STATE OF COLORADO

Colorado Commission on Higher Education Agenda
January 6, 2005
10:00 a.m.

Colorado Community College System
9101 East Lowry Boulevard, Board Room
Denver, Colorado

Welcome — Dr. Nancy McCallin, President of Colorado Community College System

I. Approval of Minutes for the November 4, 2004, meeting

Reports – No written materials

A. Chair's Report
B. Commissioners' Reports
   Commissioner Feeley's Status Report on Colorado State University Alcohol Task Force
C. Advisory Committee Reports
D. Public Comment

II. Presentations & Discussion – No written materials

A. Update on Performance Contract Negotiations (Langer)
B. Update on COF Stipend Application Process (Schweigert/Adkins)

III. Action Items

A. Credit Hours Available Under the College Opportunity Fund for Continuing Students (Langer)
B. Colorado School of Mines Facilities Master Plan (Hoffman)
C. Pikes Peak Community College Centennial Campus and Downtown Studio Campus Facilities Master Plan (Hoffman)
D. Pikes Peak Community College Rampart Range Campus Facilities Master Plan (Hoffman)

IV. Consent Items

A. State Guaranteed General Education Courses for Adams State College (Gianneschi)
B. Metropolitan State College of Denver Teacher Education Program Proposals (Gianneschi)
C. Vacant Buildings Report (Johnson)
D. Teacher Education Reauthorization: Metropolitan State College of Denver (Gianneschi)

V. Written Report – No Discussion

A. 2005 No Child left Behind Grants (Gianneschi)
B. FTE – Service Area Exemptions (Arnesen)
C. Report on Out-of-State Instruction (Arnesen)
D. Colorado Mountain College Facilities Master Plan, Phase II, August, 2003 (Hoffman)
E. Quality Indicator System Report (Carnahan)
F. Teacher Education Report to the Governor and General Assembly

Adjournment - The next meeting will be at 10:00 a.m. on Thursday, February 3, 2005, in Lory Center on the Colorado State College Campus in Ft. Collins.

MINUTES OF THE COLORADO COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION
November 4, 2004
Community College of Denver

Chairperson Judy Weaver called the meeting to order at 10:00 a. m.

Commission members attending were Judy Weaver, Chairperson; Terry Farina, Vice-Chairperson; Ray Baker; Judy Altenberg; James Stewart; Mike Feeley; Greg Stevinson; Richard Garcia; Bill Vollbracht; and Pres Montoya. Commissioner Dean Quamme was excused. Commission Staff members attending were Executive Director Rick O'Donnell, Rich Schweigert, Jenna Allen, Matt Gianneschi, Jason Hopfer, Amy Roberts, Joan Johnson, Diane Lindner, Gail Hoffman, and Mary Lou Lawrence.

Advisory Committee member Chris Purkiss was present.

Chairperson Weaver introduced Dr. Christine Johnson, President of Community College of Denver (CCD) and host of the meeting, who made welcoming remarks. Chairperson Weaver then introduced the new President of the Colorado Community College System (CCCS), Nancy McCallin, who made brief remarks.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Commissioner Stewart moved to approve the minutes of the October 7, 2004, meeting and Commissioner Feeley seconded the Motion. They were unanimously approved.

REPORTS

Chairman's Report: Chairperson Weaver reflected on the recent election and pending legislative session and encouraged the Commission to reach out and work with all legislators to continue the viability of higher education in Colorado. She gave a status report on performance contract negotiations, stating they were progressing with mutual collaboration.

Commissioners' Report: At Commissioner Montoya's request, President Johnson reported on financial aid seminars for Hispanic families hosted by Sallie Mae in conjunction with the Pueblo foundation at CCD and Aims Community College with one being planned for Greeley. They were done in English and in Spanish on a Saturday morning to a large crowd, debunking the myth that minority families are not interested in higher education. Commissioner Weaver reported similar attendance at the seminar in Pueblo. Commissioner Montoya hopes other, unique approaches will be considered for marketing the College Opportunity Fund to the underserved community.

Advisory Committee Report**:** There were no reports.

Public Comment: George Walker spoke on accountability and the failure of recent state legislatures to implement programs to advance diversity in higher education and mitigate the disparate impact of the Tabor Amendment on minorities. The disparity of students' home and institutional educational environment impacts their ability to productively perform in transferable core curriculum courses between schools of different social,

racial, economic makeup. He submitted written remarks for the record, which are attached.

PRESENTATIONS & DISCUSSION

Update on COF Stipend Applications Process: Jeanne Adkins, Director of the College Access Network, provided a verbal and visual presentation on the development and administration of the computer program being developed for on-line application and accounting for stipends. Commissioner Baker noted the criticality of the application process to the stipend program and wants the Commission to be apprised of any and all problems if they occur. A status report will be presented at each Commission meeting until the system is fully operational. There was no public comment.

Update on Private Institution Participation in COF: Mr. Schweigert reported that Requests for Information were issued to private institutions in October. From the responses received, Colorado College, University of Denver and Regis College were accepted into the program and performance contracts would be negotiated with them. The application from Colorado Christian University was denied and Naropa University withdrew its application. Mr. Schweigert reported as many as two thousand students may qualify to receive one half of the public institution stipend amount and the Commission's proposed FY 05-06 budget requests additional money, separate from the budget request for public institutions, for private school stipends. There was no public comment.

ACTION ITEMS

Treatment of the Colorado Opportunity Fund Stipend in the Financial Aid Process: Pursuant to SB04-189, Staff Member Lindner prepared a uniform policy that states stipends are not to be included in a student's Cost of Attendance and resources available to pay for those costs when determining financial aid. Ms. Lindner assured Commissioner Farina the enabling legislation had been reviewed and its intent and meaning were included in the policy. Mr. Schweigert stated staff would meet with institutions to further clarify the treatment of the stipend and the policy. Commissioner Feeley asked if there had been any discussion with the Internal Revenue Rulings (IRS) addressing stipends as income. Mr. Schweigert reported that there had been no staff discussions with the IRS. There was no public comment. A motion to adopt the policy was made, seconded and unanimously approved.

WRITTEN REPORTS FOR POSSIBLE DISCUSSION

Memo on Statutory Authority of Higher Education Capital Construction Projects: Executive Director O'Donnell stated the memo from Staff Member Johnson reiterates statutory requirements and Commission and Department policies regarding capital construction for higher education, as there was confusion resulting from SB04-189 and SB04-252. Commissioner Baker reported the FY 05-06 Governor's Budget requests $33.2 million for controlled maintenance on Levels I & II facilities, the majority of which

are Commission owned properties. Commissioner Baker and Ms. Johnson discussed SB85-1187 and the fact that it continues to control the Commission's responsibility and authority on capital construction issues. There was no public comment.

Capital Construction Issues: Ms. Johnson reported that the H.P.E.R. project at Colorado State University- Pueblo had become an emergency due to asbestos contamination.

State General Funded Program Plans FY 05-06 and Cash-Funded Capital Construction Projects FY 05-06:

Ms. Johnson reported that Mesa State College had revised the funding source for the Business and Info Tech Center from general fund coverage to cash funds. Therefore, approval of the project was recommended as a cash-funded project.

Ms. Johnson also requested the Commission approve a change in the University of Northern Colorado (UNC) project to replace the Underground High Temperature Hot Water Main. UNC has requested and CCHE staff has approved a supplemental for this fiscal year for $635,825 in cash funds so the University can begin design work on the project. The Capital Development Committee (CDC) approved the supplemental on November 4. The Joint Budget Committee (JBC) is expected to consider the request prior to the holiday break in December. The UNC request for state funds for FY 05-06 will be $6,040,153. The change was approved.

Staff member Gail Hoffman reported the Ekeley Sciences Middle Wing Renovation at the University of Colorado Boulder (UCB) had not been evaluated since its initial submission and the renovation is more programmatic than life safety changes. She had requested additional information from the UCB staff but the requested data has not been forthcoming.

Jack Burns, Vice President for Academic Affairs at UCB, explained only a small portion of Ekeley needs renovation and is required by the fire and environmental hazards created by the wet lab in the portion marked for renovation. The current conditions create risks to the faculty and the research conducted in the area. Commissioners suggested UCB staff confer with Commission staff regarding the hazards and agreed to conditional approval of the renovation pending subsequent Executive Director approval.

Commissioner Baker moved to approve:

State General Fund Program Plan amendments for FY 05-06:
Colorado Historical Society – Cumbres & Toltec Railroad: Track Upgrade and Locomotive Upgrade;
Colorado State University – Regulated Materials Handling Facility;
Colorado State University-Pueblo – H.P.E.R. Renovation;
University of Colorado at Boulder – Ketchum Arts & Sciences Building Renewal;
University of Colorado at Colorado Springs – Dwire Hall Renovation and Technology Ugrade;

Colorado School of Mines – Green Center-CTLM Addition (Phase III);
University of Colorado at Boulder – Eckley Sciences Middle Wing Renovation. (Approval of this project is contingent upon the CCHE Executive Director's approval of the program plan amendment); and

State-funded projects in the priority order listed:

1. Colorado School of Mines – Green Center Decontamination/CTLM Addition Phase III - $4,836,735;
2. Colorado State University-Pueblo – H.P.E.R. Renovation, Phase I - $1,588,600;
3. University of Northern Colorado – Replace Underground High Temperature Hot Water Main - $6,040,153;
4. University of Colorado at Colorado Springs – Dwire Hall - $1,500,000 (CCFE); $1,500,000 (CFE);
5. Colorado State University – Regulated Materials Handling Facility – $1,502,078;
6. Pikes Peak Community College – Telephone System - $834,793;
7. Colorado State University – Vet Teach Hospital, Fire Sprinklers – $3,225,172;
8. Community College of Aurora – Campus Maintenance Facility - $116,051;
9. Arapahoe Community College – Telephone Switch - $254,100;
10. University of Colorado at Boulder – Ketchum Arts & Sciences, Phase I, $903,428;
11. Colorado Historical Society – Cumbres & Toltec Railroad – Track Upgrade – $1,350,000 (CCFE), $1,350,000 (CFE), $1,300,000 (FF);
12. Colorado Historical Society – Cumbres & Toltec Railroad – Locomotive Upgrade - $650,000 (CCFE), $650,000 (CFE);
13. University of Colorado at Boulder – Eckley Sciences Middle Wing Renovation - $1,965,610 (CCFE), $218,401 (CFE); and

Commission recommendation that alternative sources of funding be sought for the following projects if they are not funded in FY 05-06:

1. CSU – Regulated Materials Handling Facility;
2. Arapahoe Community College – Telephone Switch;
3. Community College of Aurora – Campus Maintenance Facility;
4. Pikes Peak Community College – Telephone System; and

Cash-funded program project plans to be forwarded to the legislative Capital Development Committee for the FY 05-06:

1. Colorado State University – 3 projects:
    a. Shortgrass Steppe Field Station Additions-Alterations, $3,800,000;
    b. Engineering Entrance Addition - $3,147,575;
    c. AILD, Annex Renovation - $2,239,000;
2. University of Colorado – 4 projects:
    a. Colorado Springs – Science/Engineering Building, Phases II and

III - $21,800,000;
   b. UCDHSC-Fitzsimons – Infrastructure Phase 9 - $5,424,376;
   c. Boulder – Information Technology Infrastructure - $13,524,930 (approval contingent on Board of Regents approval of the project as totally cash-funded);
   d. Boulder – Business School Expansion & Renovation - $24,718,555 (approval contingent on Board of Regents' approval of the project as totally cash-funded);
3. Mesa State College – 2 projects:
   a. House Demolition & Ground Recovery - $20,638,900 (the Commission recommends to the JBC that the Long Bill contain a footnote exempting Mesa State from the three-year rule that 25 percent of the total project cost has to be encumbered within three years of appropriation);
   b. Business and Information Technology Center - $11,500,000;
4. Colorado Historical Society – 1 project:
   a. Regional Museums - $542,000.

Commissioner Feeley seconded the motion. There was no public comment. The motion was unanimously approved.

Commissioner Baker commented that there were other options available to institutions to secure funding for capital construction projects and maintenance, including lease back which institutions could consider.

Five-Year Capital Construction Projects for FY 05-06:

Ms. Johnson reported few Governing Boards had explored other means of funding projects on the five-year list as the Commission requested they do at the June 3, 2004, Commission meeting. This report is required to be submitted to the Legislature's Capital Development Committee. There was no public discussion.

A Motion was made and seconded to approve the Five Year Capital Construction Project Report for FY 05-06 and forward it to the Capital Development Committee. The motion was unanimously approved.

CONSENT ITEMS

American Sign Language in Public Higher Education Institutions; Policy Revision on Tuition Classification of Members of the Armed Forces at Public Institutions of Higher Education; and Statewide Remedial Education Policy:

Commissioner Montoya moved for approval of all items as presented and Commissioner Vollbracht seconded the motion. There was no public discussion. The motion was unanimously approved.

WRITTEN REPORTS - NO DISCUSSION

FTE – Service Area Exemptions:

No action was taken.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairperson Weaver adjourned the meeting stating, the next meeting would be on January 6, 2005, at 10:00 a.m., at the Community College System, 9101 East Lowry Boulevard.

TOPIC: CREDIT HOURS AVAILABLE UNDER THE COLLEGE OPPORTUNITY FUND FOR CONTINUING STUDENTS

PREPARED BY: JENNA LANGER

I. SUMMARY

The College Opportunity Fund (COF) Act imposes a lifetime-credit-hour limitation of 145 credit hours for which eligible undergraduate students may receive a stipend. For eligible undergraduate students who are enrolled as continuing students as of July 1, 2005, the statute directs the Commission to determine, based on the number of credit hours the eligible undergraduate student has earned, the number of credit hours for which those students may receive a stipend.

II. BACKGROUND

To address this and other issues associated with the COF, a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was created. Members of the TAC included staff from the Commission, College Access Network and the institutions. The TAC held weekly meetings to identify issues and assign them to the appropriate standing committees, which are comprised of representatives from all the institutions (e.g., chief financial officers, chief academic officers, data advisory groups, etc.). The standing committees discussed the issues and reported their recommendations back to the TAC. The TAC then analyzed the recommendations and compiled a report detailing recommended actions or policies and any points of disagreement among the standing committees or institutions. The Executive Director presented these recommendations to the chief executive officers of the institutions for consideration and approval. The recommendation set forth in this Agenda Item therefore reflects the policy developed by staff and institutional representatives and accepted by the chief executive officers.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

Title 23, Article 18, Section 202(c)(II) provides: "For an eligible undergraduate student who is enrolled as a continuing student as of July 1, 2005, the commission shall determine the number of credit hours for which the student may receive a stipend from the college opportunity fund, based on the number of credit hours the eligible undergraduate student has earned." The statute does not, however, specify how that determination should be made. Several recommendations were proposed and considered by the TAC and standing committees. The policy recommended by the TAC and chief executive officers is for each institution to assign each continuing student a "student level" (Freshman, Sophmore, Junior, Senior) based on the number of credit hours the student has earned and CCHE will assign each "student level" the same number of eligible stipend credit hours. The number of eligible stipend credit hours for each "student level" is based on a determination of the reasonable number of hours the average

student would need to earn his or her undergraduate degree in a timely manner. The following chart sets forth the student levels and respective stipend credit hour eligibility:

Credits as of July 1, 2005	Student Level	Stipend Eligibility*
90 or more	Senior	55 credit hours
60-89	Junior	85 credit hours
30-59	Sophomore	115 credit hours
Less than 30	Freshman	145 credit hours

* Continuing students are eligible for the institutional and Commission waivers of the lifetime-credit-hour limitation[1] as well as an additional 30 undergraduate credit hours available to students who earn a bachelor's degree.[2]

This policy will provide continuing students sufficient stipend eligible credit hours to complete their degree programs while still effectuating the intent of COF to encourage students to complete degrees in a timely manner. This policy also will entail fewer administrative costs than other alternatives considered.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Commission adopt the following policy for determining the number of credit hours for which a continuing student may receive a stipend from the college opportunity fund:

The eligibility of a **continuing student** to receive stipend payments from the college opportunity fund shall be based on the **student level** a student has achieved during the Academic Year 2004-2005.[3]

A **continuing student** shall be defined as any student who was enrolled at a Colorado state institution of higher education during the Academic Year 2004-2005.[4]

Credit hours for determining **student level** shall include credit hours counted toward a degree or certificate.[5]

---

[1] Section 23-18-202(5)(e) provides that "Notwithstanding the lifetime-credit-hour limitation . . . an eligible undergraduate student may apply to the commission for a waiver of that limitation." Institutions also may annually grant a one-year waiver of the lifetime-credit-hour limitation for up to five percent of eligible undergraduate students. *See* C.R.S. §23-18-202(5)(f).

[2] Section 23-18-202(c)(I) provides that "if an eligible undergraduate student has received payment for a stipend for one hundred forty-five credit hours and the student has received a bachelor's degree, the eligible undergraduate student is eligible to receive stipend payments for an additional thirty undergraduate credit hours."

[3] Summer Term excluded.

[4] Summer Term excluded.

[5] Excludes remedial credit hours.

The **student level** for a **continuing student** who has completed less than 30 **credit hours** shall be a "**Freshman**" and such student may receive stipend payments from the college opportunity fund for 145 credit hours.

The **student level** for a **continuing student** who has earned between 30 to 59 **credit hours** shall be deemed a "**Sophomore**" and such student may receive stipend payments from the college opportunity fund for 115 credit hours.

The **student level** for a **continuing student** who has earned between 60 to 89 **credit hours** shall be deemed a "**Junior**" and such student may receive stipend payments from the college opportunity fund for 85 credit hours.

The **student level** for a **continuing student** who has earned 90 or more **credit hours** shall be deemed a "**Senior**" and such student may receive stipend payments from the college opportunity fund for 55 credit hours.

STATUTORY AUTHORITY

C.R.S. §23-18-202(5)(c)(II)

TOPIC: COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES FACILITIES MASTER PLAN

PREPARED BY: GAIL HOFFMAN

I. SUMMARY

The Colorado School of Mines Facilities Master Plan, submitted to CCHE in summer 2004, replaces the one CCHE approved in 1985**.** It was developed for the campus as an outgrowth of a strategic plan, which has these seven major strategies for the next 10 years:

- Cultivate world-class expertise in key focus areas: earth resources, energy, advanced materials, and environment;

- Enhance Mines' distinction as a research institution, increasing externally sponsored annual research expenditures from $30 million to $50 million;

- Sharpen Mines' distinction in undergraduate education by enriching undergraduate education through additional curricular and extracurricular offerings;

- Align graduate programs with professional and societal needs, such as increasing non-thesis master's programs and five-year bachelor's and master's combinations;

- Realign the geographic, demographic, and programmatic mix of students to attract more international students and students from all parts of the United States and more women and minorities; increase non-resident undergraduate and graduate students; and market custom-designed (if needed) professional and continuing education directly to corporations;

- Expand the financial resource base by increasing the percentage of non-resident graduate and undergraduate residents; obtaining financial resources elsewhere that will allow the college to reduce state General Fund support from around 15 percent to less than 10 percent to qualify for enterprise status; increasing campus endowments to $300 million; earning at least $2 million a more annually in certificates and non-degree programs; expanding campus housing; and deriving revenues from commercialization of the college's intellectual property; and

- Restructure the deployment of financial resources and capital assets, such as allocating incremental revenues to strategic priorities, increasing space utilization, and reallocating, where necessary, space allocations on the basis of national norms for science and engineering facilities.

The following list of possible future facilities includes two projects that the Commission approved for FY 2005-2006 funding: the cash-funded Wellness Center and the state-funded CTLM addition for the computer center.

Colorado School of Mines Building Projects

	Current Space Needs	***Space to Meet Enrollment Growth***	***Potential Future Buildings***	***Estimated Square Feet/# of Stories***
Cash Funded				
	Wellness Center *			100,000/2
	Student Center Addition*			15,000/3
		Creation of new housing village at 19th and Elm*		246,000/2-5 in 11 new buildings
			Six parking garages on campus periphery*	1,915,000/2&4
			Addition to Green Center	40,000/3
			New campus support building at terminus of Elm Street extended	48,000/3
			Greek Housing on West Campus Road	10,000/2
State or Cash Funded				
	Center for Technology and Learning Media (CTLM) Addition			20,000/3
	Brown Hall Addition			48,000/4
	New Academic Building to lease to USGS			72,000/4
		Lakes Library Addition		18,000/3
		Addition to Power Plant Building close to Coolbaugh Hall		12,000/3
			New academic building north of CTLM	60,000/2&3
			New academic building south of CTLM	56,000/4
			New academic or student services building in housing village	8,000/2
			Addition to one parking garage for academic or auxiliary services	Not stated
			New building along Arapahoe between 17th and 18th to replace demolished one	Not stated

			Three buildings to replace state-owned demolished ones.	Not stated
TOTAL				***2,788,000***

** Self-funded projects, meaning they will be built, operated and maintained from internal, dedicated revenue sources*

Not shown on the list above are infrastructure projects involving utilities or road/bikeway improvements. The road/bikeway improvements include:

- Construction of a bridge over 6th Avenue on 19th Street to better connect Mines Park housing with the rest of the campus. The City of Golden has earmarked $1 million for a pedestrian bridge across 6th Avenue at 19th, but is waiting for a decision from the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) on the eventual route of the Northwest Parkway. If CDOT decides the Parkway should follow the route of Highway 93 and 6th Avenue, an overpass for vehicles, bikes and pedestrians will be needed over 6th Avenue.

- Reduce the scale and potential use of Illinois Street through campus and close portions of other streets to create a more pedestrian feel to the campus, which is currently bisected with city streets; and

- Reroute main access routes in and around the campus using 14th Street and a realigned Elm Street around the academic core in cooperation with the City of Golden.

These projects may be cash funded as stand-alone projects or undertaken in association with other building plans. Another project not shown on the list is development of athletic fields, which will also be cash funded. In addition, fully using Green Center as a multipurpose conference and academic facility after asbestos abatement, roof replacement, and building renewal work is complete remains an important part of CSM's plans. CSM is working with the City of Golden on a joint partnership for renovation of at least the auditorium of the Green Center. Another project not on the list above is one to convert the Colorado School of Mines Building Corporation-owned building leased to the U.S. Geological Survey to an academic one. Construction of another building for USGS to replace it is on the list above.

The strategic financial model that drives the building plans is based on these assumptions:

- Full-time equivalent (FTE) student enrollment will increase from the current 3,363 to 5,750, a 69 percent increase;

- Entering class of freshmen will increase from 700 to 910 students;

- Undergraduate student population will be 56.3 percent resident and 43.7 percent non-resident; and

- Research volume and indirect cost recoveries will increase by 50.4 percent in 10 years.

II. BACKGROUND

Colorado School of Mines is the oldest publicly supported higher education, opening its doors in 1874. Today its campus occupies about 470 acres in three distinct areas:

- About 145 acres of the main campus west of downtown Golden;

- About 282 acres, or 60 percent of the campus lands, lie west of Highway 6 in two areas: one Mines Park housing and surrounding undeveloped land and the other undeveloped open space.

The school offers 14 degree programs in engineering and mining sciences, such as chemistry, chemical engineering, geochemistry, geology, math and computer science, and metallurgy/materials engineering, hearkening back to its beginnings as an institution to assist the mining industry.

The buildings on campus have a total of 1,380,019 gross square feet, with a replacement value of $304,950,655.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

Space Needs

The building plans outlined in the summary are based not only on the assumption that the student FTE enrollment will increase to 5,750 from the current 3,363, but that there will be 50 percent increase in tenure-track faculty, a 75 percent increase in adjunct faculty and lecturers, and a 10 percent increase in staff. Another assumption is that the 5,750 FTE enrollment will be made up of 4,500 undergraduate students, 1,000 graduate students, and 250 doctoral students.

Planning variables to calculate the space needs in the space projections model are based on CCHE, national, and CSM guidelines. For example, CCHE has a suggested guideline that classrooms should be used 60 hours a week and that student stations should be occupied 70 percent of the time. The planning variables, however, assume that scheduled classroom use at CSM should amount to 48 hours a week in order to provide space for unscheduled uses such as guest lectures, study sessions, community meetings, and other

similar events. The variables can be changed at any time or used to study the effects of possible alternatives. If the enrollment and staffing increases take place as anticipated, Colorado School of Mines could have the following space deficits in gross square feet (gsf):

Space Needs, Colorado School of Mines in Gross Square Feet			
	Existing (as of July 2003)	Projected (when student FTE is 5,750)	Space (Deficit)/Surplus
Unclassified (space not attributed to any one function. The unassigned space includes such things as corridors, restrooms, mechanical rooms, etc.)	352,283	476,428	(124,145)
Classrooms	73,839	77,353	(3,514)
Labs	205,547	296,123	(90,576)
Office	181,681	170,727	10,954
Study	50,942	91,149	(40,206)
Athletic/Clinic	100,300	168,359	(68,059)
General	97,560	137,428	(39,869)
Shop and Storage	96,979	133,475	(36,497)
Health	2,681	5,376	(2,695)
Housing	218,207	450,668	(232,461)
Total	*1,380,019*	*2,007,086*	*(627,067)*

Source: *Colorado School of Mines Facilities Master Plan Reference Manual, Spring 2004*

It is interesting to note that a 69 percent increase in student FTE can be accommodated, according to this model, with very little additional classroom space if the existing space is used more efficiently, but about 44 percent more laboratory space will be needed. The 90,576 gsf deficit for labs needs be made up with 68,039 gsf in class labs and 24,005 gsf in research labs, while open labs have a 1,468 gsf surplus. The class lab space deficit is due to program-specific requirements of laboratories at CSM. Many labs can be used only for certain disciplines and are not available or suitable for general use. More student FTE enrollment and the desire to increase the percentage of students living on campus increases the amount of space used for student housing.

