University	2764 Compass Dr., Grand Junction	Study	30-Jun-04	1-Apr-01	\$9,493.80	775
Approved	1-Mar-01	Colorado State University	801 E. Burlington Ave. Ft. Morgan	Office	30-Jun-06	1-Jul-01	\$0.00	2,464
Approval recommended - pending		Colorado State University	215 North Linden, Suites A, B and E Cortez	Office	30-Jun-02	1-Jul-01	\$23,664.00	3,120
Approval recommended - pending		Colorado State University	419 Canyon Ave. Ft. Collins	Office	28-Feb-02	1-Mar-01	\$0.00	3,405
Approval recommended - pending		Colorado State University	1512 Webster Court, Ft. Collins	Special Use	14-Apr-02	15-Apr-01	\$74,900.00	22,568
<b>State Board of Agriculture Totals</b>							<b>\$ 134,704.00</b>	<b>32,992</b>
Approval recommended - pending		Morgan Community	280 Colfax, Bennett 120 West Fourth Street,	General Use	30-Jun-01	1-Jul-00	\$3,300.00	380.00
Approved	8-Mar-01	Northeastern Junior College	Wray	Office	30-Jun-02	1-Jul-01	\$1,300.00	400.00
Approval recommended - pending		Morgan Community College	215 S. Main Street, Yuma	General Use	31-Dec-00	1-Jan-00	\$2,000.00	462.00
Approved	28-Feb-01	Front Range Community College - Larimer Campus	300 Oak Street, Ft. Collins	Office	31-Mar-01	1-Apr-97	\$18,471.60	1,759.00
Approved	1-Mar-01	Front Range Community College - Larimer Campus	565 N. Cleveland Avenue, Loveland	Classrooms	30-Jun-01	1-Jul-00	\$12,240.00	2,003.00
Approved	28-Feb-01	Front Range Community College - Westminster Campus	1931 East Bridge Street, Brighton	Classrooms	31-May-01	1-Jan-99	\$42,312.00	3,280.00



Approved - Notification pending	7-Mar-01	University of Colorado - Health Sci Center 9th\Co	1763 High Street Basement, Denver	Office	28-Feb-02	1-Mar-97	\$4,920.00	702.86
Approved - Notification pending	7-Mar-01	University of Colorado - Health Sci Center 9th\Co	2741 Welton Street, Denver	Office	31-Jul-01	1-Apr-97	\$2,650.00	294.44
Approved - Notification pending	7-Mar-01	University of Colorado - Health Sci Center 9th\Co	1763 High Street, 2nd Floor, Denver	Office	30-Apr-02	15-May-97	\$7,800.00	866.67
Approved - Notification pending	1-Mar-01	University of Colorado Boulder	5353 Manhattan Circle #103, Boulder	Office	31-Oct-00	4-Jan-00	\$6,320.00	332.63
Approval recommended - pending		University of Colorado Boulder	1200 28th Street, Boulder	Office	31-Aug-05	1-Mar-01	\$62,273.00	1,997.00
Approved	7-Mar-01	University of Colorado - Health Sci Center 9th\Co	2741 Welton St, Denver	Office	31-Jul-01	1-Apr-97	\$31,800.00	3,533.33
Approved	7-Mar-01	University of Colorado - Health Sci Center 9th\Co	425 S Cherry #200, Denver	Office	30-Jun-01	1-Mar-96	\$29,406.00	2,262.00
Approval recommended - pending		University of Colorado - Health Sci Center 9th\Co	425 S Cherry #200, Denver	Office	30-Jun-01	1-Mar-96	\$29,406.00	2,262.00
Approved	1-Mar-01	University of Colorado - Denver Campus	900 Auraria Pkwy, #245, 259, 260	Office	30-Jun-06	1-Jun-98	\$40,740.00	3,395.00
Approved	7-Mar-01	University of Colorado - Health Sci Center 9th\Co	4525-35 E. 8th Avenue, Denver	Office	30-Jun-06	1-Jan-01	\$37,925.00	2,528.33
Approved	7-Mar-01	University of Colorado - Health Sci Center 9th\Co	1741 Vine Street #100, Denver	Office	31-Jan-02	13-Jan-98	\$40,240.00	2,874.29
Approved	7-Mar-01	University of Colorado - Health Sci Center 9th\Co	1741 Vine Street, #200, Denver	Office	31-Jan-02	1-Jan-97	\$40,240.00	2,874.29
Approval recommended - pending		University of Colorado - Health Sci Center 9th\Co	1741 Vine Street, #200, Denver	Office	31-Jan-02	1-Jan-97	\$40,240.00	2,874.29
Approval recommended - pending		University of Colorado - Health Sci Center 9th\Co	1741 Vine Street #100, Denver	Office	31-Jan-02	13-Jan-98	\$40,240.00	2,874.29
Approved	7-Mar-01	University of Colorado - Health Sci Center 9th\Co	1600 Downing Street #200, Denver	Office	28-Feb-03	1-Feb-98	\$41,472.00	2,962.29
Approved	7-Mar-01	University of Colorado - Health Sci Center 9th\Co	2741 Welton St, Denver	Office	31-Jul-01	1-Apr-97	\$31,800.00	3,533.33
Approved	6-Mar-01	University of Colorado - Health Sci Center 9th\Co	2121 E. 18th Ave., Denver	Office	31-Aug-04	1-Feb-00	\$32,877.00	4,109.63
Approved	1-Mar-01	University of Colorado - Systems Office	4001 Discovery Drive, Suite 390A, Boulder	Office	31-Aug-12	1-Apr-01	\$136,609.00	4,151.00
Approval recommended - pending		University of Colorado Boulder	900 Frontage Road, Boulder	Office	31-Dec-05	1-Apr-01	\$81,093.00	4,969.00
Additional Information Requested from Institution		University of Colorado - Denver Campus	535 16th Street, #300, Denver	Office	2-Feb-02	1-Feb-97	\$87,500.00	5,833.33
Approved	7-Mar-01	University of Colorado - Health Sci Center 9th\Co	3750 E. 12th #100 & 300, Denver	Office	28-Feb-01	1-Mar-96	\$45,783.00	7,630.50
Approval recommended - pending		University of Colorado - Health Sci Center Fitz	12635 Montview Blvd, Aurora	Labs	28-Feb-01	1-Mar-96	\$45,783.00	7,630.50