The planned projects, if implemented, together will exceed the amount of space needed. Future buildings for which the gross square footage is not included on the project list are beyond the scope of this master plan. They are included for long-term planning purposes.

Performance Contract and Master Plan

The CSM Board of Trustees and CCHE entered into an amended performance contract that received its final signature on March 26, 2002. The contract had been permitted under SB 01-229 in lieu of CSM compliance with certain statutory requirements. The contract stated that CSM would have a new facilities master plan before July 1, 2003, and that once CCHE has reviewed and approved the master plan, "all CSM self-funded capital projects will be authorized to proceed after CSM Board of Trustee and CCHE review and approval."

The projects with the asterisks on the building projects chart above are self-funded projects, otherwise known as SB 92-202 projects due to the state law that permitted their expedited review and allowed work on them to begin before their inclusion in the next state appropriation bill for information purposes only. The only SB 92-202 project that CCHE has approved since the master plan submittal is the Wellness Center. CSM interprets the contract to mean the legislative committees, Capital Development and Joint Budget, would still have to approve the 202 projects before they could begin.

CSM did not meet the July 1, 2003, deadline for master plan completion because of the serious illness of the consultant working with CSM on the strategic plan. CCHE informally approved the delayed submittal. Later internal discussions and changes to the plan delayed the master plan submittal further. As a result, CSM did not submit the plan to CCHE until spring 2004.

The performance contract deals with numerous other issues, including exempting CSM from what was then CCHE review of new academic programs. Instead, the performance contract permits new academic programs to be introduced or current academic programs modified with very little review from CCHE. CSM is prevented from starting a new academic program or modifying an existing one only if CCHE finds new or modified academic programs are inconsistent with CSM's role and mission and notifies the Board of Trustees of its findings the meeting after Board of Trustees action.

Technology and Academic Planning

The master plan supports the technology plan included in the reference material by providing for new and extended lines of copper wiring from the center of campus to the housing area on the main campus and out to Mines Park for campus telephone, fire alarm, and controls. The facilities master plan also includes preferred routes for fiber optic cabling and sites for future fiber optic distribution points. The fiber optic cabling is the backbone of telephone, data, and fire alarm systems and data network communications. The distribution points of fiber optic cables will be coordinated with future utility infrastructure to use tunnel systems as pathways when possible. Currently, CSM has a looped tunnel to serve the academic core; an extension of the loop is proposed to the

south between 18th and 16th on the south and north and Cheyenne Street and what would be Maple Street on the east and west.

The technology plan indicates a $2.9 million of annual unmet technology needs, of which $1.25 million is for technical support staff. Another $900,000 is needed for capital technology needs that should last longer than five years. Possible ways of funding those technology needs—and the anticipated increased costs of Internet 2 and participation in or cooperation with the state multi-use network—are not spelled out in the technology plan, other than that future funding needs to be explored.

The performance contract discussed in the earlier section exempted CSM from the one-time requirement of filing an annual academic plan with CCHE. For that reason, perhaps, the master plan makes no mention of the connection between facilities planning and academic planning, other than to state in the strategic plan that CSM will "cultivate scholarly expertise" in these specific focus areas:

- Development of the earth's resources;
- Acquisition, conversion, distribution, and use of energy;
- Synthesis of advanced materials; and
- Preservation and stewardship of the environment.

The focus areas are discussed in the last academic plan for CSM on file at CCHE, one dated January 1, 2002, that covered academic planning during 2001. The plan referred to strategic planning efforts that were then beginning. The report noted concern about the continued use of the Green Center basement for geophysical engineering, particularly since accreditation may well depend on improving the space. The plan appears consistent with the facilities master plan.

Building Conditions and Maintenance

Most of the CSM buildings require at least major maintenance or extensive building renovations. State Buildings and Real Estate Programs requires state entities such as colleges to periodically perform facility condition audits on their buildings to determine those most in need of attention. The state goal is to have facility condition indices (FCI) of 85 or more on state-owned building, with 100 being completely sound.

The following are the FCI rankings of the academic buildings:

Good Condition, FCI 95-100:

- Research Building/Geology Museum
- Center for Technology and Learning Media Building (Computer labs, Physics)
- Hill Hall (Metallurgy, Materials Science)

- Cooling Facility

Needing Maintenance, FCI 75-94:

- Carpenter Shop
- Truck and Welding Shop
- Brown Hall (Engineering, Mining, Earth Mechanics Institute)
- Berthoud Hall (Geology)
- Lakes Library
- Volk Gymnasium
- Steinhauer Field House
- Alderson Hall (Petroleum, Chemical Engineering)
- Unit Operations Lab
- Stratton Hall (Mathematics & Computer Sciences, Liberal Arts and International Studies)
- Coolbaugh Hall (Chemistry & Geochemistry, Environmental Sciences)
- Power Plant
- Engineering Hall (Economics and Business)

Remodel, FCI 55-74:

- EMI Drilling Lab
- Hazardous Materials Management Facility
- Plant Facilities (Planning and Construction Office, Telecommunications)
- Guggenheim Hall (Administration, Copy Center, Payroll, Cashier)
- Meyer Hall (Physics)
- President's Home
- Green Center (Geophysics, Computing Center, Bunker Auditorium, Metals Hall, Petroleum Hall)
- Hill Hall Annex (Metallurgy, Materials Science)

Extensive Renovation or Demolition, FCI 35-54:

- Chauvenet Hall (Environmental Health and Safety; Mathematics and Computer Science)
- Hall of Justice (Classrooms - now vacant)

Two buildings—Meyer Hall and Chauvenet Hall—will be replaced due to functional obsolescence. The plant facilities and the former Jefferson County Hall of Justice eventually will be razed to support land and building use and circulation strategies.

One auxiliary building, Weaver Towers, may be demolished, depending on the results of a study on the financial implications of doing so. The somewhat outmoded housing

building is requiring more and more maintenance as it ages. It occupies some of the area planned for the new housing village.

Building conditions are partly a reflection of age, as well as availability of institutional and state funds for repair. State money for controlled maintenance projects has only been available for emergencies for the past two years. The oldest buildings were built nearly a century ago, but most are between 20-50 years old. Historically significant buildings include Guggenheim Hall, Berthoud Hall, Engineering Hall, and Stratton Hall.

CSM is not the only higher education institution to have serious controlled maintenance backlogs and little ability to raise the necessary funds outside of continuing to seek state funds for the larger projects. When available, controlled maintenance funding is used for projects costing $2 million or less. SB 92-202 maintenance projects, however, must come from dedicated cash resources. Controlled maintenance projects costing more than $2 million become requests for state capital construction funds. Money for such projects has been close to nil the past couple of years, and CSM may have too small a student body to be able to generate sufficient funds for building maintenance projects from any reasonable student-approved facility fee.

Conclusions

With the exception of making little reference to the impact of academic planning on facility planning, the facilities master plan is quite complete.

It details ways the campus can become a more cohesive, pedestrian-oriented one and can create definite entrances to the campus. Utility extensions and additions are clearly laid out. The campus structure centering around the historic Kafadar Commons and Guggenheim Hall is important. The plan also takes maximum advantage of the campus location on a high plateau overlooking downtown Golden by providing vistas and focal points. Land use is zoned to keep the academic core around Guggenheim Hall, with athletic and recreation fields concentrated in the lower, furthest northwest corner of the campus. The master plan seriously examines increasing utilization of existing classrooms and labs through adjusting the academic calendar to reduce the amount of academic space that will be needed. But, most important of all, the facility master plan is aligned with the strategic plan, which sets out ways to assure CSM's continued existence.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Commission approve the Colorado School of Mines Facilities Master Plan, Spring 2004.

Appendix A

STATUTORY AUTHORITY

(23-1-106) Duties and powers of the commission with respect to capital construction and long-range planning

(3) The commission shall review and approve master planning and program planning for all capital construction projects of institutions of higher education on state-owned or state-controlled land, regardless of source of funds, and no capital construction shall commence except in accordance with an approved master plan, program plan, and physical plan.

(4) The commission shall ensure conformity of facilities master planning with approved educational master plans and facility program plans with approved facilities master plans.

TOPIC: **PIKES PEAK COMMUNITY COLLEGE CENTENNIAL CAMPUS AND DOWNTOWN STUDIO CAMPUS FACILITIES MASTER PLAN**

PREPARED BY: **GAIL HOFFMAN**

I. SUMMARY

Pikes Peak Community College (PPCC) completed its latest facilities master plan for the Centennial Campus and the Downtown Studio in 2002, but the plan wasn't submitted to CCHE for some time after that due to misunderstanding about whether the community college system or the college had referred it to CCHE. Other responsibilities kept CCHE staff from reviewing the master plan until recently. This facilities master plan replaces the master plan for Centennial Campus that CCHE approved in 1994. No master plan had been done for the Downtown Studio Campus, which PPCC leases from the Community College Foundation.

Facility needs for Centennial Campus are based on the assumption that full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollment will climb about 34 percent to 3,550 by fall 2007 from the fall 2001 base year FTE enrollment of 2,646 FTE. At that time, Centennial Campus still will have sufficient space, but there will be an imbalance between the types of spaces existing and those needed for collaborative learning. Therefore, the emphasis on the facilities master plan is on renovation of existing facilities.

Three Centennial Campus projects detailed in the master plan are:

- Breckenridge Building (B-Building) Renovation, 85,000 gross square feet (gsf), $7,279.026 Capital Construction Funds Exempt (CCFE): The state-funded renovation will create space for the facilities management program so that it can be moved from leased space and high-bay spaces for technology programs (automotive technology, automotive collision, diesel, welding, machinery, and culinary arts) on the first level. On the second level, appropriately sized classrooms and labs will be constructed for such programs as architectural drafting and interior design.

- Aspen Building (A-Building) Renovation for the Library and Information Technology, 32,800 gsf of renovation, $2,186,259 CCFE: The second and third levels of the Aspen Building would be renovated with state funds for the library, information technology, and office functions. The information technology spaces are to accommodate the gradual shift from hard-copy to on-line reference sources. Computer labs would be located adjacent to the library information technology section. The president's suite also will be renovated for more appropriate configuration.

- Aspen Building (A-Building) Science Laboratory Renovation, 11,000 gsf of renovation, $3,224,746 CCFE: General office space on the first floor of the A-Building will be converted into science laboratories and existing laboratory spaces updated to meet changing teaching methods. In addition, circulation will be improved in the laboratory area so that people do not have to exit and re-enter the building or use the second level to move from one lab to another.

Another Centennial Campus project in the master plan is one to make student services on the first floor of A-Building more accessible to students. PPCC already has partially completed this one with college operating funds since completion of the master plan. The college remodeled the area to make a one-stop enrollment services center that consolidated admissions, records, and financial aid in one central location. But, the need for a 3,000-gsf improved entry to make the recessed entry protrude and therefore more visible still exists. The overall project had been estimated to cost $2,453,340 CCFE originally to encompass 26,000 gsf of renovated space and 3,000 gsf of new construction.

For the Downtown Studio, facilities needs are based on the assumption that FTE enrollment will grow from 426 FTE in 2001 to 602 FTE by fall 2007. PPCC also intends to make the campus a full-service one providing student services and academic support. Making the Downtown Studio a full-service one and expanding its academic offerings beyond the art classes previously located there is intended to boost enrollment there and maximize use of the site. The one project that has not already begun is:

- Renovation of Original Campus Building, 34,000 gsf of renovation, $3,891,140 Cash Funds Exempt – Foundation: The first and second floor of the original campus building will be renovated to provide appropriately sized academic spaces, student services and student union space, and improve overall use.

Another Downtown Studio project outlined in the master plan has already begun. This is the renovation of the second level of the Diocese Building after Pikes Peak Community College acquired it in December 2002. Due to the rapid enrollment increase and a recognized need for a science lab, the college used in-house facility personnel to renovate about 6,500 gsf of the total 15,041 gsf originally planned for renovation. The renovation that has already taken place provided space for a Science Lab, Prep Room, and lecture classroom. The master plan has cash funds from the foundation as the funding source for this project as well.

The two campuses are quite some distance apart, but the facilities master plans were combined because they share similar demographics.

II. BACKGROUND

Pikes Peak Community College began as El Paso Community College in 1967, the same year the General Assembly passed the Community College and Occupational Education Act that created a state-supported system of community colleges. El Paso, Teller, and Elbert counties make up the service area for PPCC, but about 95 percent of the students come from El Paso County.

Classes for PPCC began in rented facilities in 1969. In 1978, classes started at the Centennial Campus of Pikes Peak Community College in buildings constructed between 1976 and 1978 on 212 surplus federal acres that were not needed for Fort Carson. The Centennial Campus occupies about 117 acres (including 17 acres for a firing range) of the 212 acres today. Also in1978, the name of the community college changed to Pikes Peak Community College.

In 1986, the college expanded to two more sites: the Downtown Studio, then located at a different downtown Colorado Springs site; and Rampart Range High School. The Downtown Studio moved to its present location in 1993. The Colorado Community College System Office of Development purchased the site in 2002 and leased it back to the college for a 25-year period.

Centennial Campus is located at 5675 South Academy Boulevard adjacent to Interstate 25 and Academy Boulevard on a site with expansive soils and a 30-foot slope from the southern edge to the property line. The college consists of eight primary buildings having a total gsf of 373,304 and an assignable square footage (asf) of 265,958.

The Downtown Studio Campus is located at North Sierra Madre Street and West Pikes Peak Avenue on a steeply sloping one-half of a city block. Its building is two large connected ones, sites of former diocese offices and a Catholic school. The Diocese Building is located at the northwest corner of West Kiowa Street and North Sierra Madre Street and the original campus building is at the southeast corner of West Pike Avenue and North Sierra Madre Street. A city library is to the east of the campus on the same city block. The two connected buildings contain 47,740 gsf and 32,463 asf. The diocese offices relocated in 2003, giving the college use of the entire square footage.

As community college campuses, both Centennial Campus and Downtown Studio offer occupational programs for youths and adults; two-year transfer programs that qualify students for admission in their junior year to four-year state-supported institutions; and a broad range of personal, career, and technical education for adults. PPCC emphasizes for-credit courses. The only non-credit program that PPCC offers is a Colorado Emissions Renewal Classes that had 63 students enrolled in fall 2001.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

Space Needs

For Centennial Campus, the following space deficits and surpluses are projected by 2007, assuming student FTE rises to 3,550 and staffing FTE increases to 494 from 2001's 461:

- Academic: 151,927 assignable square feet (asf) in 2001, 146,278 asf needed by 2007, for a 4 percent *surplus* of 5,649 asf;
- Academic Support: 62,291 asf in 2001, 69,590 asf needed by 2007, for a 5 percent *deficit* of 3,617 asf; and
- Auxiliary Space: 31,902 asf in 2001, 38,427 asf needed by 2007 compared to the 65,973 asf that will be available, for a 12 percent *surplus* of 5,143 asf.

For Downtown Studio, the following deficits and surpluses are projected by 2007, assuming student FTE increases to 602 and staffing FTE increases to 26 from 2001's 23:

- Academic: 11,722 asf in 2001, 17,963 asf needed by 2007 compared to 15,433 asf that will be available, for a 16 percent *deficit* of 2,530 asf;
- Academic Support: 2,801 asf in 2001, 6,722 asf needed compared to 14,638 asf available, for a 54 percent *surplus* of 7,916 asf; and
- Auxiliary Space: 820 asf in 2001, 3,913 asf needed compared to 2,242 asf available by then, for a 75 percent *deficit* of 1,671 asf.

If the building projects outlined in the summary are implemented and the staffing levels and student FTE projections hold true, however, Centennial Campus would have a 5,383 asf surplus and Downtown Studio Campus a 3,425 asf surplus by 2007.

Space Utilization

Figures in the facilities master plan indicate that improvement of utilization might be warranted at Centennial Campus. For example, 70 percent of Centennial Campus classrooms are in use only one hour per day, and the 54 classrooms at Centennial Campus are in use an average of 27 hours per week, compared to the CCHE guideline of 60 hours per week. Laboratory use at Centennial Campus shows a similar pattern. The 37 teaching laboratories are used 27 hours a week, compared to CCHE's guideline of 40 hours per week.

Space utilization at Downtown Studio comes a bit closer to CCHE guidelines for classroom use. The seven classrooms at the Downtown Studio are used an average of 39 hours per week. Including 4.7 hours per week of unscheduled, but documented, use brings the total hours per week the classrooms are occupied to 43.7 hours per week. But the five teaching laboratories—used for art, dance, and computer science—have a weekly average of 27 hours.

Even with increased utilization of classroom and laboratory spaces, however, it must be recognized that they are only a small part of the total academic spaces needed at a community college. Open laboratories, academic offices, physical education and recreation, and "other" academic department space are the other academic spaces. Also, lab spaces designed for specific disciplines may be unusable as general labs, also limiting their use.

Parking

As would be expected from comparing a campus on a large site with one in a downtown location, the Centennial Campus has no need for additional parking. Its 1,790 parking spaces are more than sufficient for the next few years, although the circulation pattern could be improved. In contrast, the Downtown Studio Campus has only a 25-space parking lot. The campus gives money to students to use on-street parking meters, and a partnership is in place with an adjacent parking facility for the use of campus students and staff.

Building Conditions and Maintenance

The last time PPCC performed facility condition audits of its buildings was in 1999, when the Downtown Studio was being leased. No facility condition indices (FCI), therefore, are available for that downtown campus.

For the Centennial Campus, the FCI for the eight buildings is:

- Good condition, FCI 95-100: 2
- Need maintenance, FCI 75-94: 3
- Remodel, FCI 55-74: 2
- Extensive remodel or demolish, FCI 35-54: 1

The two buildings targeted for renovation in the master plan, Breckenridge and Aspen, had FCI rankings of 72 and 75, respectively, in 1999. The rankings could be lower if the condition audits were performed today. The two buildings are where most of the academic functions are located, so renovating them with money from some source is extremely important for their continued usefulness.

Some colleges are seriously considering, or have already instituted, student-approved facility fees that would be used to both maintain buildings and construct new ones in a time of very limited state funds for higher education capital projects. Such an option for campuses with relatively small student headcounts such as Centennial and Downtown Studio is probably not feasible. The fee would have to be extremely high to even begin to generate sufficient funds to pay for major maintenance.

Technology and Academic Planning

Information Technology Support Services developed a strategic plan for technology use in late 2001 outlining such objectives as infrastructure upgrades, assisted technology, computer replacement, wireless technology, and storage access network. Facilities additions and renovations will be brought to the attention of the information technology group to ensure integration of information technology systems. The facilities plan was developed in concert with an academic plan and under the guidance of the 2002-2007 strategic plan.

The existing FTE used in the facilities master plan excludes those FTE generated from off-campus sites, distance education, and independent study. PPCC has five off-campus sites ranging from Fort Sill, Oklahoma, to Fort Carson and Peterson Air Force Base in Colorado Springs.

Long-Term Planning

PPCC students in 2002 approved a student fee to pay back auxiliary bonding to finance construction of on-campus child care centers at Centennial Campus and Rampart Range Campus. Both child care centers opened in January 2004 following CCHE approval of the program plans. The child care center at Centennial is included in a long-range plan for Centennial. (The Centennial center has 100 children enrolled, filling eight of the 11 classrooms. The ninth classroom will open in the spring for the center, which is planned to meet the day-care need on campus for the next five years.) Although Centennial occupies a large site, the steep topography limits building to the existing area. The long-term map for Centennial proposes:

- Redoing the vehicular loop road to the exterior of the parking lots so that pedestrians do not have to cross a busy road to reach the campus buildings;

- Construction of a short-term parking lot at the front of the campus for visitors and new students needing to use student services;

- Pedestrian zones of green space to give access to campus buildings from the main parking lots, with the pedestrian zone on the east side leading to the secondary entrance near the Student Center Building, the bookstore, and library.

Conclusions

Given the current outlook for state funding, the reliance on state funding for the Centennial Campus renovation projects is a concern. CCHE staff urges PPCC, the community college system, and their associated foundations to examine possible ways of raising the necessary funds to accomplish the projects outlined.
That Centennial and Downtown Studio have already expended their own funds to accomplish parts of one project each is an indication that ways can be found if necessary.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Commission approve the facilities master plan for Pikes Peak Community College Centennial Campus and Downtown Studio Campus with the suggestion that PPCC, the community college system, and their associated foundations seek cash funding for completion of the Centennial projects before program plans are submitted to CCHE.

Appendix A

STATUTORY AUTHORITY

(23-1-106) Duties and powers of the commission with respect to capital construction and long-range planning

(3) The commission shall review and approve master planning and program planning for all capital construction projects of institutions of higher education on state-owned or state-controlled land, regardless of source of funds, and no capital construction shall commence except in accordance with an approved master plan, program plan, and physical plan.

(4) The commission shall ensure conformity of facilities master planning with approved educational master plans and facility program plans with approved facilities master plans.

TOPIC: PIKES PEAK COMMUNITY COLLEGE RAMPART RANGE CAMPUS FACILITIES MASTER PLAN

PREPARED BY: GAIL HOFFMAN

I. SUMMARY

This facilities master plan is the first submitted to CCHE for the Rampart Range Campus of Pikes Peak Community College (PPCC). Rampart Range Campus began at its present site in the summer of 1998. Located at 11195 Highway 83 in northern Colorado Springs, Rampart Range Campus was established for the rapidly growing residential areas and high-tech businesses in the northern part of the city.

Submitted to CCHE in 2003, the master plan is based on the assumption that student full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollment will grow from 1,260 FTE in 2001 to 1,673 FTE by fall 2007, or 33 percent. A utilization study of campus classrooms and teaching laboratories conducted as part of the master plan indicates that while utilization is fairly high, the campus has no serious space deficits to support the role and mission of Rampart Range.

The only facility plan provided for in the plan is a new 500-space parking lot at a cost of $701,127 in state money. Responding to a parking shortage, campus in-house facility personnel already built an overflow parking area on campus vacant land. They graded and covered the area with road base, which the campus recognizes as a temporary fix only. The only other facility project that took place while the master plan began going through the approval process at the community college system and CCHE was a Child Development Center. Students at Rampart Range Campus and Centennial Campus approved paying increased student fees to pay off the bonds for the two on-campus child care centers in the spring of 2002. Both child care centers opened for business in January 2004. The Rampart Range Campus on-campus day care has 81 children enrolled, with a continuing need for toddler classrooms. One of the preschool rooms may be converted for the toddler program.

Looking beyond the five- or six-year planning window for most college and university facilities master plans, the plan delineates zones for future additional academic facilities, recreational fields, and an outreach area to the community and surrounding area on the 75-acre campus.

II. BACKGROUND

Rampart Range Campus began in 1986, when PPCC started offering evening classes at Rampart Range High School. When the high school became inadequate to meet the

demand for community college classes in the fast-growing area, planning began on building a new campus to help meet the need for 100,000 additional square feet documented for PPCC in 1989. The campus opened for classes in the summer of 1998. Fall enrollment that year was 2,112 students, far beyond expectations.

All three campuses of Pikes Peak Community College—Downtown Studio, Rampart Range, and Centennial—serve the Elbert, El Paso, and Teller counties, with about 95 percent of the students coming from El Paso County.

In fall 2001, the Rampart Range Campus' 2,062 students included 38.6 percent attending college full time and 61.4 percent part time. Women outnumbered men 57.4 percent vs. 42.6 percent. Resident students made up 98.1 percent of the study body. Ethnically, whites were 74.8 percent of the student body; Hispanics, 8.1 percent; black, 6.6 percent; Asian/Pacific Islander, 4 percent; Indian/Alaskan, 1.6 percent; and "unknown," 4.9 percent. The average age of the students was 27.9 years, with the 18-21 year olds the largest age group at 38.6 percent.

(By way of comparison, the ethnic make up of PPCC's Downtown Studio and Centennial students was a little more diverse, with whites making up 74 percent at the Downtown Studio Campus and 65.3 percent at Centennial Campus. The average age of students at Centennial in 2001 was 28.2; at Downtown Studio, 30.33. Women made up 68.2 percent of the student population at Downtown Studio and 57.3 percent at Centennial.)

In 2001, Rampart Range employed 28.5 FTE classified employees, 29.5 FTE faculty, 95 FTE adjunct faculty, and 7 exempt employees, for a total staffing of 107 FTE. The staffing is expected to grow to 112 by 2007, an increase used in projecting space needs.

The main, two-story Rampart Range building is 116,000 gsf (77,765 asf). The Child Development Center is 17,600 gsf (11,400 asf), for a total of 133,780 gsf (89,205 asf).

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

Space Needs and Utilization

Based on assumptions in student and staff FTE growth between 2001 and 2007, the master plan indicates the following space deficits and surpluses:

- Academic Space (classrooms, teaching labs, open labs, academic offices, other academic spaces, and associated support space): 47,116 assignable square feet (asf) in 2001, 44, 289 asf needed by 2007, for a 6 percent *surplus* of 2,827 asf;

- Academic Support Space (administrative offices, library, physical plant, other administrative department space, and associated support spaces): 21,643 asf in 2001, 16,655 needed by 2007, for a 23 percent *surplus* of 4,988 asf;
- Auxiliary Space (Student Union and child care): 8,906 asf in 2001, 22,315 asf needed in 2007 compared to 20,346 asf available due to opening of child care center, for a 10 percent *deficit* of 1,969, primarily for student union needs.

Rampart Range's 14 classrooms are used an average of 44.2 hours a week (counting documented unscheduled use of 12.2 hours a week), compared to CCHE's space use guideline of 60 hours a week. The classroom with the highest amount of use is the only one with a capacity of 61-75 students.

The campus' 19 teaching laboratories were used an average of 24 hours a week, compared to the CCHE guideline of 40 hours per week. The labs with the lowest average usage per week are specialized, discipline-specific ones for dental assisting, nursing, and computer science. Many of the labs are used for far more than scheduled classes, but that usage couldn't be documented for the master plan.

The master plan found that the library space will have about a 37 percent surplus of space by 2007, compared to the 51 percent surplus it had in 2001. This conclusion was based on applying standards from the Association of College and Research Libraries collections guideline and weighing them against the knowledge that many students conduct research on line away from the library, reducing the number of student stations needed.

Parking

Rampart Range Campus has 801 parking spaces for students, staff, and faculty, or about a parking space-to-FTE ratio of 0.383. This is a lower ratio than for Centennial (0.721), Front Range Community College – Westminster (0.553), but slightly more than for Arapahoe Community College (0.354). The plan therefore suggests construction of a 500-space parking lot to the northwest of the existing lot with a separate parking circulation route. This location is closest to the Child Development Center for easier and safer access.

The master plan suggests state funding for additional parking. While CCHE is aware that community colleges are reluctant to burden students with fees and charges in order to keep education accessible, CCHE staff urges the college to consider a parking fee assessed per student to cover the cost of parking lot maintenance and construction. Parking facilities are often auxiliary enterprises, at least at four-year institutions. It may be time for community colleges to consider the same approach, particularly when more pressing needs for state money include simply trying to address serious health and life safety issues of existing buildings.

Longer-Term Planning

One of the restrictions on the Rampart Range site is a gas line buried less than 10 feet underground that has a 50-foot easement on either side. The gas line bisects the parcel nearly in two. Therefore, the campus today is confined to one side of the gas line. Another is the slope of the parcel, which is one-story higher to the north than to the south. A small retention pond is in the southwest corner, where open space is planned for later.

Longer-term planning envisions respecting the gas-line easement, but adding buildings on the other side of the gas line as well. The main campus entry, according to a long-range map in the master plan, will have its access off Interquest Parkway (Highway 83), with an access road going to the main entrance off of Old State Route 83 as well. Open space would buffer the parking lots from being seen from Interquest Parkway and from Old State Route 83. Parking lots would continue to be placed in front of the main building, with others added later next to a planned recreation field (perhaps in cooperation with the City of Colorado Springs) and two future academic buildings. An outreach zone possibly providing land for business partnerships with the college is also suggested. The current main building and the planned two new academic buildings would be grouped around a planned campus green.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Commission approve the master plan for the Rampart Range Campus of Pikes Peak Community College with the understanding that the campus and those of other community colleges work toward making their parking functions self-supporting.

TOPIC: **STATE GUARANTEED GENERAL EDUCATION COURSES FOR ADAMS STATE COLLEGE**

PREPARED BY: **JETT CONNER & MATT GIANNESCHI**

I. SUMMARY

In compliance with state statute (C.R.S. 23-1-125), this agenda item presents recommendations regarding the adoption of specific courses for State Guaranteed General Education designation. This designation means that a course is universally transferable as a general education course among all Colorado public institutions and all undergraduate degree programs.

This agenda item relates to Adams State College's two-year associate of arts and sciences degree programs. By adopting CCHE staff recommendations regarding three science courses and one math course nominated by Adams State, the Commission will enable the college's two-year associate of arts (AA) and associate of science (AS) students to transfer to other four-year institutions, should they choose to do so, with the same core course guarantees offered to other community college students.

Staff recommends the approval of these four courses for the statewide guaranteed transfer program. Upon approval these courses may be added to the list of guaranteed general education courses, beginning with the spring 2005 semester.

II. BACKGROUND

Two state colleges in Colorado, Adams State College and Mesa State College, offer two-year degrees as well as four-year degrees, as permitted by their statutory role and mission. When the General Assembly directed the Commission to outline a plan to implement a core course concept in 2002 (C.R.S. 23-1-125), defining the general education course competency guidelines for all public institutions of higher education, and ensuring the most effective way to achieve the transferability of general education course credits among public institutions in Colorado, the focus of the Commission's initial plan was on the state's community colleges and four-year, degree-granting institutions. Less attention was paid initially to Adams State and Mesa State's two-year programs, which have similar, but not identical, transfer core requirements to the state's community colleges.

During the last two years of general education course reviews and recommendations, most – but not all – of the eligible core courses nominated by Adams State and Mesa State for statewide transfer were approved. These two colleges do not participate in the common

course numbering system associated with the state's community colleges.
For the past two years, the community colleges have, with few exceptions, nominated their core courses for the statewide guaranteed transfer program as a single block of courses. Adams State and Mesa State did not couple its two-year course nominations with those of the community colleges. Thus, recommendations and course approvals for the statewide program for the community colleges did not necessarily include similar courses in the two-year programs at Adams State and Mesa State.

Following adoption by the Commission of the common course "matrix" numbering system used for all core courses designated for statewide guaranteed transfer in January 2003, it was noticed that a few eligible core courses at Adams State and Mesa State had not yet been approved for the program. This meant that two-year students at these two colleges had fewer choices than other community college students. It also meant that students at Adams and Mesa might not have been able to participate fully in the 60 + 60 transfer plan, since several prerequisite courses necessary to complete in the first two years had not yet been guaranteed for transfer.

This fall, special focus was given to Adams State and Mesa State's two- year programs, to help make the core requirements at each fully compatible with the community college's approved core courses. These recommendations have now been completed for Adams State. Mesa State's course nominations are likely to be reviewed sometime during the next cycle of general education nominations, sometime in spring 2005.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

Staff realized that three science courses and one math course were all that were needed to make Adams State's core requirements fully compatible with other community colleges' transfer core programs and 60 + 60 transfer requirements. The four courses are as follows:

Math 121 Calculus II
Biol 204 General Biology II
Chem 132 General Chemistry II
Phys 232 General Physics II (Calculus based)
(All science recommendations include required lab components)

Two GE-25 Council committees, one from math and one from the sciences, reviewed the above course nominations and recommended the courses to the Commission staff. Staff concurs with the recommendations.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Commission approve the fully recommended courses for state guaranteed general education transfer designation.

V. STATUTORY AUTHORITY

23-1-125. Commission directive – student bill of rights – degree requirements – implementation of core courses (1) Student bill of rights.

TOPIC: METROPOLITAN STATE COLLEGE OF DENVER TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM PROPOSALS

PREPARED BY: MATT GIANNESCHI

I. SUMMARY

Metropolitan State College of Denver (MSCD) is seeking approval for two proposed teacher education licensure preparation programs: Chicano/a Studies for Elementary Education licensure and African American Studies for Secondary Social Studies licensure. Both programs are offered at the undergraduate level.

The Colorado State Board of Education (SBE) reviewed MSCD's proposals and determined that the two aforementioned programs meet the expectations for licensure and satisfy all of the Colorado State Board of Education-adopted standards. Accordingly, the Colorado Department of Education (CDE) recommends that the Commission approve these program proposals for teacher education licensure.

II. BACKGROUND

Chicano/a Studies (Elementary Education Licensure)

On May 3, 2001, the Commission approved the Chicano/a Studies major for Secondary Social Studies licensure. Using this already approved program as a foundation, MSCD proposes expanding this program to the Elementary Education level (most of the CCHE performance measures approved by the Commission in 2001 have been proposed to be adopted by this new licensure program).

The Colorado Department of Education reviewed the content of the Chicano/a Studies major in September 2004. At that time, the CDE determined that the major satisfies all of the Colorado Model Content Standards and the academic requirements for licensure in Elementary Education. At its meeting on October 14, 2004, the Colorado State Board of Education approved Chicano/a Studies as a major qualifying eligible candidates for Elementary Education licensure and submitted an affirmative recommendation to the Commission.

CCHE Performance Based Teacher Education Program Measures (pursuant to 23-1-121, C.R.S.):

a. 126-Credit Hour Degree:
   The program meets the 126-credit hour degree program limit established by CCHE policy. Total credit hours required: 126.

b. Comprehensive Admission:
Policies already approved by the Commission.

c. Ongoing Screening and Counseling:
Policies already approved by the Commission.

d. Coursework and Field Based Training that Integrates Theory and Practice:
All coursework has been approved by the State Board of Education as meeting the Colorado content model standards and licensure requirements. The following courses required in this program demonstrate the integration of theory of practice in the coursework and field-based training:

Foundations

EDU 3100:	Social Foundations and Multicultural Education
RDG 3110:	Foundations of Literacy Instruction in Grades P-6
SED 3600:	The Exceptional Learner in the Classroom
EDT 3610:	Applications of Educational Technology
PSY 1800:	Developmental Education Psychology

Integrated Methods

EDU 3640:	Basic Techniques in Instruction, Assessment and Mangement
EDU 3650:	Elementary Instruction, Assessment, and Management Field Exp.
MUS 2050:	Music Lab for the Elementary Instructor
ART 2060:	Art Lab for the Elementary Instructor
HPS 2080:	Physical Education Lab for the Elementary Instructor
RDG 4000:	Literacy Instruction in Grades K-6
EDU 4100:	Integrated Methods of Teaching Language Arts and Social Studies
EDU 4105:	Integrated Language Arts and Social Studies Field Experience
EDU 4120:	Integrated Methods of Teaching Science, Health and Mathematics
EDU 4125:	Integrated Science, Health and Mathematics Field Experience
EDU 4190:	Student Teaching and Seminar

e. 800-Hour Filed Experience:
Policies already approved by the Commission.

f. Demonstration of Skills Required for Licensure:
Policies already approved by the Commission. Coursework approved by the Colorado State Board of Education.

g. Comprehensive, On-Going Assessment:
Policies already approved by the Commission.

African American Studies (Secondary Social Science Licensure)

In 2004, MSCD proposed African American Studies as a qualifying major leading to licensure in Secondary Social Studies.

The Colorado Department of Education reviewed the content of the African American Studies major in October 2004. The CDE determined that the program satisfies all of the Colorado Model Content Standards and the requirements for licensure in Secondary Social Studies. At its meeting on November 11, 2004, the Colorado State Board of Education approved African American Studies as a major qualifying eligible candidates for Secondary Social Studies licensure and submitted an affirmative recommendation to the Commission.

The CCHE has reviewed the MSCD proposal for African American Studies, and determined that the program meets the state's performance-based standards.

CCHE Performance Based Teacher Education Program Measures (pursuant to 23-1-121, C.R.S.):

a. 126-Credit Hour Degree:
Program meets the 126-credit hour degree program limit established by CCHE policy. Total hours required: 125.

b. Comprehensive Admission:
All students must demonstrate competency in writing, mathematics, and speaking; all students must have a 2.50 gpa overall or in the last 30 credit hours; all candidates must have 50 hours of successful age-appropriate experience and a negative TB test.

c. Ongoing Screening and Counseling:
Students must attain or maintain a gpa of at least a 2.75 to enter student teaching. All students will be advised by faculty in the African American Studies major and the Teacher Education Program.

d. Coursework and Field Based Training that Integrates Theory and Practice:
All coursework approved by the State Board of Education as meeting the Colorado content model standards and licensure requirements. The following courses required in this program demonstrate the integration of theory of practice in the coursework and field-based training:

Licensure/Pedagogy: 37 Credit Hours

EDS 3110: Processes in Education in Multicultural Urban Schools
EDS 3120: Field Experiences in Multicultural Urban Schools
EDS 3200: Education Psychology Applied to Teaching
SED 3600: The Exceptional Learner in the Classroom
RDG 3280: Teaching Literacy Skill Development in Content Area
EDS 3210: Standards Based Curriculum, Assessment, and Management
EDT 3220: Field Experience in Standards Based Teaching, Assessment, and Management
EDT 3610: Applications of Education Technology
HIS 4010: Methods of Teaching Social Science: Secondary
EDS 4290: Student Teaching and Seminar: Secondary 7-12

e. 800-Hour Filed Experience:

Candidates must complete EDS 3120 (80 hours), EDS 3220 (80 hours), and EDS 4290 (640 hours).

f. Demonstration of Skills Required for Licensure:

All students are monitored by faculty in Teacher Education to ensure that all courses required for licensure are completed. In addition, all students must pass the PLACE content exam prior to student teaching. Students that do not pass the PLACE content exam will not be recommended by MSCD or permitted to enroll in EDS 4290 (student teaching).

g. Comprehensive, On-Going Assessment:

Assessment in Major: All students are required to pass an assessment examination designed by the faculty.

Assessment in Teacher Education: All students must complete a portfolio and pass a comprehensive assessment. All students must pass the PLACE content exam prior to receiving a recommendation from MSCD or permitted to enroll in EDS 4290 (student teaching).

III. RECOMMENDATION

That the Commission approve Chicana/o Studies and African American Studies as degree programs leading to teacher licensure in Elementary Education and Secondary Social Studies, respectively, at Metropolitan State College of Denver.

IV. STATUTORY AUTHORITY

C.R.S. 23-1-121 (d)(e). A requirement that each teacher candidate complete during the course of teacher preparation program a minimum of eight hundred hours of supervised field-based experience that relates to predetermined learning standards. A requirement that each teacher candidate, prior to graduation, must demonstrate the skills required for licensure, as specified by rule of the state board of education pursuant to section **22-2-109(3), C.R.S.**

C.R.S. 22-2-109(3). On or before July 1, 2000, the state board of education by rule shall adopt performance-based teacher licensure standards, which at a minimum shall include a requirement that each candidate for a provisional teacher license shall have and be able to demonstrate the following skills:

(a) The ability to align instructional objectives with adopted student learning standards;
(b) The ability to teach in a manner that addresses individual student needs and enables the student to improve his or her performance;
(c) Proficiency in measuring and monitoring each student's progress toward achieving learning standards;
(d) The ability to adjust instructional practices and methods when necessary to stimulate or enhance student progress;
(e) The ability to engage parents as learning partners to promote student learning;
(f) The ability to integrate technology into instruction at the grade level for which the teacher expects to be endorsed;
(g) The ability to assess student performance;
(h) The ability to demonstrate a high level of content area knowledge and professional competencies in the areas identified by rule of the state board pursuant to section 22-60.5-203.

V. SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

Letters from the Colorado Department of Education are on file in the office of the Chief Academic Officer.

TOPIC: VACANT BUILDINGS REPORT

PREPARED BY: JOAN JOHNSON

I. SUMMARY

This is the second year for CCHE to make recommendations on higher education's vacant buildings to the Department of Personnel and Administration which, in turn, will forward the reports from all the principal departments of state government to the Office of State Planning and Budgeting and the Capital Development Committee (SB03-34).

Higher Education institutions have identified 60 vacant buildings on their campuses as opposed to 51 in 2003. For 2004, the gross square footage (G.S.F.) of these buildings is 1,582,935; vacant/not utilized G.S.F. is 902,167 and the current replacement value (C.R.V.) is $249,192,742.

The report, Attachment A, is a compilation of the 60 vacant or semi-vacant facilities at nine institutions. Eight institutions listed buildings in 2003. The vacant facilities are shown in the following chart:

Institution	2003	2004
Adams State College	2	3
Colo Community College @Lowry	12	15
Colorado School of Mines	1	1
Colorado State University	23	23
Pueblo Community College	0	5*
University of Colo at Boulder	4	4
University of Colo at Denver & Health Sciences Center	7	7
University of Colo at Colorado Springs	1	1
University of Northern Colorado	1	1

*PCC vacant buildings are all on the Fremont campus in Canon City. These buildings were not listed in the 2003 report.

II. BACKGROUND

The Vacant Buildings statute is more pertinent today than it might have been in the past as buildings become unusable or unsafe from the lack of money for controlled or deferred maintenance. CCHE worked with Senator Ken Arnold on the bill in 2003 to make sure higher education was included in the reporting requirements.
For 2004, the Department of Higher Education has exactly one-half of the total number of

vacant buildings for state agencies: 60 for Higher Education and 60 for the rest of the affected state departments. Here is the breakdown by department:

Cumbres & Toltec Scenic Railroad	8 buildings/facilities
DPA – Woodward House	1 building
Human Services	18 buildings
Military/Veterans Affairs	2 buildings*
Corrections	31 buildings

*Both are armories: Lamar and Trinidad

For the departments listed above, the G.S.F. is 1,949,589; vacant/not utilized G.S.F. is 1,268,821 and the total current replacement value (C.R.V.) is $39,704,021.

Higher Education has 81% of the G.S.F.; 71% of the vacant/not utilized G.S.F. and 86% of the C.R.V. for all the vacant buildings across the state.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

Here is a breakdown, by institution, of the vacant facilities on their campuses.

Adams State College has three vacant facilities; two were on the 2003 list. The Old Art building will be renovated when funds are available; the Casa De Sol Apartments could possibly end up on the historic register; otherwise, it is planned to use the land for parking. The President' Residence has received historic designation and a grant is being sought from the State Historical Fund for renovation of the building.

Colorado Community Colleges @Lowry has 15 facilities on their list; three are new this year: Building #869, Bath House #9102 and Bath House #9103. All 15 are scheduled to be demolished when funds are available.

Colorado School of Mines once again has one facility on their list: the Jefferson Co Hall of Justice which Mines intends to renovate when funds are available.

Colorado State University had 23 facilities on the list for both 2003 and 2004. Other than the two parts of the Old Fort Collins High School (which is intended to become the University Center for the Arts), all the buildings have either been condemned or are in such bad shape that the plans are to demolish all of them when funds are available.

Pueblo Community College is new to the list this year with five buildings; all are on the Fremont campus in Canon City and have been abandoned. The plans are to demolish them when funds become available

University of Colorado at Boulder once again has four buildings on their 2004 list and has plans to use all four buildings either for occupancy by University programs or renting out the space.

University of Colorado at Denver & Health Sciences Center had seven buildings/facilities at the Fitzsimons campus on the 2003 list and has seven for this year. One of the buildings on the 2003 list, #611, has been demolished. Building #618 on the 2004 list is scheduled to be demolished in May of 2005. Building 500, the Administration Building at the Fitzsimons campus (and the old Army Hospital), is almost completely remodeled; only 48,200 G.S.F. of a total of 478,211 G.S.F. is not currently being utilized/vacant. The other five buildings on the 2004 list are currently being used for storage and, once funds become available, asbestos abatement and structural modifications are planned for all of them.

University of Colorado at Colorado Springs once again has just one facility on their list: the Science Building which is partially vacant. It is planned to renovate the 12,313 G.S.F. once funds become available.

University of Northern Colorado has listed Bishop-Lehr, a classroom building, on both the 2003 and 2004 list. The building has been closed for at least two years and will stay vacant until funds are available to renovate the facility. This is probably the most critical vacant facility in Higher Education as it means 118,054 G.S.F. of classroom space is not available on the UNC campus.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Commission approve the Vacant Buildings Report and forward it to State Buildings in the Department of Personnel and Administration.

STATUTORY AUTHORITY

C.R.S. 23-1-106(12) Each institution shall submit to the commission a facility management plan or update required by section 24-30-1303.5(3.5), C.R.S. The Commission shall review the facility management plan or update and make recommendations regarding it to the department of personnel.

Attachment A

Spreadsheet from State Buildings.

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

PREPARED BY: **MATT GIANNESCHI**

I. SUMMARY

The Metropolitan State College of Denver MSCD teacher education program was reviewed by a joint Colorado Commission on Higher Education and Colorado Department of Education site visit team in April 2004.

The site team concluded that the MSCD teacher education program demonstrated quality and met the six state performance measures outlined in 23-1-121 (C.R.S.): comprehensive admissions system, advising and screening of candidates, content knowledge aligned to standards, skills required for Colorado Department of Education licensing, 800 hours of field experiences, and assessment of student progress.

The one area in which MSCD did not fully meet state policy was in four-year completion. Specifically, four of MSCD's undergraduate licensure programs—Biology (elementary & secondary education), Environmental Science (secondary science), Human Sport and Performance (K-12 physical education), and Music Education (K-12 music)—required more than 126 credit hours to complete. This issue was addressed and resolved by the MSCD faculty and administration in December 2004. By May 15, 2005, all four of these degree programs will comply with the credit hour limits; that is, all degree programs will require 126 or fewer credit hours.

One area of significant concern was the poor collaboration observed between the teacher education and Liberal Arts and Sciences (LAS) faculty that provide content education. The site team concluded that this problem was, in part, due to problems with the administrative leadership of the teacher education and LAS faculties. The site visit team asked MSCD to develop a detailed plan to address problems resulting from this lack of collegiality.

The MSCD teacher preparation program communication plan was received by the CCHE on October 15, 2004. Moreover, the CCHE Chief Academic Officer met with the teacher education and content leadership on November 19, 2004, to review and discuss the plan.

On October 14, 2004, the Colorado State Board of Education determined that the MSCD teacher education program meets the performance measures as specified in 22-2-109(3) (C.R.S.) and recommended approval to the CCHE.

II. STAFF ANALYSIS

The MSCD 2204 site review focused on the progress in implementing the performance-based measures as well as the areas that had been identified as needing attention for the initial reauthorization in 2001.

Program Strengths

The site review team determined that the MSCD program meets the performance goals for the six state statutory elements. The Colorado Department of Education representative on the team indicated that the program meets state requirements.

The site visit team commended the MSCD program for its ability to serve large numbers of students, many of whom are transfer students from other 2-year and 4-year institutions. The site visit team also commented that, according to interviews with local area district officials, graduates from the MSCD teacher education program are highly sought after for their ability to work in diverse environments, their knowledge of state standards, and the quality of their preparation.

Program Challenges

The site review team found that five areas needed additional attention from the MSCD faculty and staff: inconsistent advising, poor collaboration between teacher education and content faculty, limited opportunities for field experiences at Professional Development Schools, the need for improved writing instruction, and that several licensure programs were above the 126 credit hour limit.

Most of these areas of concern were believed to have been derived or aggravated by problems observed between the teacher education and liberal arts and science (LAS) faculty. Poor advising, ineffective program leadership, and confusion about credit hour requirements were attributed to the problems observed between the teacher education and LAS area faculty.

Progress: April – December, 2004

On October 15, 2004, the Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs at MSCD, submitted to the CCHE a teacher preparation program communication plan that had been developed and implemented since the April 2004 site team visit. In essence, the communication plan,

- Implemented bi-monthly meetings between the Vice President of academic affairs, the deans of the LAS faculties, and the chair of the Department of Teacher Education;

- Required that the two LAS deans attend a conference entitled, "Collaboration in Teacher Preparation";

- Brought the LAS and teacher education faculties together to work on a major Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant (which was funded);

- Required the teacher education faculty to work with the LAS faculty to revise and update curriculum guides for students;

- Created the Metro Education Leadership Council (MELC), an interdepartmental advisory group that addresses issues relevant to teacher education; and,

- Implemented a requirement that any changes to curriculums—teacher education or content—or policies require the assembling of discussion groups comprised of teacher education and LAS faculty to avoid problems and create solutions.

On November 19, 2004, the CCHE's Chief Academic Officer met with the deans of LAS, the Chair of the teacher education program, and the Vice President of Academic Affairs to discuss the success of the implementation of MSCD's communication plan. At that meeting, the MSCD representatives acknowledged the problems summarized by the site visit team and discussed the implementation of the communication plan.

Following this discussion, the CCHE CAO believes that the components of the communications plan are being implemented appropriately and with earnest. The MSCD program is on-track and has made students its first priority.

In addition, in December 2004, MSCD submitted plans to reduce the total number of credit hours required for the Biology (elementary and secondary), Environmental Science (secondary), Human Sport and Performance (K-12 physical education), and Music Education (K-12 music) licensure programs by May 15, 2005. Upon adoption of these program modifications in summer 2005, all approved licensure programs at MSCD will comply with the CCHE's 126-credit hour limit.

III. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Commission reauthorize the Metropolitan State College of Denver to offer teacher education programs in:

Post-Bachelors Degree Programs

Art: K-12
Early Childhood: Ages 0-8
Elementary Education
English: Secondary
Foreign Language: Secondary
Mathematics: Secondary
Music: K-12
Physical Education: K-12
Science: Secondary
Social Science: Secondary
Special Education: Generalist

Undergraduate Degree Programs

Art: K-12	Art
Bilingual: K-12	
Early Childhood: Ages 0-8	History
	English
	Behavioral Science
	Speech Communications
	Human Development
Elementary Education	Behavioral Science
	Modern Languages: Spanish Concentration
	Speech Communications
	History
	Biology
	English
	Human Development
	Mathematics

Institution Level Licensure/Endorsement Area Program Name

English: Secondary	English
Foreign Language: Secondary	Modern Language
Mathematics: Secondary	Mathematics
Music: K-12	Music Education
Physical Education: K-12	Human Performance & Sport
School Nurse: Ages 0-21	
Science: Secondary	Environmental Science
	Chemistry
	Biology
Social Science: Secondary	History
	Behavioral Science
	Chicano Studies
	Economics
	Political Science

Special Education Generalist Special Education

The next site review of the teacher education program at Metropolitan State College of Denver by the CCHE and the CDE is scheduled for spring 2009.

IV. STATUTORY AUTHORITY

23-1-121 (4)(a)(II) C.R.S. Following the initial review of teacher preparation programs pursuant to this section, the commission shall establish a schedule for review of programs that ensures each program is reviewed as provided in this section at least every five years.

V. SUPPLEMENTAL DOCUMENTS

The following related documents are available from the CCHE's Chief Academic Officer:

- Report of the On-site Review Team
- Error of Fact letter from MSCD
- Authorization letter from the Colorado Department of Education
- MSCD Teacher Preparation Program Communication Plan
- MSCD plan to reduce the credit hours in four licensure programs

TOPIC: 2005 CCHE NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND (NCLB) GRANTS

PREPARED BY: MATT GIANNESCHI

I. OVERVIEW

In December 2005, CCHE distributed $623,453 in federal No Child Left Behind grant dollars to nine authorized teacher education programs in Colorado.

Grant recipients, along with a brief overview of the proposed projects, are listed at the end of this report. While specifics are provided in the summary, several general points about the projects are worth noting:

A. The proposals reflect collaboration within institutions between faculty in schools/colleges of education and the content areas in the liberal arts and sciences.

B. Grant recipients are statewide, with 37% of the funds awarded to institutions outside the Front Range.

B. Applicants often collaborate with other funding sources to leverage a greater funding impact than individual grants would allow.

Awardees are expected to complete their projects by December 2005, unless an extension is requested.

This report is for information, and no action is needed.

II. BACKGROUND

The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001, Improving Teacher Quality, is a federal program that focuses on the preparation, training, and recruitment of highly qualified teachers. To achieve these goals, the Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) is authorized to administer competitive grants to higher education institutions. For 2005, approximately $750,000 was available for distribution.

In 2003, the CCHE approved and funded eleven grants for a total of $747,031. These grants supported 345 teachers and thousands of students throughout the state. In 2004, the CCHE approved and funded ten grants for a total of $669,463, which assisted programs that reached approximately 22,500 students.

III. OVERVIEW OF 2005 GRANT PROCESS

In fall 2004, the CCHE solicited proposals that focused on the following areas:

A. Professional development activities for teachers in the mathematics and science content areas, especially in grades 8 and 9 and at high need public and private schools.

C. Projects that support first-year teacher retention and mentoring.

This year CCHE added a new component to the NCLB grant process by allowing institutions which have received previous NCLB awards to submit proposals for continuation funding. These awards allow institutions to continue programs that are already making a difference in preparing and training teachers.

CCHE enforced funding limits of $75,000 on new proposal requests and $35,000 on requests for continuation funding.

Fourteen proposals were submitted by eight public higher education institutions and one non-public university. In total, the CCHE received seven continuation proposals and seven new proposals.

A review team comprised of K-12 educators, content knowledge specialists, policy makers, and CCHE staff members reviewed the proposals. The review team approved eleven proposals to receive funding for the 2005 No Child Left Behind grant for a total allocation of $623,453.

IV. DESCRIPTIONS OF 2005 CCHE NCLB GRANT PROJECTS

NEW NCLB AWARDS

Amount: $74,921

Institution: Colorado State University- Pueblo

Title: Southern Colorado Math & Science Initiative
Project Director: Victoria Marquesen

Summary: Through this project Colorado State University-Pueblo, in collaboration with Otero Junior College and K-12 partners, will increase the number of highly qualified math and science teachers in southeastern Colorado. Building on lessons learned from the 2004 CCHE NCLB grant *Southern Colorado Math Initiative*, the project will continue activities to increase the number of highly qualified mathematics teachers science teachers. Science courses will be developed to enrich teachers' knowledge of earth science and chemistry content related to the Colorado Model Content Standards, and will include a detailed lab component and final capstone field module. Additionally, this project will continue activities to recruit and retain future math and science teachers, implementing future teacher activities across the partnership.

Institution: Colorado State University **Amount: $74,982**

Title: Reform in Science Education (RISE): A Model of Collaboration for Enhancing Science Preparedness and Teacher Retention
Project Director: Rick Ginsberg

Summary: This project's goal is to improve the planning, delivery, and synthesis of science instruction for K-12 teachers and students. Through a model that embraces an inclusive partnership between Colorado State University, Weld County RE-1 School District, and local representatives of the scientific community, participants will implement science reform. Dialogue teams will be created to train and mentor teachers. These teams will be comprised of two upper elementary teachers, three middle school science teachers, one senior high school science teacher, one professional from the local scientific community, one CSU science faculty member and one in teacher education, and one preservice candidate from the CSU science education program. Teachers from all schools within the Weld County RE-1 School District will collaborate with the dialogue teams to improve and redesign content and instructional strategies.

Institution: Mesa State College **Amount: $75,000**

Title: Geometry Foundations for Middle School Teachers
Project Director: Cathy Barkley

Summary: This project will create a model for assisting local school districts in their efforts to provide highly qualified mathematics teachers in middle schools. The model will build on experiences from the 2004 CCHE NCLB grant, *Mathematics Foundations for Middle School Teachers*. Few preparation programs offer content programs targeted specifically for teachers of middle grades.

Institution: Metropolitan State College of Denver **Amount: $74,062**

Title: Teachers as Leaders Project
Project Director: Deborah Figueroa

Summary: This project is a partnership between Metropolitan State College of Denver and Adams County School District 14 (Adams 14). The *Teachers as Leaders Project* serves both rural and urban middle and high schools in the Adams 14 school district. The project endeavors to "retain high-quality teachers well beyond their first year" by supplementing content instruction in math and science, and effective instructional techniques that support Teacher Performance and Model Content Standards. This project will create a system of peer mentorships and professional development, as related to best practices in pedagogy and first-year teacher retention. The project complements concurrent programs that focus on teacher quality, including *Instructional Coaching*, the *Rocky Mountain Math Science Partnership*, and Metro's *Secondary Teacher Enhancement Project* (STEP).

Institution: Metropolitan State College of Denver **Amount: $74,996**

Title: Middle School Mathematics Teacher Program
Project Director: Don Gilmore

Summary: Metropolitan State College of Denver, in collaboration with the Denver Public School District and Aurora Public School District will offer a series of five mathematics courses that will enhance the content knowledge of middle school mathematics teachers who are teaching out of area. The new program will increase the number of "highly qualified" teachers of mathematics at the middle school level in the Denver metropolitan area. Additionally, it will serve as a model for content-centered teacher preparation and professional development of middle school mathematics teachers across Colorado.

Institution: University of Colorado at Denver and Health Sciences Center **Amount: $74,491**

Title: The Colorado New Teacher Consortium: A Focus on Leadership
Project Director: Carole Basile

Summary: The purpose of this project is support induction-focused partnerships among K-12 school districts, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, the School of Education, and other local partners. These efforts are intended to assist new teachers in their first through third years. The project includes four primary components: (1) piloting "induction looping" that links teacher preparation and induction programs in the Jefferson County School District and Denver Public School's Northeast Quadrant; (2) developing induction modules for training mentors; (3) hosting a symposium for school administrators and business leaders to develop strategies and best practices regarding the recruitment and retention of teachers; and (4) hosting a symposium for teacher educators and induction leaders focused on linking teacher preparation with induction.

CONTINUATION AWARDS

Institution: Adams State College **Amount: $35,000**

Title: San Luis Valley Math Academy
Project Director: Deborah Blake

Summary: This continuation project, "The San Luis Valley Math Academy-Summer II," funds programs for the improvement of teacher preparation (pre-service and in-service) in math education, increases the number of highly qualified math educators, and the continues the development of a "learner centered" mathematics curriculum through three activities: planning and coordination (Spring 2005), Math Camp for Teachers and Students (Summer 2005), and assessment and reporting. This program funds partnerships between ASC and four school districts in rural and outlying areas in the San Luis Valley.

Institution: Colorado State University **Amount: $35,000**

Title: Reform in Mathematics Education (RIME): A Model of Collaboration for Enhancing Mathematics Preparedness & Teacher Retention
Project Director: David Whaley

Summary: The purpose of this continuation grant is to extend the efforts of the initial grant entitled, "RIME (Reform in Mathematics Education)." This project represents a successful collaboration between Colorado State University (CSU) and the Weld County RE-1 school district. The objectives of the grant are to enhance the content preparedness and instructional expertise of teachers of mathematics; enhance the overall job satisfaction of mathematics teachers, thereby improving the retention potential of these teachers; improve student learning in mathematics; strengthen partnerships between CSU, Weld RE-2, and the local business and engineering community; and, create a model for instructional reform in mathematics that is sustainable and replicable.

Institution: Fort Lewis College **Amount: $35,000**

Title: Calculating Success Mini Grants
Project Director: Amy Getz

Summary: This project will fund mini grants for rural teachers to participate in the *Southwestern Colorado Mathematics Initiative* (SCMI) program. Currently there are 45 teachers in the program with the potential of adding another 18 by June 2005. The majority of these are middle school math teachers, although this number also includes special education teachers, science teachers, and high school and elementary math teachers. Fort Lewis College estimates that this grant will fund a minimum of 10 mini-grants of $1,000-$3,000 each. Teachers can also apply to use the mini-grants to pursue professional development or to complete a specific project in one of six areas, *Knowledge of Standards and Assessment, Knowledge of Content, Knowledge of Individualization of Instruction, Knowledge of Technology, Mentoring for Novice Teachers, or Increasing Family Involvement*.

Amount: $35,000

Institution: University of Northern Colorado

Title: A Continuation of a Project to Improve Student Achievement & Teacher Quality in Mathematics & Literacy
Project Director: Carolyn Edwards

Summary: The goal of this continuation project is for the University of Northern Colorado College of Education, College of Arts and Sciences, and Weld County School District #6 to continue the partnership, begun in 2003, that addressed improving student achievement and teacher quality in mathematics and reading. This school-renewal project is designed to increase student achievement in mathematics and reading through an after school math/reading intervention program in three elementary schools identified as high needs schools, and promote high quality professional development in mathematics and reading, with special focus on strategies for English language learners.

Institution: Colorado Christian University & Colorado School of Mines Amount: $35,000

Title: Colorado Christian University, Colorado School of Mines, and Selected Denver Metro School Districts Partnership to Prepare Highly Qualified Mathematics Teachers for Grades 7-12.
Project Director: Sara Dallman

Summary: Supported by a previous "NCLB Improving Teacher Quality" grant, Colorado Christian University's School of Education and the Colorado School of the Mines' Mathematical and Computer Sciences Department constructed an educational partnership to improve teacher preparation opportunities for university mathematics majors seeking to become Colorado teachers, provide professional development for current middle/high school teachers seeking to become "highly qualified" as mathematics teachers in response to the *NCLB Act*, and build university-local school district partnerships that improve mathematics content knowledge of CCU teacher candidates.

TOPIC: **FTE – SERVICE AREA EXEMPTIONS**

PREPARED BY: **ARNE ARNESEN**

I. SUMMARY

C.R.S. 23-1-109 limits state support eligibility to credit hours offered within the geographic boundaries of the campus. The geographic service areas for community colleges defined in CCHE policy Section I, Part N - *Service Areas of Colorado Public Institutions of Higher Education* apply to two-year colleges, area vocational schools (AVS), Adams State College (ASC), and Mesa State College (MSC).

The Commission recognizes that its FTE Policy may not address all possible circumstances. Consequently, institutions may request exemptions to the FTE policy from the Commission when specific circumstances warrant such an adjustment, for example, when no institution in a particular service area offers a particular approved degree or academic program. Exemptions approved by CCHE staff and entered into the public record do not modify state policy.

Below is a list of service area exemptions approved by the CCHE that allow community colleges, local district colleges, and area vocational schools to provide short-term access to a certificate or degree program not available in another institution's defined service area. The FTE reported herein can be claimed for state support. No further action is needed.

GUEST INSTITUTION	HOST INSTITUTION	PROGRAM	FTE	TIME PERIOD
ACC	CMC	Paralegal Courses	4.8	FY 2004-05
CNCC	MSC	Academic Classes for Dual Enrollment	47.51	FY 2004-05

TOPIC: REPORT ON OUT-OF-STATE INSTRUCTION

PREPARED BY: ARNE E. ARNESEN

I. SUMMARY

The Commission has the authority to approve instruction offered out-of-state beyond the seven states contiguous to Colorado. 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 regards instruction that the Executive Director certified as meeting the criteria for out-of-state delivery. These programs are sponsored by the Board of Trustees of Adams State College, the Board of Regents of the University of Colorado and the Board of Trustees of Metropolitan State College of Denver.

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 with 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 Trustees of Adams State College submitted a request for out-of-state instructional programs to be delivered by Adams State College in Los Angeles, California.

- **ED 589: Supporting Teachers of English Learners in Language Arts/Reading – Gr. K-3** to be presented January 14-March 3, 2005, April 8-May 26, 2005, and June 24-August 11, 2005.

- **ED 589: Supporting Teachers of English Learners in Language Arts/Reading – Gr. 4-8** to be presented September 10-October 5, 2004, January 14-March 3, 2005, April 8-May 25, 2005 and June 24-August 11, 2005.
- **ED 589: Strategies for English Learners – Grades K-8** to be presented September 17-October 22, 2004, January 14-February 17, 2005, April 8-May 12, 2005 and June 24-July 28, 2005.
- **MAED 589: Integers, Brain Research & Differentiated Instruction – Grades 6-8** to be presented January 14-March 10, 2005, April 8-June 2, 2005 and June 24-August 18, 2005.
- **MAED 589: Data Analysis – Grades 6-8** to be presented January 14-March 10, 2005, April 8-June 2, 2005 and June 24-August 18, 2005.
- **MAED 589: From Patterns to Discrete Functions – Grades 6-8** to be presented January 14-March 10, 2005, April 8-June 2, 2005 and June 24-August 18, 2005.
- **MAED 589: Introduction to Continuous Functions – Grades 6-8** to be presented January 14-March 3, 2005, April 8-May 26, 2005 and June 24-August 11, 2005.

The Board of Regents of University of Colorado submitted a request for out-of-state instructional programs to be delivered by University of Colorado Health Sciences Center.

- **"25th Annual Winter Jackson Hole Urologic Conference,"** to be presented January 29-February 4, 2005, in Jackson Hole, Wyoming.

- **"CU Clinic at Sea: Primary Care CME,"** to be presented March 6-13, 2005 in the Eastern Caribbean aboard the Costa Atlantica cruise liner.

The Board of Trustees of Metropolitan State College of Denver submitted a request for an out-of-state instructional program to be delivered by Metropolitan State College of Denver in Copenhagen, the island of Mon in Denmark and selected sites in Germany.

- **Vikings, Vistas and Legends,** to be presented June 1 – June 16, 2005.

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: **COLORADO MOUNTAIN COLLEGE FACILITIES MASTER PLAN, PHASE II, AUGUST 2003**

PREPARED BY: **GAIL HOFFMAN**

I. SUMMARY

Colorado Mountain College (CMC) provides community college courses and vocational programs in mountain communities in its CCHE-designated service area of Garfield, Eagle, Summit, Pitkin, Lake, Chaffee, Grand, and Jackson counties and in Routt County School District RE 2. (The area of the school district that extends into Eagle County is within the service area of Colorado Northwestern Community College.)

Supported largely from a local property tax, CMC also receives General Fund support from the state allocated on full-time equivalent (FTE) students enrolled. Because the college is locally supported and its buildings and lands are not state-owned, the college is not subject to statutory requirements regarding facility and master plan review. However, CMC requested CCHE review of one proposed building (the Edwards Classroom Building), which it received in March 2002, and submitted a master plan for CCHE review in the summer of 2003. Phase I of the master plan was a 1990 projection of space needs and an outline of maintenance and renovation recommendations.

Phase II of the master plan focuses on building use and projected growth, areas that CMC officials wanted statistical clarification. The facilities master plan defines classroom "full utilization" as 40 hours a week for the residential campuses in Steamboat Springs, Leadville, and Spring Valley (near Glenwood Springs) and 20 hours a week for the commuter campuses in Glenwood Springs, Carbondale, Aspen, Rifle, Eagle, Edwards, Vail, Dillon, and Breckenridge. Laboratory "full utilization" is defined in the plan as two-thirds classroom usage, or 24 hours a week for residential campuses and 12 hours a week for commuter campuses.

In contrast, CCHE guidelines suggest that classrooms be in use 60 hours a week and laboratories 40 hours a week. These CCHE guidelines were determined not to be useful to CMC because students at residential campuses aren't likely to enroll in night or weekend classes and those at the commuter campuses aren't likely to enroll in courses taught during the day and on Fridays and weekends.

The plan outlines a number of facility plans for eight of the 12 campuses of CMC. The 19 projects recommended through 2008 total an estimated $17.246 million. The 12 long-term projects recommended for the next six to 10 years after that total an estimated $14.385 million. Cost of the near-term projects in 2003 dollars and the inflated cost of the long-term

projects would total $40.678 million.

This report is submitted for the Commission's information only. No action is required.

II. BACKGROUND

CMC's district covers roughly 6,600 square miles in eight counties in north central Colorado. CMC consists of seven campuses in six of the counties. Three counties—Garfield, Summit, and Eagle—have more than one CMC campus. Garfield County has campuses in Spring Valley, Glenwood Springs, Carbondale, and Rifle. Summit County has campuses in Dillon and Breckenridge. And Eagle has campuses in Eagle, Edwards, and Vail, although completion of the Edwards Classroom Building in Edwards was intended to lead to consolidation of the Eagle County campuses to one or two sites. Each campus has its own dean. Some of the campuses have one or more sites. The residential campuses in Leadville, Steamboat Springs, and Spring Valley (near Glenwood Springs) also have libraries, cafeterias, and other amenities besides dorms. Two of the campuses—Glenwood Center and Carbondale—consist of a single building each.

About 22,000 people in 2003 enrolled in CMC classes, but not many took a full class load. This is reflected in the fact that the 22,000 headcount translates into 3,200 full-time equivalent (FTE) students, or about a 7:1 student-to-FTE ratio. In 2003, the percentage of students enrolled in non-credit classes was larger than the percentage of those enrolled in credit classes at all but the Spring Valley campus near Glenwood Springs, in which 68 percent were taking more than 12 or more credits per semester. No one at Spring Valley took a course without credit.

Many of the campuses have relatively unique programs that reflect community needs and demographic makeup. For example, Alpine Campus in Steamboat Springs offers a course in "Ski and Snowboard Business," in which students learn skills applicable to a ski shop, such as ski tuning and boot fitting. Similarly, the Timberline Campus in Leadville has a course in "Ski Area Operations" that teaches students about snowmaking and ski lift and snow cat maintenance. Aspen's offerings focus on enrichment: computers, business, dance, outdoor and physical activities. Spring Valley outside Glenwood Springs has vet technician and nursing. Vail and Dillon offer courses in culinary arts, while Breckenridge specializes in the arts, dance, and training for firefighters and emergency medical technicians. The Garfield County campuses in Glenwood Center, Carbondale, and Rifle have English as a Second Language training, highlighting the fact that the area resorts and ski areas draw people from all over looking for work.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

Enrollment Patterns

The following chart depicts enrollment for each campus for the 2001-2002 academic year, the base year for the master plan:

FTE, Headcount Enrollment for Colorado Mountain College Campuses

	Annual FTE	***FTE % of CMC***	***Headcount***	***Headcount % of CMC***
Alpine*	699	10%	3,926	16%
Timberline*	287	7%	1,202	4.9%
Spring Valley*	402	10%	861	3.5%
Glenwood Springs	299	7%	2,597	10.6%
Carbondale	190	5%	2,210	9%
Aspen	336	8%	3,736	15.3%
Rifle	285	7%	2,143	8.8%
Eagle	283	7%	2,362	9.7%
Edwards	Included in Vail	Included in Vail	Included in Vail	Included in Vail
Vail	234	6%	2,027	8.3%
D illon	150	4%	1,330	5.4%
Breckenridge	359	9%	2,265	9.3%

**Residential campuses*

It may not be an accident that two residential campuses (Alpine in Steamboat Springs and Spring Valley) have a larger percentage of CMC's total FTE than any other CMC campus. Timberline in Leadville is an exception to that, drawing a lower percentage than the non-residential campuses of Aspen or Breckenridge. That could be because the programs in Ski Area Operations, Natural Resource Management, and Outdoor-Based Activities do not draw large numbers of students. The 10,000-foot altitude in Leadville also may scare away potential students.

Overall Master Plan

The CMC master plan does not address many of the issues that the CCHE master planning guidelines suggest. The plan does not attempt to link information technology and academic planning with facility planning, examine each campus as a whole in terms of land use and relationship to the surrounding area, outline possible improvements to make the campuses easier to get around, or address parking, access, vistas, topography, or utilities, among other

issues.

Because CMC has 12 separate campuses, doing a mini-master plan for each campus would have been unnecessarily expensive and time consuming, particularly since CMC officials working with the consultant were primarily interested in building use and projected growth in order to plan for future facility improvements and additions.

Utilization Rates

CCHE space utilization guidelines are clearly intended to be guidelines only. The guidelines state that failure to meet them will not constitute sufficient reason for denial of a project. CMC should be complemented for incorporating CCHE space utilization guidelines into its facilities master plan because it was under no obligation to do so.

As would be expected for an entity with an older student base (the average age for students ranges from 23 at Spring Valley to 46 at Breckenridge), usage patterns at CMC fluctuate tremendously. On the surface at least, the material on utilization shows that CMC has student stations (sitting areas in classrooms and labs) going vacant for hours at a time. This is not unusual for community colleges, which typically see usage spiking in the evenings, when working students have the time to attend class.

An important feature of many CMC campuses is the amount of space devoted to community uses. For example, Bogue Hall at Alpine Campus in Steamboat Springs is used partially as a business incubator, in which space is provided for start-up businesses. Glenwood Center in Glenwood Springs houses a day care center, senior citizen meal site, space for high school classes, and training for local businesses. The Aspen-Santa Fe Ballet uses 4,300 square feet in the basement of the Morgridge Academic Center at Aspen. All these uses and more result from CMC's commitment to serve various communities in a number of ways. The consultant considered recommending evicting these community uses as a way of obtaining more space for academic purposes, but CMC officials did not support that idea.

Facility Needs

One of the factors considered in devising a list of facility needs was the percent of class sections taught off campus. An average of 18 percent of all class sections at CMC are off campus, at such sites as a hot springs pool, a ballet studio, and restaurant kitchens. Some of those sections need to be taught off campus, and accounting for them reduces the need for on-campus spaces.

In proposing a list of possible projects, the consultant also recommended that some suggested projects not go forward due to insufficient justification. By simply stopping construction of unneeded spaces, the facilities master plan has more than served its purpose, which was to

give CMC officials some statistical information on which to base decisions.

Of the 28 projects recommended in both the short and long term, 11 are remodeling or renovation projects of existing buildings.

TOPIC: QUALITY INDICATOR SYSTEM REPORT

PREPARED BY: JULIE CARNAHAN

I. SUMMARY AND HIGHLIGHTS

- Four-year graduation rates increased slightly from 24.7% to 25.4%. Four-year graduation rates including transfers to other state institutions increased from 26.2% to 26.7%.

- Six-year graduation rates remained at 48.7% for four-year institutions.

- Two-year institutions' graduation rates decreased from 21.5% to 20.1%. This change is consistent with the variability from one year to the next reflecting the population of students who attend these institutions.

- Retention rates at four-year institutions are up slightly statewide. However, five institutions show a decline in their retention rates.

- Retention rates at the two-year institutions are up slightly from 51.9% to 52.1% at the original institution.

- There is a slight decline in the percentage of students at two-year institutions who are transferring to other institutions.

- The total minority graduation rate at four-year institutions is up slightly from the previous year. This figure was impacted by significant increases in the minority graduation rates at Adams State College and Colorado State University. Seven institutions show a decline in their minority six-year graduation rate.

- The total minority graduation rate decreased slightly at two-year institutions but there is a high amount of fluctuation among the colleges.

- The four–year institution total retention rate for minority students of 70% compares favorably to the four-year total retention rate for all students of 73.5%.

- The two-year total minority retention rate is up slightly.

II. INTRODUCTION

This Quality Indicator System (QIS) report is the sixth since the inauguration of QIS in 1997. During 1997, the Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE), in

collaboration with the governing boards of the state-supported institutions of higher education, implemented HB96-1219, which the General Assembly had passed during the 1996-97 legislative session. Outlining the General Assembly's initial expectations for a quality indicator system for Colorado's state-supported higher education system, HB96-1219 was refined during the 1999 legislative session through the enactment of SB99-229 which identified state goals and institutional actions as part of a revised QIS.

The specific quality indicators involved in QIS are similar to those used in the variety of quality indicator systems found in other states: graduation rates, freshmen retention and persistence rates, passing scores or rates on tests and licensure examinations, undergraduate class size, faculty teaching workload rates, and institutional support/administrative expenditures. The indicators utilized in the 2004 QIS report mark the beginning of the transition from QIS and performance funding to COF and performance contracts. The indicators included in this year's report are presented as trend data with the intent to present each institution's performance on five indicators as a progress report for that institution alone. This report includes a description of the five indicators used in QIS and the institutional data for each, presented over a timeframe of two to five years.

III. BACKGROUND

Colorado is one of nearly forty states that has implemented some type of a performance measurement system for their state-supported institutions of higher education. While many states rely on a greater number of indicators than Colorado (e.g., Missouri – 24, Wisconsin - 21, Kentucky – 16, Virginia – 14, Washington – 13), Colorado's QIS keeps the overall number of indicators to ten or fewer (with subcomponents). Like Colorado, other states periodically change their indicators to reflect policy changes or to enhance specified goals and objectives.

Along with the indicators common to other states, Colorado's QIS has unique aspects which result from specifics contained in SB99-229. First and foremost, Colorado's QIS focuses solely on undergraduate education. Graduate level education and research are not specifically contained in SB99-229 and thus, neither is included explicitly in Colorado's QIS. The exclusion of these two vital aspects of Colorado's higher education enterprise should not be construed as a devaluing of either, as both are recognized by the state.

QIS was designed with the following four major goals: 1) encouraging continuous improvement by institutions in achieving high levels of performance 2) measuring institutional performance and accountability 3) determining funding recommendations and the funding distribution for the higher education system 4) build public support for increased funding for higher education

Balance and Limitations Inherent in Any Quality Indicator System

Each state-supported institution of higher education in Colorado has a particular role and mission. Each has an admission selectivity level assigned to it by statute. Each has its own particular set of academic and student support programs and services. Each has relationships with its local community, region, and the state. Some have national and international relationships. Traditions have shaped each institution. Taken as a whole, each institution has aspects that cannot be adequately taken into account or measured by any system, no matter how sophisticated that system may be when, by design, the system incorporates some amount of uniformity and commonality among the institutions. This is a limitation of any quality indicator or performance measurement system that seeks to include all institutions in some common format and approach. Whatever the quality indicator or performance measurement system employed, it must recognize this limitation and strive to balance the diversity of institutions and their respective differences with the commonality and uniformity inherent in the quality indicator or performance measurement system.

On the other hand, all state-supported institutions should be able to demonstrate good educational and administrative practices in offering their programs, allocating their resources, and being accountable to their students, taxpayers, and the public. As state-supported institutions of higher education that benefit from public funds, state-supported institutions have a special obligation to be accountable to the citizens of the state. This balance must also be achieved by a quality indicator or performance measurement system. It is believed that the quality indicator system reflected in this report strikes this balance by honoring the diversity of Colorado's state-supported institutions of higher education while promoting continuous improvement in their operations through accountability.

IV. 2003 – 2004 QUALITY INDICATORS

Indicator 1A: Baccalaureate Graduation Rates (four-year institutions)

For baccalaureate degree-granting institutions, graduation rates are the single most common indicator used by quality indicator and performance measurement systems across the many states that use some form of a quality indicator or performance measurement system. Its inclusion is reflected in the fact that graduation rates are reported nationally by educational organizations, publications (e.g., *US News and World Report*), and other states.

Colorado's QIS mirrors the nation's and other states' utilization of a similar indicator. Four, five, and six-year graduation rates are calculated for each baccalaureate degree-granting institution based on the nationally accepted definition of a first-time, entering, full-time, degree-seeking student. Students meeting these criteria and beginning at a specified time constitute an entering cohort upon which the measurement is based. A

graduation rate for students completing at their original institution is calculated along with a graduation rate from any four-year institution in Colorado's state-supported system of higher education. For the latter measure, students transferring to private institutions in Colorado and to institutions outside Colorado are not counted. Since some institutions have more of a transfer role than others, the graduation rate from any four-year institution in Colorado's state-supported system of higher education is meant to recognize this important component of an institution's role and mission.

Indicator 1B: Three-Year Graduation Rates (two-year institutions)

This indicator is the equivalent indicator for two-year institutions as indicator 1A is for four-year institutions. This indicator measures the three-year graduation rate for first-time, full-time, certificate or associate degree-seeking freshmen who entered a two-year institution in summer or fall 2000 and either graduated from the original institution or another two-year institution in Colorado's state-supported institution of higher education within three years after entry. Individual institution numbers are based on recent performance with the expectation for improvement from the past year's performance level.

Indicators 2A and 2B: Freshmen Retention and Persistence Rates

These indicators mirror similar indicators used by other states which measure the percentage of first-time, full-time, certificate or degree-seeking freshmen entering in summer or fall 2002 who either completed a program by August 2003, were enrolled in the fall 2003 term at the same institution, or transferred to another Colorado state-supported institution of higher education and enrolled at that institution in the fall 2003 term. The expectation is that recent performance of the institution will demonstrate improvement from the past years' level of performance.

Indicators 3A and 3B: Support and Success of Minority Students

These two indicators take the six-year graduation (from four-year institutions), three-year graduation (from two-year institutions), freshmen retention, and freshmen persistence rate indicators and measure them for first-time, full-time, certificate and degree-seeking freshmen minority students.

Factors to Keep in Mind When Interpreting Graduation, Retention, and Persistence Rates

Following nationally-recognized definitions, the entering cohorts tracked in the QIS graduation, retention, and persistence rate indicators (indicators 1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B) are limited to first-time, degree-seeking freshmen who entered the institution in the summer or fall and were enrolled full-time in their first fall term. All other undergraduate students new to the institution are excluded from the entering cohorts (e.g., freshmen enrolled part-time their first term, all non-degree students, and all transfer students).

For some institutions, a large percentage of their new undergraduates may be non-degree seeking students, transfers, or part-time. This translates into a small cohort for QIS purposes. Once the entry cohort is formed, no students are added, and students are removed only for death, military service, or missionary service. Finally, one also should be mindful that, while a student may have enrolled full-time in his or her first term of attendance, the student may register on either a full-or part-time basis in subsequent terms but continue to be included in the QIS calculation.

Indicator 4: Undergraduate Class Size

The Undergraduate class size indicator measures the percent of undergraduate class sections having an enrollment less than or greater than certain sizes. The objective is for the smaller class sizes to increase and the larger class sizes to decrease or at a minimum remain steady.

Indicator 5: Faculty Teaching Workload

The average number of hours per week devoted to organized class meetings by full-time faculty constitutes this indicator. Organized class meetings include lectures and seminars, laboratories, field instruction, studios, and on-line delivery of courses. The hours per week that are measured do not include class preparation time, grading, student advising, or individualized instruction such as independent study or supervision of dissertations, thesis, internships, cooperative education, and student teaching.

QIS Measure 1A: BACCALAUREATE GRADUATION RATES
AFTER FOUR, FIVE, AND SIX YEARS AT
COLORADO PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS
Fall 1995 1996, 1997, 1998, and 1999 Cohorts

Institution	Base Year* For Cohort Entering In Fall --	# Students In Entering Cohort**	Cumulative % Graduating Four Yrs After Entry From --			Cumulative % Graduating Five Yrs After Entry From --			Cumulative % Graduating Six Yrs After Entry From --		
			Orig Inst	Transf Inst	All CO Public Inst	Orig Inst	Transf Inst	All CO Public Inst	Orig Inst	Transf Inst	All CO Public Inst
ASC	1995	449	13.4	2.0	15.4	27.4	4.2	31.6	31.6	7.6	39.2
	1996	431	15.8	1.9	17.6	24.6	5.1	29.7	27.8	6.5	34.3
	1997	**420**	**15.7**	**3.1**	**18.8**	**27.9**	**7.9**	**35.7**	**30.2**	**10.2**	**40.5**
	1998	**483**	**15.7**	**2.1**	**17.8**	**26.5**	**5.8**	**32.3**			
	1999	**416**	**14.2**	**2.2**	**16.3**						
CSU	1995	2,568	31.4	1.1	32.5	57.4	3.4	60.8	62.4	4.3	66.7
	1996	2,723	31.2	1.3	32.5	58.9	3.8	62.7	62.9	5.2	68.1
	1997	**2,639**	**32.8**	**1.1**	**34.0**	**57.9**	**3.6**	**61.4**	**62.1**	**5.0**	**67.1**
	1998	**3,055**	**33.8**	**1.4**	**35.3**	**58.5**	**4.2**	**62.7**			
	1999	**3,117**	**34.3**	**1.3**	**35.6**						
CSU-Pueblo	1995	590	11.7	0.8	12.5	22.0	5.3	27.3	26.6	8.3	34.9
	1996	574	11.8	0.7	12.5	23.5	3.8	27.4	29.8	4.7	34.5
	1997	**584**	**8.4**	**0.2**	**8.6**	**23.8**	**2.6**	**26.4**	**33.4**	**3.9**	**37.3**
	1998	**620**	**12.4**	**1.9**	**14.4**	**23.4**	**5.6**	**29.0**			
	1999	**611**	**12.8**	**0.8**	**13.6**						
	1995	1,012	9.5	2.2	11.7	22.9	6.7	29.6	28.1	10.5	38.5
FLC	1996	1,125	10.8	2.1	13.0	24.9	8.9	33.8	29.7	11.6	41.2
	1997	**1,057**	**9.3**	**1.0**	**10.3**	**25.9**	**7.0**	**32.9**	**30.9**	**10.4**	**41.3**
	1998	**970**	**11.0**	**2.1**	**13.1**	**25.5**	**9.0**	**34.4**			
	1999	**998**	**9.8**	**1.4**	**11.2**						
MSC	1995	667	9.0	2.5	11.5	20.1	7.8	27.9	27.4	11.1	38.5
	1996	630	9.7	2.2	11.9	23.8	6.2	30.0	29.7	9.5	39.2
	1997	**706**	**11.0**	**2.1**	**13.2**	**23.5**	**8.2**	**31.7**	**28.3**	**9.3**	**37.7**
	1998	**663**	**13.0**	**2.1**	**15.1**	**25.8**	**7.4**	**33.2**			
	1999	**626**	**8.8**	**1.8**	**10.5**						
MSCD	1995	1,239	3.9	0.9	4.8	14.9	4.4	19.4	21.5	6.6	28.1
	1996	1,324	3.9	0.8	4.7	13.7	3.4	17.1	20.8	5.3	26.1
	1997	**1,478**	**4.7**	**0.9**	**5.6**	**13.9**	**4.5**	**18.3**	**19.7**	**6.4**	**26.1**
	1998	**1,382**	**5.8**	**1.1**	**6.9**	**16.5**	**3.3**	**19.8**			
	1999	**1,440**	**5.9**	**0.6**	**6.5**						
CU- Boulder	1995	4,164	34.8	0.4	35.2	60.2	2.2	62.4	65.4	3.4	68.8
	1996	3,946	38.8	0.7	39.5	62.4	2.4	64.8	66.8	3.5	70.3
	1997	**4,259**	**36.7**	**0.7**	**37.4**	**62.6**	**2.3**	**65.0**	**67.7**	**3.3**	**71.0**
	1998	**4,267**	**36.1**	**0.8**	**36.9**	**60.9**	**2.6**	**63.6**			
	1999	**4,547**	**37.5**	**0.8**	**38.3**						
UCCS	1995	373	10.7	3.5	14.2	24.9	9.9	34.9	29.0	11.3	40.2
	1996	385	18.2	1.8	20.0	33.5	8.3	41.8	37.4	10.9	48.3
	1997	**542**	**17.5**	**2.2**	**19.7**	**30.8**	**7.0**	**37.8**	**36.2**	**8.7**	**44.8**
	1998	**665**	**17.9**	**2.0**	**19.8**	**33.2**	**5.9**	**39.1**			
	1999	**684**	**15.8**	**2.3**	**18.1**						
CU - Denver	1995	266	15.4	2.6	18.0	32.3	4.9	37.2	40.2	6.8	47.0
	1996	375	14.4	2.7	17.1	34.9	7.5	42.4	43.7	10.7	54.4
	1997	**439**	**14.4**	**2.3**	**16.6**	**32.6**	**6.4**	**39.0**	**39.2**	**8.7**	**47.8**
	1998	**394**	**15.0**	**2.3**	**17.3**	**29.9**	**6.9**	**36.8**			
	1999	**478**	**15.7**	**2.5**	**18.2**						
UNC	1995	1,763	22.9	1.9	24.7	40.8	5.3	46.2	45.5	8.6	54.1
	1996	1,842	25.1	2.2	27.3	43.2	6.7	49.9	47.1	9.9	56.9
	1997	**1,908**	**25.7**	**1.0**	**26.7**	**43.2**	**6.1**	**49.3**	**47.0**	**9.0**	**56.0**
	1998	**2,164**	**23.8**	**1.8**	**25.6**	**41.5**	**7.0**	**48.5**			
	1999	**2,293**	**25.7**	**2.2**	**27.9**						
WSC	1995	599	10.5	1.8	12.4	23.4	8.2	31.6	27.5	10.7	38.2
	1996	632	12.0	1.7	13.8	27.1	6.0	33.1	30.4	8.2	38.6
	1997	**562**	**13.7**	**1.8**	**15.5**	**27.4**	**5.9**	**33.3**	**31.0**	**8.5**	**39.5**
	1998	**591**	**13.5**	**1.2**	**14.7**	**28.8**	**7.3**	**36.0**			
	1999	**557**	**14.5**	**1.1**	**15.6**						
Total	1995	13,690	22.9	1.3	24.2	42.5	4.4	46.9	47.8	6.4	54.1
	1996	13,787	24.4	1.4	25.8	43.9	4.6	48.6	48.7	6.5	55.1
	1997	**14,594**	**24.1**	**1.1**	**25.2**	**43.7**	**4.5**	**48.2**	**48.7**	**6.3**	**54.9**
	1998	**15,254**	**24.7**	**1.4**	**26.2**	**44.0**	**4.9**	**48.9**			
	1999	**15,767**	**25.4**	**1.3**	**26.7**						

*Base year cohort is 1999 for four-year graduation rate, 1998 for five-year rate, and 1997 for six-year rate; graduate totals based on specified number of academic years plus the following summer.

**Cohort based on first-time, full-time, baccalaureate degree-seeking students entering in specified fall term or prior summer.

Source: Cohort calculation based on SURDS files and institutional data; g\QIS\2003\tables\1A_2A_Grads_3A_3C_Ret_4yr.xls

CIS Measure 1B: GRADUATION RATES AFTER THREE YEARS FROM COLORADO PUBLIC TWO-YEAR HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS
Fall 2000 Cohort

Institution	Cohort Entering in Fall --	# Students in Entering Cohort**	# Graduating With Certificate Three Years After Entry From --		# Graduating With Associate Degree Three Years After Entry From --		Cumulative # Graduating With Cert or Assoc Degree Three Years After Entry			Cumulative % Graduating With Cert or Assoc	
			Orig Inst	Transf Inst	Orig Inst	Transf Inst	Orig Inst	Transf Inst	All Inst	Orig Inst	Transf Inst
Aims Comm Coll	1998	429	22	1	41	1	63	2	65	14.7	0.5
	1999	300	17	0	66	2	83	2	85	27.7	0.7
	2000	453	21	1	50	3	71	4	75	15.7	0.9
Arapahoe Comm Coll	1998	295	24	1	34	1	58	2	60	19.7	0.7
	1999	285	27	1	35	1	62	2	64	21.8	0.7
	2000	241	17	1	18	2	35	3	38	14.5	1.2
Colo Mountain Coll	1998	412	24	1	55	1	79	2	81	19.2	0.5
	1999	383	17	1	57	3	74	4	78	19.3	1.0
	2000	525	30	1	94	4	124	5	129	23.6	1.0
Colo NW Comm Coll	1998	127	3	1	31	3	34	4	38	26.8	3.1
	1999	112	5		22		27	0	27	24.1	0.0
	2000	127	3		31	3	34	3	37	26.8	2.4
Comm Coll of Aurora	1998	235	5		29	2	34	2	36	14.5	0.9
	1999	320	89	1	32	1	121	2	123	37.8	0.6
	2000	322	66	2	19	1	85	3	88	26.4	0.9
Comm Coll of Denver	1998	493	45		34	1	79	1	80	16.0	0.2
	1999	494	41	2	35		76	2	78	15.4	0.4
	2000	429	41	3	31	3	72	6	78	16.8	1.4
Front Range Comm	1998	830	66		75	7	141	7	148	17.0	0.8
	1999	912	65	7	76	3	141	10	151	15.5	1.1
	2000	940	69	2	63	2	132	4	136	14.0	0.4
Lamar Comm Coll	1998	158	11	4	39		50	4	54	31.6	2.5
	1999	113	12		25	1	37	1	38	32.7	0.9
	2000	103	9	1	25	1	34	2	36	33.0	1.9
Morgan Comm Coll	1998	50	15		8		23	0	23	46.0	0.0
	1999	67	7		18	1	25	1	26	37.3	1.5
	2000	41	7		14		21	0	21	51.2	0.0
Northeastern Junior	1998	320	15	3	111		126	3	129	39.4	0.9
	1999	275	12	3	86	1	98	4	102	35.6	1.5
	2000	315	19	3	96	2	115	5	120	36.5	1.6
Otero Junior Coll	1998	180	19	3	54		73	3	76	40.6	1.7
	1999	211	48		39	2	87	2	89	41.2	0.9
	2000	216	39	1	51		90	1	91	41.7	0.5
Pikes Peak Comm Coll	1998	738	12	3	72	2	84	5	89	11.4	0.7
	1999	673	13		60		73	0	73	10.8	0.0
	2000	656	21		48		69	0	69	10.5	0.0
Pueblo Comm Coll	1998	301	17	1	53		70	1	71	23.3	0.3
	1999	247	17		21		38	0	38	15.4	0.0
	2000	265	8		29		37	0	37	14.0	0.0
Red Rocks Comm Coll	1998	425	21	1	53	2	74	3	77	17.4	0.7
	1999	345	17	3	31	4	48	7	55	13.9	2.0
	2000	406	34	2	32	1	66	3	69	16.3	0.7
Trinidad State Jun Coll	1998	236	31		47	2	78	2	80	33.1	0.8
	1999	236	33	2	44		77	2	79	32.6	0.8
	2000	254	44	2	34		78	2	80	30.7	0.8
Two-Year Inst Total	1998	5,229	330	19	736	22	1,066	41	1,107	20.4	0.8
	1999	4,973	420	20	647	19	1,067	39	1,106	21.5	0.8
	2000	5,293	428	19	635	22	1,063	41	1,104	20.1	0.8

**Base year cohort is 2000 for three-year graduation rate; graduate totals based on specified number of academic years plus the following.
Cohort based on first-time, full-time, certificate and associate degree-seeking students entering in specified fall term or prior summer.
Beginning with CIS 2002, students with registration status=2 were excluded from cohorts.
Source: Cohort and calculations based on SURDS files; g:\CIS\2003\tables\1B_2B_Grads_3B_3D_Ret_2yr.xls

QIS Measure 2A: RETENTION RATES
ONE YEAR AFTER ENTRY BY
COLORADO PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS
Fall 2000, 2001, 2002 Cohort

Institution	Base Year* For Cohort Entering In Fall --	# Students In Entering Cohort**	Percent Retained One Year After Entry From -- Orig Inst	Transf Inst	All CO Public Inst
ASC	2000	423	58.6	11.3	70.0
	2001	444	57.4	12.4	69.8
	2002	**405**	**56.8**	**14.3**	**71.1**
CSU	2000	3,261	81.9	6.5	88.4
	2001	3,685	83.1	6.2	89.3
	2002	**3,790**	**82.5**	**6.8**	**89.3**
CSU-Pueblo	2000	641	64.1	12.2	76.3
	2001	626	64.4	11.8	76.2
	2002	**634**	**65.1**	**12.1**	**77.3**
FLC	2000	983	54.7	11.3	66.0
	2001	1,097	52.9	14.1	67.0
	2002	**1,061**	**55.4**	**13.6**	**69.0**
MSC	2000	668	60.3	8.1	68.4
	2001	589	60.4	10.7	71.1
	2002	**684**	**59.5**	**11.4**	**70.9**
MSCD	2000	1,548	62.1	9.0	71.1
	2001	1,738	60.8	10.3	71.1
	2002	**1,784**	**62.3**	**9.4**	**71.6**
CU - Boulder	2000	5,052	82.3	3.8	86.0
	2001	4,969	83.3	4.0	87.3
	2002	**5,378**	**83.1**	**3.7**	**86.8**
UCCS	2000	743	63.7	12.5	76.2
	2001	772	64.2	13.1	77.3
	2002	**878**	**68.7**	**12.9**	**81.5**
CU-Denver	2000	515	68.3	9.3	77.7
	2001	492	68.1	12.6	80.7
	2002	**580**	**65.9**	**13.3**	**79.1**
UNC	2000	2,115	68.9	14.1	83.0
	2001	2,105	68.2	14.7	82.9
	2002	**1,940**	**70.2**	**14.7**	**84.9**
WSC	2000	500	52.8	18.6	71.4
	2001	582	58.2	14.3	72.5
	2002	**607**	**59.3**	**13.0**	**72.3**
Four-Year Inst Total	2000	16,449	72.6	8.3	80.9
	2001	17,099	72.9	8.8	81.7
	2002	**17,741**	**73.5**	**8.7**	**82.2**

*Base year cohort is 2002.
**Cohort based on first-time, full-time, baccalaureate degree-seeking students entering in specified fall term or prior summe
Source: Cohort calculation based on SURDS files and institutional data; g\QIS\2003\tables\1A_2A_Grads_3A_3C_Ret_4yr.xls

QIS Measure 2B: RETENTION RATES ONE YEAR AFTER ENTRY BY COLORADO PUBLIC TWO-YEAR HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS
Fall 2002 Cohort

Institution	Base Year** For Cohort Entering In Fall --	# Students In Entering Cohort**	Percent Successful One Year After Entry At --		
			Orig Inst	Transf Inst	All CO Public Inst
Aims Comm Coll	2000	453	40.4	7.9	48.3
	2001	407	51.1	10.1	61.2
	2002	404	49.8	9.2	58.9
Arapahoe Comm Coll	2000	241	48.1	12.0	60.2
	2001	447	51.7	13.0	64.7
	2002	477	50.7	9.2	60.0
Colo Mountain Coll	2000	525	51.4	10.5	61.9
	2001	367	47.7	11.4	59.1
	2002	397	50.1	13.1	63.2
Colo NW Comm Coll	2000	115	56.5	13.0	69.6
	2001	97	46.4	15.5	61.9
	2002	124	54.0	8.9	62.9
Comm Coll of Aurora	2000	322	46.3	7.8	54.0
	2001	352	48.0	8.0	56.0
	2002	349	51.6	6.9	58.5
Comm Coll of Denver	2000	429	54.1	4.4	58.5
	2001	502	54.0	5.0	59.0
	2002	488	53.1	8.0	61.1
Front Range Comm	2000	940	52.0	9.8	61.8
	2001	1,359	51.7	12.2	63.9
	2002	1,148	48.1	11.6	59.7
Lamar Comm Coll	2000	103	55.3	3.9	59.2
	2001	183	56.8	10.4	67.2
	2002	204	55.9	9.3	65.2
Morgan Comm Coll	2000	41	70.7	7.3	78.0
	2001	37	59.5	2.7	62.2
	2002	105	52.4	14.3	66.7
Northeastern Junior Coll	2000	317	58.0	12.9	71.0
	2001	324	54.3	12.3	66.7
	2002	450	64.4	12.4	
Otero Junior Coll	2000	216	54.6	8.8	63.4
	2001	342	45.6	12.3	57.9
	2002	287	55.1	12.2	67.2
Pikes Peak Comm Coll	2000	656	47.7	6.4	54.1
	2001	763	50.7	6.2	56.9
	2002	811	50.8	4.2	55.0
Pueblo Comm Coll	2000	265	51.3	5.3	56.6
	2001	344	56.1	5.8	61.9
	2002	418	53.1	5.5	58.6
Red Rocks Comm Coll	2000	406	46.8	10.3	57.1
	2001	481	55.9	9.8	65.7
	2002	507	55.4	8.9	64.3
Trinidad State Jun Coll	2000	254	45.3	4.7	50.0
	2001	307	53.7	7.5	61.2
	2002	383	47.5	9.9	57.4
Two-Year Inst Total	2000	5,283	50.1	8.5	58.6
	2001	6,312	51.9	9.7	61.6
	2002	6,552	52.1	9.2	61.3

**Base year cohort is 2002; retention totals based on
Cohort based on first-time, full-time, certificate and associate degree-seeking students entering in specified fall term or prior summer.
Beginning with QIS 2002, students with registration status=2 were excluded from cohorts.
Source: Cohort calculation based on SURDS files; g\QIS\2003\tables\1B_2B_Grads_3B_3D_Ret_2yr.xls

QIS Measure 3A: BACCALAUREATE GRADUATION RATES
AFTER SIX YEARS AT
COLORADO PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS
Fall 1995, 1996, 1997 Minority Cohort

Institution	Base Year* For Cohort Entering In Fall --	# Students In Entering Cohort**	Cumulative % Graduating Six Yrs After Entry From --		
			Orig Inst	Transf Inst	All CO Public Inst
ASC	1995	122	32.0	4.9	36.9
	1996	122	15.6	9.0	24.6
	1997	**115**	**29.6**	**5.2**	**34.8**
CSU	1995	345	54.5	4.1	58.6
	1996	463	42.3	4.3	46.7
	1997	**332**	**56.6**	**6.0**	**62.7**
CSU - Pueblo	1995	199	17.6	7.5	25.1
	1996	173	24.9	4.0	28.9
	1997	**196**	**28.6**	**4.1**	**32.7**
FLC	1995	195	25.6	2.6	28.2
	1996	195	27.7	5.6	33.3
	1997	**222**	**20.3**	**4.1**	**24.3**
MSC	1995	85	25.9	9.4	35.3
	1996	67	28.4	7.5	35.8
	1997	**92**	**25.0**	**4.3**	**29.3**
MSCD	1995	403	19.4	2.5	21.8
	1996	392	16.6	3.8	20.4
	1997	**422**	**14.2**	**4.0**	**18.2**
CU - Boulder	1995	655	52.8	5.3	58.2
	1996	577	56.2	4.7	60.8
	1997	**627**	**58.1**	**6.1**	**64.1**
UCCS	1995	75	26.7	8.0	34.7
	1996	72	37.5	8.3	45.8
	1997	**99**	**36.4**	**4.0**	**40.4**
CU - Denver	1995	131	42.0	4.6	46.6
	1996	128	50.0	3.9	53.9
	1997	**185**	**34.6**	**6.5**	**41.1**
UNC	1995	297	38.7	6.4	45.1
	1996	257	44.4	7.0	51.4
	1997	**343**	**39.9**	**5.8**	**45.8**
WSC	1995	60	25.0	13.3	38.3
	1996	51	21.6	5.9	27.5
	1997	**37**	**13.5**	**10.8**	**24.3**
Four-Year Inst Total	**1995**	**2,567**	**37.5**	**5.1**	**42.7**
	1996	**2,497**	**37.5**	**5.1**	**42.6**
	1997	**2,670**	**37.9**	**5.3**	**43.2**

*Base year cohort is 1997 for six-year rate; graduate totals based on specified number of academic years plus the following summer.

**Cohort based on first-time, full-time, baccalaureate degree-seeking students entering in specified fall term or prior summer and reported in an ethnic/minority category.

Source: Cohort and calculation based on SURDS files and institutional data; g\QIS\2003\tables\1A_2A_Grads_3A_3C_Ret_4yr.xls

CIS Measure 3B: GRADUATION RATES AFTER THREE YEARS FROM COLORADO PUBLIC TWO-YEAR HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS
Fall 2000 Minority Cohort

Institution	Cohort Entering in Fall --	# Students in Entering Cohort**	Cumulative % Graduating With Cert or Assoc Degree Three Years After Entry From --		
			Orig Inst	Tranf Inst	All CO Public Inst
Aims Comm Coll	1998	173	3.5	0.6	4.0
	1999	68	17.6	1.5	19.1
	2000	**149**	**10.1**	**0.0**	**10.1**
Arapahoe Comm Coll	1998	42	19.0	0.0	19.0
	1999	44	11.4	0.0	11.4
	2000	**30**	**10.0**	**0.0**	**10.0**
Colo Mountain Coll	1998	33	9.1	0.0	9.1
	1999	35	14.3	0.0	14.3
	2000	**38**	**28.9**	**0.0**	**28.9**
Colo NW Comm Coll	1998	13	15.4	7.7	23.1
	1999	23	13.0	0.0	13.0
	2000	**22**	**4.5**	**0.0**	**4.5**
Comm Coll of Aurora	1998	81	14.8	0.0	14.8
	1999	112	27.7	0.9	28.6
	2000	**121**	**15.7**	**0.8**	**16.5**
Comm Coll of Denver	1998	280	14.3	0.4	14.6
	1999	226	12.8	0.4	13.3
	2000	**219**	**13.2**	**0.9**	**14.2**
Front Range Comm	1998	138	13.8	0.7	14.5
	1999	121	10.7	1.7	12.4
	2000	**137**	**9.5**	**1.5**	**10.9**
Lamar Comm Coll	1998	39	30.8	0.0	30.8
	1999	31	29.0	0.0	29.0
	2000	**26**	**23.1**	**7.7**	**30.8**
Morgan Comm Coll	1998	11	27.3	0.0	27.3
	1999	9	22.2	0.0	22.2
	2000	**7**	**42.9**	**0.0**	**42.9**
Northeastern Junior Coll	1998	44	13.6	0.0	13.6
	1999	40	12.5	2.5	15.0
	2000	**46**	**13.0**	**2.2**	**15.2**
Otero Junior Coll	1998	57	43.9	0.0	43.9
	1999	84	38.1	1.2	39.3
	2000	**85**	**32.9**	**0.0**	**32.9**
Pikes Peak Comm Coll	1998	207	13.0	1.0	14.0
	1999	193	9.8	0.0	9.8
	2000	**179**	**10.6**	**0.0**	**10.6**
Pueblo Comm Coll	1998	151	28.5	0.0	28.5
	1999	116	14.7	0.0	14.7
	2000	**122**	**13.1**	**0.0**	**13.1**
Red Rocks Comm Coll	1998	60	13.3	1.7	15.0
	1999	60	18.3	5.0	23.3
	2000	**63**	**15.9**	**0.0**	**15.9**
Trinidad State Jun Coll	1998	126	30.2	0.8	31.0
	1999	106	27.4	0.0	27.4
	2000	**140**	**30.0**	**1.4**	**31.4**
Two-Year Inst Total	1998	1,455	17.3	0.5	17.9
	1999	1,268	17.5	0.8	18.3
	2000	**1,384**	**16.0**	**0.7**	**16.7**

**Base year cohort is 2000 for three-year graduation rate; graduate totals based on specified
Cohort based on first-time, full-time, certificate and associate degree-seeking students entering
specified fall term or prior summer and reported in an ethnic minority category.
Beginning with CIS 2002, students with registration status=2 were excluded from cohorts.
Source: Cohort calculation based on SURDS files; g\CIS\2003\tables\1B_2B_Grads_3B_3D_Ret_2yr.xls

QIS Measure 3C: RETENTION RATES
ONE YEAR AFTER ENTRY BY
COLORADO PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS
Fall 2000, 2001, 2002 Minority Cohort

Institution	Base Year* For Cohort Entering In Fall --	# Students In Entering Cohort**	Percent Retained One Year After Entry From --		
			Orig Inst	Transf Inst	All CO Public Inst
ASC	2000	138	58.7	5.8	64.5
	2001	127	57.5	11.0	68.5
	2002	**114**	**59.6**	**14.0**	**73.7**
CSU	2000	459	81.3	7.4	88.7
	2001	463	84.4	5.4	89.8
	2002	**517**	**79.9**	**7.7**	**87.6**
CSU - Pueblo	2000	241	66.0	9.5	75.5
	2001	257	62.6	12.5	75.1
	2002	**245**	**66.1**	**11.8**	**78.0**
FLC	2000	244	42.6	5.3	48.0
	2001	309	49.5	7.4	57.0
	2002	**266**	**45.9**	**7.9**	**53.8**
MSC	2000	89	64.0	6.7	70.8
	2001	87	60.9	13.8	74.7
	2002	**108**	**50.9**	**6.5**	**57.4**
MSCD	2000	417	62.6	5.0	67.6
	2001	448	59.6	7.4	67.0
	2002	**442**	**62.4**	**8.6**	**71.0**
CU - Boulder	2000	676	80.9	5.8	86.7
	2001	696	79.6	6.5	86.1
	2002	825	**83.0**	**4.2**	**87.3**
UCCS	2000	137	63.5	8.8	72.3
	2001	146	63.7	15.8	79.5
	2002	148	**72.3**	**12.8**	**85.1**
CU - Denver	2000	205	75.6	7.3	82.9
	2001	171	75.4	5.8	81.3
	2002	195	**68.7**	**11.3**	**80.0**
UNC	2000	297	68.0	13.1	81.1
	2001	249	69.1	14.5	83.5
	2002	245	**66.1**	**16.7**	**82.9**
WSC	2000	29	48.3	20.7	69.0
	2001	67	46.3	20.9	67.2
	2002	54	**48.1**	**14.8**	**63.0**
Four-Year Inst Total	2000	2,932	69.6	7.4	76.9
	2001	3,020	68.8	8.8	77.6
	2002	**3,159**	70.0	8.7	78.7

**Cohort based on first-time, full-time, baccalaureate degree-seeking students entering in specified fall term or prior summ and reported in an ethnic/minority category.

Source: Cohort calculation based on SURDS files and institutional data; g\QIS\2003tables\1A_2A_Grads_3A_3C_Ret_4yr.xls

QIS Measure 3D: RETENTION RATES ONE YEAR AFTER ENTRY BY COLORADO PUBLIC TWO-YEAR HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS
Fall 2000, 2001, 2002 Minority Cohort

Institution	Base Year* For Cohort Entering In Fall --	# Students In Entering Cohort**	Percent Successful One Year After Entry By -- Orig Inst	Transf Inst	All CO Public Inst
Aims Comm Coll	2000	149	26.2	4.7	30.9
	2001	87	49.4	9.2	58.6
	2002	103	43.7	4.9	48.5
Arapahoe Comm Coll	2000	30	46.7	6.7	53.3
	2001	63	39.7	15.9	55.6
	2002	76	50.0	10.5	60.5
Colo Mountain Coll	2000	38	65.8	15.8	81.6
	2001	22	68.2	0.0	68.2
	2002	30	56.7	6.7	63.3
Colo NW Comm Coll	2000	22	50.0	13.6	63.6
	2001	22	40.9	13.6	54.5
	2002	15	33.3	6.7	40.0
Comm Coll of Aurora	2000	121	40.5	10.7	51.2
	2001	132	50.0	7.6	57.6
	2002	127	40.9	9.4	50.4
Comm Coll of Denver	2000	219	54.3	3.7	58.0
	2001	276	52.2	2.9	55.1
	2002	247	54.7	5.7	60.3
Front Range Comm	2000	137	55.5	7.3	62.8
	2001	219	48.9	12.8	61.6
	2002	210	44.3	9.5	53.8
Lamar Comm Coll	2000	26	42.3	11.5	53.8
	2001	43	51.2	11.6	62.8
	2002	44	54.5	11.4	65.9
Morgan Comm Coll	2000	7	85.7	14.3	100.0
	2001	8	75.0	0.0	75.0
	2002	20	30.0	25.0	55.0
Northeastern Junior Coll	2000	46	39.1	17.4	56.5
	2001	50	34.0	18.0	52.0
	2002	69	55.1	11.6	66.7
Otero Junior Coll	2000	85	54.1	7.1	61.2
	2001	125	42.4	10.4	52.8
	2002	89	46.1	16.9	62.9
Pikes Peak Comm Coll	2000	179	45.3	7.3	52.5
	2001	226	44.7	5.3	50.0
	2002	222	45.5	5.0	50.5
Pueblo Comm Coll	2000	122	54.9	6.6	61.5
	2001	155	59.4	3.9	63.2
	2002	198	54.0	5.1	59.1
Red Rocks Comm Coll	2000	63	52.4	6.3	58.7
	2001	77	42.9	5.2	48.1
	2002	507	55.4	8.9	64.3
Trinidad State Jun Coll	2000	140	43.6	4.3	47.9
	2001	143	51.7	7.0	58.7
	2002	197	45.7	6.6	52.3
Two-Year Inst Total	2000	1,384	47.4	7.1	54.5
	2001	1,648	49.0	7.6	56.6
	2002	2,154	49.8	8.1	57.9

**Base year cohort is 2002; retention totals based on specified number of academic year(s) plus
Cohort based on first-time, full-time, certificate and associate degree-seeking students entering in specified fall term or prior summer and reported in an ethnic minority category.
Beginning with QIS 2002, students with registration status=2 were excluded from cohorts.
Source: Cohort calculation based on SURDS files; g\QIS\2003\tables\1B_2B_Grads_3B_3D_Ret_2yr.xls

OIS Measure 4: CLASS SIZE COMPARISONS FOR COLORADO PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS
Fall 2002 & 2003

Institution	Fall Term	Total # of Sections	Number of Sections with Student Enrollment of --		Percent of Sections with Student Enrollment of --	
			<20	≥50	<20	≥50
Adams State College	2002	443	211	26	47.6%	5.9%
	2003	501	289	18	57.7%	3.6%
CSU - Ft. Collins	2002	2,564	994	449	38.8%	17.5%
	2003	2,671	943	426	35.3%	15.9%
CSU - Pueblo	2002	578	247	42	42.7%	7.3%
	2003	539	230	48	42.7%	8.9%
Fort Lewis College	2002	753	369	28	49.0%	3.7%
	2003	790	357	18	45.2%	2.3%
Mesa State College	2002	1,070	492	81	46.0%	7.6%
	2003	989	447	66	45.2%	6.7%
MSCD	2002	2,193	734	140	33.5%	6.4%
	2003	2,306	752	138	32.6%	6.0%
CU - Boulder	2002	2,954	1,350	468	45.7%	15.8%
	2003	2,969	1,262	498	42.5%	16.8%
CU - Colorado Springs	2002	888	337	99	38.0%	11.1%
	2003	859	288	109	33.5%	12.7%
CU - Denver	2002	1,014	407	81	40.1%	8.0%
	2003	1,023	370	79	36.2%	7.7%
Univ of Northern Colorado	2002	1,357	388	213	28.6%	15.7%
	2003	1,276	317	209	24.8%	16.4%
Western State College	2002	462	164	6	35.5%	1.3%
	2003	457	186	11	40.7%	2.4%
Total Public Four-Year Inst		**28,213**	**10,923**	**3,227**	**38.7%**	**11.4%**

Source: Institution reporting in 2002-2003 & 2003-2004 Common Data Set, Part I-3

QIS Measure 4: CLASS SIZE COMPARISONS FOR COLORADO PUBLIC TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS Fall Term 2002

Institution	Class Sizes for Fall Term --	Total # of Sections	Number of Sections with Student Enrollment of --		Percent of Sections with Student Enrollment of --	
			≤15	≥35	≤15	≥35
Aims Comm Coll	2000	1,243	919	19	73.9%	1.5%
	2001	1,262	943	25	74.7%	2.0%
	2002	960	561	40	1	4.2%
Arapahoe Comm Coll	2000	1,010	554	16	54.9%	1.6%
	2001	963	511	10	53.1%	1.0%
	2002	1,003	395	26	39.4%	2.6%
Comm College of Aurora	2000	484	241	2	49.8%	0.4%
	2001	625	351	2	56.2%	0.3%
	2002	647	329	6	50.9%	0.9%
Comm Coll of Denver	2000	811	457	11	56.4%	1.4%
	2001	861	433	25	50.3%	2.9%
	2002	936	496	36	53.0%	3.8%
Colo Mountain Coll	2000	1,774	1,283	27	72.3%	1.5%
	2001	1,161	815	35	70.2%	3.0%
	2002	1,340	895	6	67%	0.0%
Colo NW Comm Coll	2000	634	551	1	86.9%	0.2%
	2001	719	616	3	85.7%	0.4%
	2002	711	606	3	85.2%	0.4%
Front Range Comm Coll	2000	1,669	725	39	43.4%	2.3%
	2001	1,763	789	44	44.8%	2.5%
	2002	1,862	747	47	40.1%	2.5%
Lamar Comm Coll	2000	277	202	2	72.9%	0.7%
	2001	360	291	2	80.8%	0.6%
	2002	348	257	3	73.9%	0.9%
Morgan Comm Coll	2000	375	298	1	79.5%	0.3%
	2001	384	310	2	80.7%	0.5%
	2002	332	246	2	74.1%	0.6%
Northeastern Junior Coll	2000	686	478	24	69.7%	3.5%
	2001	671	461	22	68.7%	3.3%
	2002	547	360	17	65.8%	3.1%
Otero Junior Coll	2000	288	171	13	59.4%	4.5%
	2001	303	184	25	60.7%	8.3%
	2002	314	195	27	62.1%	8.6%
Pikes Peak Comm Coll	2000	1,686	1,051	3	62.3%	0.2%
	2001	1,630	1,010	8	62.0%	0.5%
	2002	1,604	851	8	53.1%	0.5%
Pueblo Comm Coll	2000	985	698	11	70.9%	1.1%
	2001	999	670	33	67.1%	3.3%
	2002	891	521	24	58.5%	2.7%
Red Rocks Comm Coll	2000	1,426	955	17	67.0%	1.2%
	2001	1,336	796	15	59.6%	1.1%
	2002	1,267	678	27	53.5%	2.1%
Trinidad State Jun Coll	2000	645	543	3	84.2%	0.5%
	2001	629	538	2	85.5%	0.3%
	2002	628	539	11	85.8%	1.8%
Total	2000	13,993	9,126	189	65.2%	1.4%
	2001	13,666	8,718	253	63.8%	1.9%
	2002	13,390	7,676	283	57.3%	2.1%

Source: Community Colleges, most recent data available

CHS Measure 5: FACULTY INSTRUCTIONAL WORKLOAD

ACADEMIC YEAR 2003-2004

Avg. Weekly Teaching Hours per Instructor Category*--

Institution	Academic Year	Type A (Group) Instruction					Type B (Individualized Instruction	
		Tenured Faculty FTE	Tenure-Track Faculty FTE	Other ** Full-time Faculty Faculty FTE	Total Full-time Faculty FTE	Benchmark -- Nat'l Study of Postsecondary	Enrollments for All Full-time Faculty Categories	Avg. Student Enrollment per Full-time Faculty FTE
Four-Year Public Institutions								
Adams State Coll	2003 - 2004	21.3	14.6	15.3	**19.1**	**11.1 - 11.5**	894	8.3
CSU	2003-2004	tbd						
CSU-Pueblo	2003 - 2004	11.3	11.1	11.4	**11.3**	**11.1 - 11.5**	341	2.2
Fort Lewis Coll	2003 - 2004	13.2	15.4	13.5	**13.8**	**11.1 - 11.5**	1,416	8.0
Mesa State Coll	2003 - 2004	13.1	14.2	11.3	**12.8**	**11.1 - 11.5**	175	13.7
Metropolitan St Coll of Denver	2003 - 2004	11.3	12.7	14.8	**12.4**	**11.1 - 11.5**	8,885	22.8
CU - Boulder	2003 - 2004	4.8	5.1	12.5	**6.1**	**7.8 - 8.1**	7,724	7.3
CU - Colo Springs	2003 - 2004	10.3	8.9	13.7	**11.0**	**9.2 - 9.6**	1,392	6.5
CU - Denver	2003 - 2004	7.5	9.1	14.1	**9.8**	**9.2 - 9.6**	3,085	8.1
UNC	2002 - 2003	12.1	13.3	14.2	**12.8**	**9.2 - 9.6**	4,392	11.5
Western State Coll	2003 - 2004	12.3	11.6	15.8	**12.8**	**11.1 - 11.5**	887	7.1
Two-Year Public Institutions								
Aims Comm Coll	2003 - 2004				**14.2**	**17.2 - 17.9**	3,209	31.2
Arapahoe Comm Coll	2003 - 2004				**16.7**	**17.2 - 17.9**	376	4.4
Colo Mountain Coll	2003 - 2004				**14.9**	**17.2 - 17.9**	817	9.6
Colo NW Comm Coll	2003 - 2004				**15.0**	**17.2 - 17.9**	527	10.1
Comm Coll of Aurora	2003 - 2004				**15.8**	**17.2 - 17.9**	58	2.2
Comm Coll of Denver	2003 - 2004				**14.9**	**17.2 - 17.9**	40	0.5
Front Range Comm Coll	2003 - 2004				**17.0**	**17.2 - 17.9**	373	3.0
Lamar Comm Coll	2002 - 2003	tbd				**17.2 - 17.9**		
Morgan Comm Coll	2003 - 2004				**23.2**	**17.2 - 17.9**	70	2.1
Northeastern Junior Coll	2003 - 2004				**18.5**	**17.2 - 17.9**	329	5.6
Otero Junior Coll	2003 - 2004				**21.1**	**17.2 - 17.9**	34	1.0
Pikes Peak Comm Coll	2003 - 2004				**23.3**	**17.2 - 17.9**	2,505	17.4
Pueblo Comm Coll	2003 - 2004				**19.2**	**17.2 - 17.9**	958	12.3
Red Rocks Comm Coll	2003 - 2004				**17.1**	**17.2 - 17.9**	369	4.2
Trinidad State Junior Coll	2003 - 2004				**25.9**	**17.2 - 17.9**	73	2.0

*Full-time equivalent (FTE) faculty totals represent state-funded (or general funded) instruction in fall and spring term.
by contracts, grants, or extended studies fees were excluded from FTE totals.

**Based on faculty who are neither tenured or tenure-track but have the expectation of an on-going appointment and are full-time as defined by the institution.

Notes: (1) Average measures for group and individual instruction should not be combined. Group instruction is measured in contact hours while individualized instruction is based on student headcount.

(2) Type A instruction involves direct contact of faculty with students and includes the following: lecture, lab, recitation/discussion/ seminar, audit, private instruction, physical education/recreation activity, studio, and field instruction.

(3) Type B instruction encompasses distance education and a variety of individualized faculty/student relationships such as independent study, master's thesis/doctoral dissertation, student teaching, co-ops, internships, and practica.

COLORADO COMMISSION ON

HIGHER EDUCATION

ACCESS TO HIGH-QUALITY, AFFORDABLE EDUCATION FOR ALL COLORADANS

REPORT TO GOVERNOR AND GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON TEACHER EDUCATION

DECEMBER 2004

1380 Lawrence Street, Suite 1200 • Denver, Colorado 80204 • (303) 866-2723
RICHARD F. O'DONNELL, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Pursuant to Colorado Revised Statutes 23-1-121(6), the Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) reports annually to the Governor and the Education Committees of the General Assembly on the implementation of the S.B. 99-154, including:

- An overview of the applications to and enrollments in approved teacher education preparation programs. (Enrollment data are reported by institution, licensure areas, and gender and ethnicity);
- Performance on PLACE assessments, by institution;
- The results of the 2004 statewide survey of first-year teachers;
- Summaries of the findings from the follow-up site visits at four universities as part of the joint Colorado Department of Education and Colorado Commission on Higher Education program reauthorization process, pursuant to 23-1-121 Colorado Revised Statutes;
- A list of approved educator preparation programs, by institution.

The following represents the major findings reported in each of the four above-mentioned sections. Comprehensive examinations of these major topics are found in the balance of this report.

Teacher Preparation Enrollments

1. Seven thousand four-hundred forty-six students (7,446) were enrolled in traditional (i.e., not alternative or teacher in residence) teacher education programs in the State of Colorado in 2003-04.

2. Undergraduates comprised the largest population of students enrolled in teacher education programs at 4,351, followed by students enrolled in graduate programs (2,108), and post-baccalaureate programs (987).

3. The largest undergraduate enrollment was at the University of Northern Colorado (1,340 students). The largest graduate population was at the University of Colorado at Denver (718). The largest post-baccalaureate population was at Metropolitan State College of Denver (457).

4. The three largest licensure areas for students enrolled in teacher education programs were Elementary (45% of total), Secondary – Social Studies (10%), and

Special Education (9%). Secondary Mathematics and Secondary Science comprised 4% and 5% of the total enrolled students, respectively.

5. Eighty-six percent of all students enrolled in teacher education programs were Caucasian. Seventy-six percent of all enrolled students were female.

Results of the 2004 PLACE Assessments

1. Ninety-seven percent of all students who took the PLACE assessment in 2003-04 passed. This figure represents an increase over 2000-01, when 93% of all students passed the assessment.

2. In 2003-04, 2,046 students took the PLACE assessment. This figure represents a much larger population than in 2000-01 (1,767).

First-year Teacher Survey

1. Teachers trained in traditional undergraduate and post-baccalaureate programs in the State of Colorado reported being better prepared than those trained in other states or via alternative programs. Teachers trained in Colorado's teacher in residence (TIR) programs reported being significantly less well prepared as compared to students trained in other types programs.

2. Teachers reported that the most valuable preparation tools tended to focus on work and feedback done with cooperating teachers and principals in the schools. Teachers also valued exposure to a variety of teaching situations. The tool that was least often reported as "very valuable" was seminars for beginning teachers.

3. In open-ended questions, 49% of respondents reported that the least beneficial aspect of their teacher education program was the redundancy and irrelevance of coursework. These results were found across all sectors and institutions. Teachers also reported a desire to have had more instruction in classroom management in place of these courses. Several teachers reported tenuous connections between theoretical coursework and real work environments in the classroom.

CCHE/CDE Teacher Preparation Reauthorization Site Visits

1. Pursuant to 23-1-121 (C.R.S.), the Colorado Commission on Higher Education and the Colorado Department of Education administered joint site visits at four postsecondary institutions in Colorado during the 2002-03 academic year: Colorado State University – Pueblo, University of Colorado at Boulder, Mesa State College, and Metropolitan State College of Denver.

2. At the time of the writing of this report, the State Board of Education and the Colorado Commission on Higher Education had reauthorized Colorado State University-Pueblo and the University of Colorado at Boulder.

3. Metropolitan State College of Denver was reauthorized by the State Board of Education in October 2004, and will be reviewed formally by the Colorado Commission on Higher Education in 2005. The Colorado Department of Education is continuing to review the teacher education program at Mesa State College; the CCHE will not take action until after the State Board of Education completes its review.

II. TEACHER PREPARATION AND ENROLLMENTS

Total Enrollment With the adoption of S.B. 99-154, the Colorado legislature posed several questions, including, "How many teacher candidates are being prepared in different licensure areas?" This section responds to that question. Importantly, because teacher education is not reported as an academic major or degree program in CCHE SURDS (Student Unit Record Data System) data files, data reported herein were submitted to CCHE by the various institutions authorized to offer teacher preparation programs. Consequently, these data should be treated as self-reported institutional statistics not verified by CCHE's division of research and information management.

In total, **7,446** students were enrolled in approved teacher education preparation programs at 15 colleges and universities in Colorado. Table 1 summarizes the enrollments of initial licensure program students, by degree level (undergraduate, post-baccalaureate, and graduate).

The University of Northern Colorado leads all public institutions in the enrollment of students in initial teacher licensure programs with 1,631, followed by Metropolitan State College of Denver (1,275), the University of Colorado at Denver (725), and the University of Colorado at Boulder (555). Among private colleges and universities, Regis University enrolled the most initial teacher licensure students with 917, followed by the University of Phoenix (144) and the University of Denver (74).

Importantly, the enrollments of students in post-baccalaureate and graduate programs leading to initial licensure varied greatly. Though without graduate programs, Metropolitan State College of Denver led the state in the enrollment of post-baccalaureate students. Metro's 457 post-baccalaureate students represented 46 percent of the state's total enrollment of such students. The University of Colorado at Boulder's 177 post-baccalaureate students represented 32 percent of that institution's total enrollment in initial licensure programs. In other words, more than 75% of all post-baccalaureate students were enrolled at either Metropolitan State College of Denver or the University of Colorado at Boulder.

With regard to graduate students, the University of Colorado at Denver led the state with 718 enrolled students, or 34 percent of the state's total. Similarly, Regis University (519), University of Colorado at Colorado Springs (177), the University of Denver (57), and the University of Phoenix' (144) graduate enrollments eclipsed significantly their undergraduate enrollments, suggesting these colleges accommodate and provide niche programs for urban, adult students, presumably those making career changes.

TABLE 1: TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM ENROLLMENTS FOR INITIAL LICENSURE BY LEVEL BY INSTITUTION, FY 2003 - 2004**

	Unduplicated Headcount			
	Undergraduate	Post-Baccalaureate	Graduate	TOTAL
Institution	FY 2004	FY 2004	FY 2004	FY 2004
ASC	274	6	44	**324**
CC	0	0	40	**40**
CCU	93	6	0	**99**
CSU	389	70	37	**496**
CSU-P	279	47	0	**326**
DU	8	9	57	**74**
FLC	129	47	0	**176**
JWU	9	0	0	**9**
MSC	267	25	0	**292**
METRO	818	457	NA	**1,275**
REGIS	319	79	519	**917**
RMCAD	9	1	0	**10**
UCB	254	177	124	**555**
UCCS	20	1	177	**198**
UCD	4	3	718	**725**
UNC	1,340	43	248	**1,631**
UP	0	0	144	**144**
WSC	139	16	0	**155**
TOTAL	**4,351**	**987**	**2,108**	**7,446**

**Based on enrollment during at least one term in the specified year.

Note: This table limited to students enrolled under the performance-based standards and seeking initial licensure. Total program enrollments are greater than those indicated above.

Licensure Area Aggregated 2004 data on the enrollment of students in teacher education preparation programs leading to various licenses are presented in Table 2[1]. The largest enrollment was in programs leading to endorsement in elementary education. The total number of enrolled students in programs leading to elementary education endorsement, 3,320, represented 45 percent of all students in teacher education preparation programs. Of special note, students enrolled in programs leading to endorsement in Special Education represented nine percent of the total.

[1] The total number of enrolled students in Table 2 does not equal that presented in Table 1 as a result of incomplete data reported to the Colorado Commission on Higher Education.

The number of students enrolled in programs leading to licensure in secondary mathematics and science was relatively low. Though these areas were identified as shortage areas by the state through the LIFT (Loan Incentive for Teachers) program, only five percent and four percent of all initial licenses were awarded in secondary mathematics and science, respectively. Further, only two percent of all students were enrolled in programs leading to licensure in secondary foreign languages.

The total enrollment of students in teacher education preparation programs leading to licensure in English as a Second Language (ESL, now referred to as Linguistically Diverse Education [LDE]) was 136, or two percent of the total. It is unknown how this figure compares to market demand for LDE instructors, but recent Colorado Department of Education reports suggest that it may be below the need.

In its 2003 report, Hispanic Pupil Membership Counts[2], the CDE indicated that the enrollment of Hispanic students in public schools in Colorado grew 30.2 percent between 1999 and 2003. Moreover, the Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education (WICHE)[3] estimates that, by 2015, the proportion of high school graduates in Colorado who are of Hispanic decent will grow from 6,676 in 2003-04 to 18,807 by 2017-18, or from 15 percent to 33 percent of the total. These trends hint that the demand for teachers with endorsements in LDE may grow in the coming years.

Admission Demographics and Grade Point Averages Demographic information of students enrolled in undergraduate and post-baccalaureate programs leading to initial licensure is presented in Table 3. Approximately four percent of all applicants to teacher education preparation programs were denied admission, while 85 percent of all accepted students enrolled. Eighty-two percent of males accepted into licensure programs enrolled compared to 86 percent of females. Overall, males comprised 24 percent of all students enrolled in teacher education programs, which was nearly equivalent to the overall proportion of males who are licensed teachers in Colorado according to CDE data.

Eighty-six percent of all students enrolled in teacher education preparation programs were white/Caucasian. Hispanics comprise nine percent of all enrolled students, followed by Asian American/Pacific Islanders (2%), Black, Non-Hispanics (2%), and American Indian/Alaskan Natives (1%). Only nine non-resident aliens were enrolled in teacher education programs.

[2] Available at: http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdereval/download/pdf/2003PM/2003HispPM5YrTrnd.xls

[3] Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education. (2003). Knocking at the college door 1988 to 2018: Projections of graduates by state, income, and race/ethnicity. Boulder, CO: WICHE.

TABLE 2: NUMBER OF ENROLLED STUDENTS BY LICENSURE AREA FOR INITIAL LICENSURE, FY2004**

Licensure Area	Undergraduate	Post-baccalaureate	Graduate	Total	% of Total
Elementary	2,109	385	826	3,320	45%
Special Education*	96	71	537	704	9%
Secondary - Language Arts	349	84	157	590	8%
Secondary - Social Studies	472	138	140	750	10%
Secondary - Science*	167	106	132	405	5%
K-12: Physical Education	241	35	6	282	4%
Secondary - Mathematics*	205	40	67	312	4%
K-12: Art	157	51	19	227	3%
K-12: Music	186	13	4	203	3%
Early Childhood	169	21	16	206	3%
Secondary - Foreign Language	79	25	19	123	2%
Middle School	23	5	2	30	<1%
Secondary - Business	10	4	31	45	1%
Secondary - Agriculture	14	1	0	15	<1%
Secondary - Drama	25	1	1	27	<1%
Secondary - Family and Consumer Studies	30	1	0	31	<1%
Secondary - Technical	4	2	0	6	<1%
Speech	15	2	1	18	<1%
ESL	0	0	136	136	2%
Secondary - Marketing	4	1	0	5	<1%
Undeclared	2	1	0	3	<1%
Secondary - Art	1	0	0	1	<1%
TOTAL	**4,358**	**987**	**2,094**	**7,439**	

*Identified as shortage area in LIFT.

**Based on enrollment during at least one term in FY 2004

Note: This table was limited to students enrolled under the performance-based standards and seeking initial licensure. Total program enrollments are greater than those above.

Of all students enrolled in undergraduate and post-secondary teacher education programs, only 29 percent were between the ages of 18 and 22. Twenty percent were between the ages of 23 and 25 years, 29 percent were between 26 and 35 years, and 22 percent were older than 35 years. In other words, 71 percent of all students who enrolled in undergraduate and post-baccalaureate teacher education preparation programs were 23 years of age or older.

TABLE 4: DEMOGRAPHICS OF UNDERGRADUATES AND POST-BACCALAUREATES PURSUING INITIAL LICENSURE BY TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM STATUS, FY 2004

Demographic Characteristic		Teacher Education Program Status			TOTAL APPLICANTS
		Applied, not Accepted	Accepted. Did not Enroll	Accepted and Enrolled*	
Race/Ethnicity					
American Indian/Alaska Native	#	5	26	62	93
Asian Amer/Pacific Islander	#	5	8	117	130
Black, Non-Hispanic	#	6	10	94	110
Hispanic	#	30	101	479	610
White, Non-Hispanic	#	201	686	4,686	5,573
Nonresident Alien	#	1	0	9	10
TOTAL	#	**248**	**831**	**5,447**	**6,526**
Gender					
Female	#	210	699	4,347	5,256
Male	#	92	307	1,385	1,784
TOTAL	#	**302**	**1,006**	**5,732**	**7,040**
Age					
18 - 22 Years	#	149	249	1,638	2,036
23 - 25 Years	#	40	227	1,169	1436
26 - 35 Years	#	62	301	1,661	2,024
Older than 35 Years	#	51	229	1,264	1,544
TOTAL	#	**302**	**1,006**	**5,732**	**7,040**

*Totals for enrolled students include those who completed during fiscal year.

**Based on enrollment during at least one term in specified year.
Note 1: This table limited to students enrolled under the performance-based standards and seeking initial licensure. Total program enrollments are greater than that shown above.

Note 2: University of Phoenix does not collect ethnicity data.

Tables 4 and 5 show the weighted mean grade point averages and mean grade point average ranges of students who applied, were accepted, and enrolled in undergraduate and post-baccalaureate programs leading to initial teacher licensure in FY 2004. Overall (Table 4), the mean weighted grade point averages of students who were accepted (3.27) and enrolled (3.29) in initial licensure programs exceeded that of students who were denied admission (2.88). The ranges of mean grade point averages for accepted (3.14 – 3.61) and enrolled (3.04 – 3.88) students were generally stronger and than the range of denied students (2.47 – 3.91).

TABLE 4: MEAN WEIGHTED GRADE POINT AVERAGES AND MEAN INSTITUTIONAL GRADE POINT AVERAGE RANGES FOR UNDERGRADUATES AND POST-BACCALAUREATES PURSUING INITIAL LICENSURE BY TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM STATUS, FY 2004

Application Status	Unduplicated Headcount	Mean Weighted GPA	Mean GPA Range (Low Mean – High Mean)
Applied, not Accepted	388	2.88	2.47 - 3.91
Accepted	872	3.27	3.14 - 3.61
Enrolled*	5,875	3.29	3.04 - 3.88

*Totals for enrolled students include those who completed during fiscal year.
Note: This table limited to students enrolled under the performance-based standards and seeking initial licensure. Total program enrollments are greater than that shown above.

The mean weighted grade point averages by licensure area (Table 5) reveal a trend similar to that found in the previous table. Based upon reported mean weighted grade point averages only, the highest mean weighted grade point averages was among students enrolled in early childhood education (3.41 gpa; ECE), followed by students in elementary education (3.33), K-12 music, art or physical education (3.31), secondary education (3.28), and special education (3.28). Nonetheless, the real differences among the weighted mean grade point averages are marginal.

TABLE 5: MEAN WEIGHTED GRADE POINT AVERAGES AND MEAN INSTITUTIONAL GRADE POINT AVERAGE RANGES FOR ENROLLED* UNDERGRADUATES AND POST-BACCALAUREATES PURSUING INITIAL LICENSURE IN TEACHER EDUCATION BY LICENSURE AREA, FY 2004

Licensure Area	Unduplicated Headcount	Mean Weighted GPA	Mean GPA Range (Low Mean – High Mean)
Elementary	3,031	3.33	2.91 - 3.89
ECE	140	3.41	3.44
Secondary	1,669[4]	3.28	3.13 - 3.97
Music, PE, or Art (K - 12)	745	3.31	3.09 - 3.63
Special Education	685	3.28	2.86 - 3.69

*Totals for enrolled students include those who completed during fiscal year.
Note: This table limited to students enrolled under the performance-based standards and seeking initial licensure. Total program enrollments are greater than that shown above.

[4] Figure excludes 385 students from Metropolitan State College of Denver for which grade point average data were not provided.

III. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF PERFORMANCE ON PLACE ASSESSMENTS: 2001 - 2004

The State of Colorado currently uses the Program for the Licensing Assessments for Colorado Educators (PLACE) from National Evaluation Systems (NES) and the PRAXIS assessment from the Educational Testing Service (ETS). Though teacher candidates have recently been granted the option to take the PLACE or the PRAXIS assessments in five endorsement content areas, for the purposes of comparative longitudinal analyses, data from the 2000-01 and 2003-04 PLACE assessment are presented only.

Data in Table 6 present the total number of examinees and pass rates on all PLACE assessments taken in 2000-01 and 2003-04[5], by college. Applying a comparative longitudinal approach, the state's overall pass rate increased during the research period from 93 percent to 97 percent. In addition, several institutions increased their pass rates during the study period. Colorado State University at Pueblo's overall pass rate increased from 86 percent to 98 percent during the study period. Likewise, Mesa State College's pass rate increased from 91 percent to 98 percent passing, Metropolitan State College of Denver's increased from 92 percent to 100 percent passing, and the University of Northern Colorado's increased from 86 percent to 93 percent passing. Smaller improvements were realized at Colorado State University (+2 percentage points), University of Colorado at Boulder (+2 percentage points), University of Colorado at Colorado Springs (+3 percentage points), and Western State College (+2 percentage points). Among privates, increases were realized at Colorado Christian University (+4 percentage points) and Regis University (+3 percentage points).

Though subject to normal year-to-year vacillations in student ability, enrollment trends, and changes in the mix of subject area assessments taken by students, decreasing overall pass rates were found at Adams State College (88% down to 85%), Fort Lewis College (90% down to 86%), and the University of Colorado at Denver (99% down to 98%). The only private university to realize a decrease in the overall pass rate was the University of Denver (94% down to 88%), which was the largest overall decrease among all institutions reported.

Comparing the total number of assessments taken in 2000-01 and 2003-04, noteworthy increases were realized overall and at several institutions. Overall, the total number of assessments taken increased 16 percent between 2000-01 and 2003-04, a real increase of 279 assessments. At the campus level, the largest increases were found at the University of Northern Colorado and Regis University (+77 assessments each), the University of Colorado at Denver (+76), the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs (+68). The largest decreases were realized at Metropolitan State College of Denver (-27), the

[5] 2003-04 data appearing in Tables 6 & 7 were provided to the CCHE by the Colorado Department of Education. 2000-01 data were found in the PLACE Annual Institution Reports and State-level Single-Assessment Pass-Rate Data for Regular Teacher Preparation, as appearing in the CCHE 2003 Legislative Report on Teacher Education.

University of Colorado at Boulder (-23), the University of Denver (-21), and Colorado State University at Pueblo (-15).

TABLE 6: PASS RATES FOR SELECTED ALL CONTENT AREAS ON THE PROGRAM FOR LICENSING ASSESSMENTS FOR COLORADO EDUCATORS (PLACE) EXAM, 2000-01 AND 2003-04

Institution	All Academic Content Areas			
	2000-01		2003-04	
	# Tested	% Passed	# Tested	% Passed
PUBLIC INST				
Adams S C	76	88%	100	85%
CO State U	128	98%	161	100%
Co State U – Pueblo (was USC)	77	86%	62	98%
Fort Lewis C	84	90%	84	86%
Mesa S C	43	91%	48	98%
Metro S C of Denver	285	92%	258	100%
U of CO – Boulder	175	97%	152	99%
U of CO – CO Springs	38	97%	106	100%
U of CO - Denver	123	99%	199	98%
U of Northern CO	402	86%	479	93%
Western S C	41	98%	42	100%
PRIVATE INST				
CO Christian U	45	91%	42	95%
CO College	27	100%	34	100%
Regis U	133	94%	210	97%
U of Denver	90	94%	69	88%
STATEWIDE TOTALS**	**1,767**	**93%**	**2,046**	**97%**

**Totals based on all tested students including test-takers at institutions with fewer than 10 examinees per year and alternative certification.

Data in Table 7 reflect the total number of test takers and overall pass rates for the Elementary Education PLACE assessment only, disaggregated by college or university, for years 2000-01 and 2003-04. Similar to the data presented in Table 6, the State's overall pass rate for students taking the Elementary Education assessment increased during the research period from 96 percent passing to 99 percent passing. Students from each institution in the sample performed consistently or increased their overall pass rate except at Fort Lewis College, the pass rate on the Elementary Education PLACE assessment decreased nominally from 92 percent to 91 percent. Importantly, the total number of assessments completed in 2003-04 compared to 2000-01 decreased by 5 percent, or from 1,056 to 1,002.

TABLE 7: PASS RATES FOR SELECTED ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ON THE PROGRAM FOR LICENSING ASSESSMENTS FOR COLORADO EDUCATORS (PLACE) EXAM, 2000-01 AND 2003-04.

Institution	Elementary Education			
	2000-01		2003-04	
	# Tested	% Passed	# Tested	% Passed
PUBLIC INST				
Adams S C	43	95%	61	95%
CO State U	--	--	--	--
CO State U – Pueblo (was USC)	44	91%	42	98%
Fort Lewis C	51	92%	32	91%
Mesa S C	22	95%	13	100%
Metro S C of Denver	154	95%	128	100%
U of CO – Boulder	101	99%	85	100%
U of CO – CO Springs	25	100%	38	100%
U of CO - Denver	90	100%	108	100%
U of Northern CO	208	94%	254	96%
Western S C	15	100%	8	100%
PRIVATE INST				
CO Christian U	39	95%	36	97%
CO College	19	100%	20	100%
Regis U	87	97%	143	100%
U of Denver	64	97%	34	100%
STATEWIDE TOTALS**	**1,056**	**96%**	**1,002**	**99%**

**Totals based on all tested students including test-takers at institutions with fewer than 10 examinees per year and alternative certification.

IV. RESULTS OF THE 2004 FIRST-YEAR TEACHER SURVEY

Pursuant to 23-1-121 Colorado Revised Statutes, the Colorado First-year Teacher Survey supplements statistical reports from the CDE and CCHE and provides attitudinal data from first-year teachers, which is used in evaluating the quality of Colorado teacher education preparation programs in the areas of content and teaching skills preparation. The intent of the survey is to measure content knowledge and mastery of teaching skills once a teacher has taught a full year in a K-12 classroom. The survey (Appendix B) includes sections on teaching and licensure areas, teacher education background, student teaching experience, subject matter content preparation, and teaching skills preparation. Based on a review of previous research and upon the results of previous surveys, the CCHE survey is guided by the following research questions:

- What is the overall level of content area preparation among first-year teachers and the training and background that explains differences in content area preparation?

- What are the overall levels of teaching skill preparation among first-year teachers as well as the training and background that can explain differences in teaching skills preparation?

A. General Information About the Survey

Survey Construction

In January 2004, a technical committee (Appendix C) of subject matter and psychometric experts was convened to construct and revise a new version of the first-year survey, to make the instrument more focused on the Colorado teacher preparation standards, easier for respondents to use online, and more amenable to analyses. The committee met several times throughout January, February, and March in order to produce the survey used in the field.

Population

In early March 2004, names and other contact information such as email addresses of first-year teachers were requested from all public school district induction coordinators throughout the state. Two follow-up requests for these names were subsequently made. Once received, the district information was compiled into a master file. A total of 3,229 teachers were identified statewide as being first-year teachers by district induction coordinators. Eight-hundred-thirty-nine teachers completed the survey for a total response rate of 25.98%. Analysis of the response rates by district and by type of district revealed that the teachers who did not respond appeared to be randomly distributed throughout the state, that is to say, no district biases appeared in the data.

In addition, many of the teachers who had been identified by their induction coordinators as first-year teachers were misidentified. These teachers were screened out of the survey with the first question, "How many years have you been teaching, excluding student teaching or paraprofessional work?" Students who answered "more than one year" were thanked for their time and informed that they were finished with the survey. Of the 839 respondents, 488 were determined to be first-year teachers. Further analysis of this issue revealed that the misidentification of first-year teachers did not appear to be a clustered phenomenon, but distributed throughout the districts and the state.

Survey Administration

Teachers identified by school district induction coordinators were invited by email to participate in the survey beginning April 18, 2004. The hosting of the survey website and technical services were provided by Blue Frog Surveys of Boulder, CO. Respondents needing technical assistance during the administration period were contacted within 24-hours of their request. One follow-up reminder was sent, again via email, to teachers who, by May 4, 2004, had not participated in the survey.

Demographics of Respondents

488[6] surveys were completed by first-year teachers. Of these, 385 (81%) were completed by teachers holding provisional teacher licenses, 36 (8%) by teachers participating in alternative license programs, 35 (7%) holding emergency licenses, and 22 (5%) enrolled in teacher in residence programs. Moreover, 302 (62%) of the respondents graduated from in-state teacher preparation programs, either at the undergraduate or post-baccalaureate levels; 186 (38%) graduated from colleges outside of Colorado.

Data in Table 8 show the differences in types of licenses held by survey participants, by location of undergraduate and/or post-baccalaureate college. Importantly, among participants in this sample, graduates from in-state colleges were more likely than graduates from out-of-state colleges to hold a provisional (standard) teacher license (86.4% compared to 70.5%). Conversely, graduates from out-of-state colleges were more likely than graduates from in-state colleges to hold an emergency license or participate in a Teacher in Residence or alternative licensure program.

TABLE 8: 2003-04 FIRST YEAR TEACHER SURVEY RESPONDENTS, BY TYPE OF LICENSE (PERCENTAGES)

	OUT-OF-STATE COLLEGE	IN-STATE COLLEGE
PROVISIONAL	124 (70.5%)	261 (86.4%)
ALTERNATIVE	18 (10.2%)	18 (6.0%)
TEACHER IN RESIDENCE	14 (8.0%)	8 (2.6%)
EMERGENCY	20 (11.4%)	15 (5.0%)
TOTAL RESPONDENTS	176 (100.0%)	302 (100.0%)

Generally speaking, compared to data on current teachers provided in the Fall 2002 Teacher Count by Gender and Race/Ethnicity report by the Colorado Department of Education, the personal demographics of the research sample are representative of most teachers in the state of Colorado. Among survey completers (Table 9), 75 percent are female (74.5% of all teachers according to the CDE report) and 25 percent are male (25.5%, CDE). Regarding ethnicity, 86 percent are white/Caucasian (93%, CDE), 6.4 percent are Hispanic (6.6%, CDE), .7 percent are African-American (1.6%, CDE), .5 percent Native American (<1%, CDE), and 1.2 percent Asian/Pacific Islander (<1%, CDE). These figures are somewhat different when data are disaggregated by location of college. Among out-of-state college graduates, 93.6 percent are white/Caucasian or chose not to answer the question, compared to 88.7 of in-state college graduates.

[6] Figures presented in Tables 8 – 11 may not total 488 as a result of non-responses by some survey participants.

TABLE 9: 2003-04 FIRST YEAR TEACHER SURVEY RESPONDENTS, BY ETHNICITY (PERCENTAGES)

	OUT-OF-STATE COLLEGE	IN-STATE COLLEGE
AFRICAN AMERICAN	2 (1.4%)	1 (0.4%)
ASIAN	0 (0.0%)	5 (1.8%)
HISPANIC	7 (5.0%)	20 (7.1%)
NATIVE AMERICAN	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.7%)
OTHER	0 (0.0%)	4 (1.4%)
WHITE	123 (87.9%)	239 (84.5%)
I PREFER NOT TO ANSWER	8 (5.7%)	12 (4.2%)
TOTAL REPONDENTS	140 (100.0%)	283 (100.0%)

The participants in the 2004 first-year teacher survey represented a variety of age ranges. In the main, out-of-state college graduates were more often younger than in-state college graduates (Table 10).

TABLE 10: 2003-04 FIRST YEAR TEACHER SURVEY RESPONDENTS, BY AGE (PERCENTAGES)

	OUT-OF-STATE COLLEGE	IN-STATE COLLEGE
UNDER 24 YEARS	51.1	35.1
25-29 YEARS	23.2	30.0
30-34 YEARS	7.0	10.9
35-39 YEARS	3.8	9.2
40 OR MORE YEARS	14.9	14.6
TOTAL RESPONDENTS	100.0	100.0

The majority of participants in the first-year teacher survey (54.8%, Table 11) taught at the secondary level. Thirty-six percent taught in elementary schools, and ten percent taught in multilevel schools. When disaggregated by location of college, more graduates from Colorado colleges held positions in elementary schools, while graduates from out-of-state colleges more often taught at the secondary level.

TABLE 11: 2003-04 FIRST YEAR TEACHER SURVEY RESPONDENTS, BY TYPE OF SCHOOL (PERCENTAGES)

	OUT-OF-STATE COLLEGE	IN-STATE COLLEGE
PRESCHOOL OR ELEM ONLY	51 (29.0%)	119 (39.4%)
SECONDARY ONLY	108 (61.4%)	154 (51.0%)
MULTILEVEL	17 (9.7%)	29 (9.6%)
TOTAL RESPONDENTS	176 (100.0%)	302 (100.0%)

Tables 12 and 13 identify the institutions from which in-state participants in the 2004 first-year teacher survey graduated. Importantly, data in these tables are not independent. That is, some of the survey participants may have received their undergraduate degree and completed their post-baccalaureate teacher education program at the same institution, and thus are counted in Tables 12 and 13; others may have received their undergraduate degree out-of-state and completed their post-baccalaureate teacher education in Colorado, and thus are counted in Table 13 only; and others still may have completed their undergraduate degree at one college in-state, and then completed a post-baccalaureate teacher education preparation program at a different in-state college, and thus are counted in both tables, but at different institutions.

TABLE 12: UNDERGRADUATE INSTITUTION OF IN-STATE COLLEGE GRADUATES, 2003-04 FIRST-YEAR TEACHERS SURVEY

	Number	Percent
Adams State College	13	4.9
Colorado College	1	0.4
Colorado Christian University	6	2.2
Colorado State University	48	17.9
Colorado State University-Pueblo	11	4.1
University of Denver	7	2.6
Fort Lewis College	5	1.9
Mesa State College	10	3.7
Metro State College of Denver	40	14.9
Regis University	12	4.5
University of Colorado at Boulder	23	8.6
University of Colorado at Colorado Springs	12	4.5
University of Colorado at Denver	9	3.4
University of Northern Colorado	67	25
Western State College	4	1.5
TOTAL RESPONDENTS	268	100.0

TABLE 13: POSTBACCALAURATE INSTITUTION OF IN-STATE COLLEGE GRADUATES, 2003-04 FIRST-YEAR TEACHERS SURVEY		
	Number	Percent
Adams State College	2	1.9
Colorado College	1	0.9
Colorado Christian University	1	0.9
Colorado State University	7	6.5
University of Denver	14	13.1
Mesa State College	1	0.9
Metro State College of Denver	5	4.7
Regis University	9	8.4
University of Colorado at Boulder	12	11.2
University of Colorado at Colorado Springs	10	9.3
University of Colorado at Denver	24	22.4
University of Northern Colorado	19	17.8
Western State College	1	0.9
On-Line Program	1	0.9
TOTAL RESPONDENTS	107	100.0

B. *Multivariate Analysis*[7]

Confirmatory Factor Analysis and Tests of Reliability

In order to determine the preparedness of first-year teachers regarding the Performance-Based Standards for Colorado Teachers, confirmatory factor analyses[8] and reliabilities were run to insure that specific questions tailored to each standard were actually measuring it. Two notable exceptions to this were Standard One (Knowledge of Literacy) and Standard Two (Knowledge of Mathematics) in which case the questions asked of primary teachers differed from those asked of secondary teachers. One question for each of these two standards was asked differently of primary and secondary teachers.

The technical committee decided to do this after struggling with the issue of how to get to this standard for students whose content areas were vastly different from the standard. Therefore, for elementary teacher literacy, the question was asked, "When you began this school year in your classroom, how well prepared were you to provide literacy instruction?" On the other hand, for secondary teachers, the question was revised to ask, "When you began this school year in your classroom, how well prepared were you to incorporate literacy in your content area, where appropriate?" That questions on these standards were not asked in the same manner for elementary

[7] Sonia Schaible-Brandon, former CCHE research analyst, prepared survey analyses presented in Section B and information found in appendixes A & B on July 6, 2004.

[8] Factor analysis is a method used in statistical analyses to "group" variables according to their significance or common association. A factor is a clustered set of variables, such as items on a survey, that can be conceptually related or grouped together and are highly intercorrelated. Factor analysis reveals common patterns among variables, such as survey responses.

teachers as they were for secondary teachers provides an analytical challenge that perhaps should be examined by future survey administrations.

However, for Standards 3 – 8, where multiple questions were asked within each standard, the results of the confirmatory factor analyses were strong, with no item loading on a factor with a value less than .549 and most at a .80 or greater, indicating that the questions addressed the standards appropriately (Tables 14 - 19). Overall reliability supported strong consistency with a Cronbach's alpha[9] = .930 (Table 20). Results supported compilation of standards-based questions into standards variables.

In order to compute the latent standard variables, each variable within a standard was summed and divided by the number of variables within the construct in order that each standard had its own comparable mean and standard deviation (Table 21). Scales are based on the following 4-point scale:

1 = Not at all prepared

2 = Somewhat prepared

3 = Adequately prepared

4 = Well prepared

Averages for preparation in content were the highest overall, with a mean of more than 3. The lowest average was for preparation in individualized instruction with a mean of 2.43.

Analysis of Variance[10]

In order to determine how well prepared teachers trained in Colorado through various methods considered themselves to be, as compared to teachers trained in other states, the sample was divided into six categories: (1) teachers trained through a Colorado undergraduate program, (2) teachers trained through an out-of-state undergraduate program, (3) teachers trained in a Colorado post-baccalaureate program, (4) teachers trained in an out-of-state post-baccalaureate program, (5) teachers trained through Colorado's teacher in residence (TIR) program, and (6) teachers trained in Colorado's alternative licensure programs. Ratings on each standard were analyzed to determine if differences existed across these different groups (Table 22). With alpha set at .05,

[9] Cronbach's Alpha is a measure of internal reliability (accuracy) of items in an index or survey. Cronbach's Alpha ranges from 0.0 (no reliability) to 1.0 (absolute reliability). Scores toward the high end suggest that the items in the index are measuring the same thing.

[10] Analysis of variance (ANOVA) is a multivariate method used to assess differences in continuous data (e.g. answers to a survey question) separated by functional categories (e.g., males versus females). This method tests for differences in responses between groups (e.g. males and females) and within groups (e.g. high school graduates and college graduates). ANOVA tests by themselves do not reveal the actual differences, by group, however. Post hoc comparisons, tests that demonstrate the differences between group means calculated after ("post") having done an ANOVA, are used for this purpose.

significant differences in the perception of preparedness among groups were found across all standards with the exception of Standard 1 for elementary teachers, Standard 2 for all teachers, and Standard 8 for all teachers. Tukey's test of Honestly Significant Differences (HSD)[11] was used to determine where the significant differences existed.

I. Results of Post Hoc Test for Standard One: Knowledge of Literacy

In analyzing Standard One, Knowledge of Literacy, elementary teachers reported no significant difference in level of preparedness based on whether they were trained in- or out-of-state, regardless of methodology (Table 23). However, for secondary teachers, those trained as teachers in the Teachers in Residence (TIR) program felt significantly less well prepared than all other groups. Alternative licensure graduates expressed perceptions of adequacy of training that were significantly lower than teachers trained in Colorado undergraduate or post-baccalaureate programs for Standard One. These teachers' perceptions did not differ significantly from teachers trained out-of-state. Secondary teachers trained in Colorado undergraduate and post-baccalaureate programs expressed the highest level of preparedness in the ability to incorporate literacy into instruction (Table 24).

II. Results of Post Hoc Test for Standard Two: Knowledge of Mathematics

The first-year teachers who completed the survey showed no significant differences in how prepared they felt regarding Standard Two, Knowledge of Mathematics, based on the method of teacher preparation they received. Neither the secondary nor the primary teachers showed any differences. For this standard, the manner of training does not appear to have affected perceptions of preparedness (Tables 25 & 26).

III. Results of Post Hoc Test for Standard Three: Knowledge of Standards and Assessment

Significant differences appeared in the analysis of variance for Standard Three. Teachers trained in Colorado undergraduate programs felt the best prepared, significantly more than both the TIR teachers and teachers trained in alternative licensure programs (Table 27). Again the teachers prepared in Colorado's Teacher in Residence programs felt significantly less prepared in regards to Standard Three, Knowledge of Standards and Assessment than students prepared in other programs, excepting the alternative licensure program.

IV. Results of Post Hoc Test for Standard Four: Knowledge of Content

Teachers who received preparation through Colorado undergraduate programs felt the most prepared in Standard Four, Knowledge of Content, significantly more

[11] Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) tests determine whether some difference between groups exists. Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) test determines which group means are different and whether the differences are statistically significant.

than TIR, alternative licensure, and students trained in undergraduate programs in other states. No other significant differences existed in this standard regarding the type of training students received (Table 28).

V. Results of Post Hoc Test for Standard Five: Classroom and Instructional Management

In Standard Five, Knowledge of Classroom and Instructional Management, first-year teachers prepared by Colorado's Teacher in Residence programs felt the least prepared of any of the other programs. The results for the TIR teachers were significantly lower than teachers prepared in every other program, including alternative licensure programs and teachers prepared in other states. No other significant differences were apparent in this standard (Table 29).

VI. Results of Post Hoc Test for Standard Six: Knowledge of Individualization of Instruction

Once again, teachers prepared in the TIR programs in Colorado felt the least prepared in the standard. For Standard Six, Knowledge of Individualization of Instruction, TIR teachers felt significantly less prepared than teachers prepared in Colorado undergraduate, Colorado post-baccalaureate, and other states' undergraduate programs. Significant differences were not seen in other combinations (Table 30).

VII. Results of Post Hoc Test for Standard Seven: Knowledge of Technology

For Standard Seven, Knowledge of Technology, it is interesting to note that the teachers trained in other states' post-baccalaureate programs are those who felt the least prepared in this area, while Colorado post-baccalaureate teachers perceived themselves to be the most prepared, followed very closely by teachers trained in Colorado undergraduate programs. Out-of-state post-baccalaureate teachers felt significantly less prepared in technology than teachers trained in Colorado post-baccalaureate and undergraduate programs. In this area, TIR teachers showed no significant differences when compared to other teachers (Table 31).

VIII. Results of Post Hoc Test for Standard Eight: Democracy, Educational Governance and Teaching

Examining Standard Eight, Democracy, Educational Governance and Teaching Careers, no significant differences in the level of preparedness were found among any of the different preparation programs (Table 32).

Ranking of Preparation Methods by Level of Teaching

In addition to the questions that focused on the Performance-Based Standards for Colorado Teachers, several informational questions were asked in the survey in hopes that the responses would better inform institutions of those program aspects that first-year teachers find most helpful once they have entered the profession. Teachers were asked how valuable the following tools were in their teacher preparation program:

1. *Regular evaluation from your faculty supervisor*
2. *Constructive feedback from your faculty supervisor*
3. *Regular evaluation from your cooperating teacher*
4. *Constructive feedback from your cooperating teacher*
5. *Extra preparation time*
6. *Common planning time with other teachers*
7. *Seminars for beginning teachers*
8. *Extra classroom assistance*
9. *Exposure to a variety of teaching situations*
10. *Regular communication with your principal*
11. *Regular meetings with your mentor teacher*
12. *Coaching by regular observing teacher*
13. *Observation of model lessons by a teacher leader*

Teacher preparation tools that teachers reported as most valuable tended to focus on work and feedback done with cooperating teachers and principals in the schools themselves. Teachers also valued exposure to a variety of teaching situations, as well. The tool that was least reported as "very valuable" was seminars for beginning teachers (Table 33).

Open-ended Questions

Of particular interest in the survey were the open-ended questions that asked teachers to identify both the least and the most beneficial aspects of their teacher education preparation programs (Tables 34 & 35). Content analysis was done in order to aggregate responses into topical categories. Nearly 36% of the respondents agreed that the most beneficial aspect of their teacher education program was the classroom experience. An additional 12% added that classroom management tips learned while in the field were the most beneficial

Importantly, more than 49% of respondents stated that the least beneficial part of their teacher education preparation program was the redundant and irrelevant nature of many of their pedagogy courses. Several went on to say they had only been exposed to one model of planning or one method of running a classroom, and these did them little good in their current position. Exposure to a variety of methods and materials was often offered as a suggestion for improvement.

Discussion and Implications

Results of the survey have several possible implications. Further examination of the Teacher in Residence program may be warranted because, among those in the sample population, graduates of this program type felt least prepared in many of the Performance-Based Standards for Colorado Teachers[12]. The finding that these teachers may be less prepared in Colorado standards than teachers prepared in other states is of particular note. These results should not be surprising in light of the fact that substantial research exists noting that recruits from alternative paths often report dissatisfaction with training, finding many aspects of teaching more difficult than students trained in more traditional programs.[13]

Additional findings suggest that teacher preparation programs may want to examine their pedagogy and educational theory coursework for redundancy and irrelevance. Several students complained that their courses were not aligned with district needs and their programs did not expose them to multiple methodologies in areas like lesson planning. Recent case study research[14] has found that the best teacher education preparation programs require the integration of theory and practice, thereby maximizing the relevance of theory in practice.

Unfortunately, because the individual institutional sample sizes are small, no valid inferences can be made at an institutional level. Institutions are encouraged to follow-up on findings within this study and evaluate the extent to which theory is integrated into current practice and experience in order to address student concern of redundancy and irrelevance of coursework.

One point of interest is the fact that teachers trained in traditional Colorado post-baccalaureate and undergraduate programs feel significantly more prepared than teachers who were trained out-of-state in post-baccalaureate programs regarding technology. More information would need to be gathered in order to determine why this would occur when no other standard shows this type of relationship.

Colorado education, K-12 and higher education need to improve the pipeline of ethnically diverse students for teacher education programs in order that districts have a representative pool of candidates from which to draw teachers. The sample in this survey suggests that the population of new teachers in Colorado is still far from its goal of ethnic representation. Programs that are having successful impacts on this phenomenon need to be highlighted by institutions in order that efforts can be recognized and replicated where they exist. All of the performance contracts negotiated between the Colorado Commission on Higher Education and the state's public colleges and universities, which will go into effect in 2005, require improvements in this area.

---

[12] All current Teacher in Residence programs were approved under old teacher education preparation standards. H.B. 04-1104 now allows TIR programs to be re-approved based upon the more recently adopted teacher education preparation standards. The CDE is beginning these reviews.

[13] Darling-Hammond, 1998; Scannell, 1999.

[14] Darling-Hammond and Snyder, 1999.

V. SUMMARIES OF THE FINDINGS FROM THE REAUTHORIZATION SITE VISITS AT FOUR TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS IN COLORADO.

The Colorado Commission on Higher Education and Colorado Department of Education conducted on-site teacher education program reviews in 2003-2004 at Colorado State University at Pueblo (February 2004), University of Colorado at Boulder (February 2004), Mesa State College (March 2004), and the Metropolitan State College of Denver (April 2004). All programs were required to demonstrate compliance with the State's statutory performance measures for teacher education. Within this performance model are criteria by which to evaluate each program's implementation of the state's performance based teacher education standards, the state's rules for the content preparedness of teacher education candidates, and the alignment with the state's K-12 Model Content Standards.

Colorado State University at Pueblo and the University of Colorado at Boulder successfully met the mandated performance measures and were reauthorized by the Colorado Department of Education and the Colorado Commission on Higher Education. As with all successful programs, there are elements within each program that the state site visitation teams identified for special consideration, either because these elements can serve as examples of excellence for other programs or because the programs could benefit by adopting aspects from other programs. The findings for Mesa State College and the Metropolitan State College of Denver were still being processed by the Colorado Department of Education or the Commission on Higher Education or both at the time of the writing of this report. Current policy prescribes that the State Board of Education first approve the content of the teacher preparation program. Once this has occurred, the Commission has the authority to formally review and reauthorize teacher preparation programs.

Colorado State University-Pueblo In its reauthorization of the teacher education program, the site visit team concluded that the teacher education program at Colorado State University at Pueblo demonstrated quality and met the state standards, including four-year degree completion, comprehensive admissions system, advising and screening of candidates, content knowledge aligned to standards, skills required for licensing by the Colorado Department of Education, 800 hours (minimum) of field experience, and the assessment of student progress. The Commission provided a special acknowledgement to CSU-P for integrating and aligning coursework and field work with the Colorado Model Content and Performance Standards.

Since the teacher education preparation program presently relies heavily on external grant funding, the site visit team asked the institution to develop a plan for transitioning the program from grant monies to university support, thus ensuring long-term sustainability for the program. The Commission also asked the institution to establish a well-defined plan for ensuring consistent and quality advising of teacher education candidates. Finally, the Commission encouraged the institution's administration to develop specific memoranda of understanding between the teacher

education preparation program and its cooperating local school districts that define expectations and responsibilities for student field experiences.

University of Colorado at Boulder The site visit team found that the University of Colorado at Boulder successfully met the mandated performance measures, including four-year completion, comprehensive admissions system, advising and screening candidates, content knowledge aligned to standards, skills required for licensing by the Colorado Department of Education, 800 hours (minimum) of field experiences, and assessment of student progress. A special acknowledgment was given to the teacher education program for the efforts of science and math faculties to promote teaching as a profession to their best students.

The site visit team recommended that the program develop a renewed commitment to diversity in both the student body and faculty. The site visit team encouraged the institution to develop specific memoranda of understanding between the teacher education program and the local school districts to ensure all parties are fully informed of the field experience goals, requirements, and school responsibilities. The site visit team further requested that the School of Education establish a formal structure for engaging its cooperating local school districts and two-year community colleges in encouraging greater numbers of students to enter the teaching profession, with specific focus on increasing minority student enrollment and retention.

Mesa State College In its review of the teacher education program at Mesa State College, the site visit team commended the institution on the recent stability of leadership in its teacher education program, on the depth of understanding of the state's Model Content Standards possessed by the content faculty (e.g., science faculty), and on the program's full implementation of the Colorado Performance-based Teacher Education Standards. The site visit team encouraged the teacher education program to develop consistency across all program offerings, including both the undergraduate and post-bachelor programs; to enhance the contact and communication between the Center for Teacher Education and other units within the college; to improve its use of technology; and to increase diversity within the program.

As mentioned previously, the State Board of Education and the Commission on Higher Education continue to process the site team's findings for reauthorization of the teacher education program.

Metropolitan State College of Denver In its review of the Metropolitan State College of Denver, the site visit team commended the ability of the teacher education program to successfully attract a wide variety of candidates as transfer students from two-year institutions and from within the institution's student body. Local district administrators reported to the visitation team that graduates of this program often become building experts on the topic of the state's Model Content Standards. The areas of literacy instruction and technology were noted as particular strengths of the Metropolitan State College of Denver's teacher education program.

The site visitation team encouraged the teacher education program to address strategies to strengthen student advising, to increase collaboration among all faculty working with teacher education candidates, to explore avenues for the field placement of all candidates in professional development schools, and to promote opportunities for enhancing writing instruction within the program.

In October 2004, the State Board of Education determined that the content of the teacher education preparation program at MSCD meets its standards. Pursuant to protocol established by statute, the Commission on Higher Education will formally consider re-authorization of the overall teacher education preparation program at MSCD in early 2005.

VI. APPROVED EDUCATOR PREPARTION PROGRAMS

Data presented in the table on the following pages represent the approved educator preparation programs in Colorado by institution and program area. These programs are not differentiated by degree level (graduate, post bachelor, or undergraduate).

Following policy changes adopted by the State Board of Education, the Linguistically Diverse (bilingual and ESL) and Special Education (areas 1 - 4) programs were phased out in 2003 (the rows for these endorsement areas are shaded in the following table). The SBE adopted new preparation content standards for the Linguistically Diverse, Linguistically Diverse Education Specialist, Special Education Generalist, and Special Education Specialist programs in 2003. All programs in these areas must be reviewed and approved by the CDE. Some institutions have already completed restructuring their programs to correspond with the new state requirements. Others are in the process of doing so.

Of particular note, all but three of the nineteen institutions listed currently offer approved programs in mathematics, science, and English.

COLORADO INSTITUTIONS of HIGHER EDUCATION
APPROVED EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAMS

The following table reflects the approved educator licensing program by Colorado Institutions of Higher Education. This table does not differentiate between graduate, post bachelor, or undergraduate programs.

APPROVED PROGRAMS	Adams State College	CO Christian University	Colorado College	Colorado State University	Fort Lewis College	Johnson and Wales University	Mesa State College	Metro State College of Denver	Regis College	Regis University	Univ. of CO at Boulder	Univ. of CO at CO Springs	Univ. of CO at Denver	Univ. of CO Health Science	University of Denver	University of Northern Colorado	University of Phoenix	Colorado State University-Pueblo	Western State College
Administrator												♦	♦		♦	♦			
Agriculture and Renewable Natural Resources				♦															
Art	♦		♦	♦	♦		♦	♦		♦					♦	♦		♦	♦
Audiologist, School											♦					♦			
Business & Marketing Ed																			
Business Education	♦			♦		♦			♦	♦									
Counselor, School	♦			♦								♦	♦		♦	♦	♦		
Drama										♦						♦			
Early Childhood Education	♦	♦		♦	♦			♦		♦						♦			
Elementary Education	♦	♦	♦		♦		♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦		♦	♦		♦	♦
English Language Arts	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦		♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦		♦	♦		♦	♦
Family & Consumer Stds				♦		♦													
Foreign Language	♦		♦	♦	♦			♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦		♦	♦		♦	♦
Health																			
Instructional Technology Specialist																			
Instructional Technology Teacher																			
Library Media , School													♦		♦	♦			
Linguistically Diverse																			♦
Linguistically Diverse Education Specialist: Bilingual Ed																			
Linguistically Diverse: Bilingual	♦				♦			♦	♦	♦	♦		♦			♦			
Linguistically Diverse: ESL	♦			♦	♦				♦	♦	♦	♦	♦			♦	♦		
Marketing Education				♦		♦													
Mathematics	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦		♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦		♦	♦		♦	♦
Music	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦		♦	♦		♦	♦				♦	♦		♦	♦
Nurse , School								♦		♦				♦		♦			
Occupational Therapist, School				♦															
Orientation and Mobility Specialist , School																♦			
Physical Education	♦				♦		♦	♦								♦		♦	♦
Physical Therapist , School														♦					
Principal	♦			♦								♦	♦		♦	♦	♦		
Psychologist , School													♦		♦	♦			
Reading Specialist																♦			
Reading Teacher	♦										♦	♦	♦			♦			
Science	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦		♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦		♦	♦		♦	♦

APPROVED PROGRAMS	Adams State College	CO Christian University	Colorado College	Colorado State University	Fort Lewis College	Johnson and Wales University	Mesa State College	Metro State College of Denver	Regis College	Regis University	Univ. of CO at Boulder	Univ. of CO at CO Springs	Univ. of CO at Denver	Univ. of CO Health Science	University of Denver	University of Northern Colorado	University of Phoenix	Colorado State University-Pueblo	Western State College
Social Studies	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦		♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦		♦	♦		♦	♦
Social Worker , School				♦											♦				
Speech				♦				♦		♦						♦			
Speech/Language Pathologist, School											♦					♦			
Technical Education (Tech Ed)				♦															
Trade and Industry Education				♦															
Special Education Director															♦	♦			
Special Education Generalist								♦											♦
Special Education Specialist																			
Special Education Specialist- Visually Impaired																♦			
Special Education Specialist- Deaf/Hard of Hearing																♦			
ECE Special Education Specialist																			
ECE Special Education																			
Gifted Education Specialist																			
Special Education Teacher 1*	♦							♦		♦	♦	♦	♦		♦	♦			
Special Education Teacher 2-Cognitive												♦	♦			♦			
Special Education Teacher 2-Affective												♦	♦			♦			
Special Education Teacher 2-Vision																♦			
Special Education Teacher 2-Hearing																♦			
Special Education Teacher 2-Communication													♦						
Special Education Teacher 3* **													♦			♦			
Special Education Teacher 4** **										♦			♦		♦	♦			

* Moderate Needs ** Severe Needs *** Profound Needs **** Early Childhood Special Education

Appendix A: Results of Multivariate Statistical Analyses on the First-year Teachers Survey

Table 14 — Standard Three – Knowledge of Standards and Assessment

Item	Factor loading
How prepared – design standards based instructional plans	.814
How prepared – develop reliable and valid assessment tools	.872
How prepared – use assessment data for instruction	.898
How prepared – use assessment data for feedback tool	.841

Table 15 — Standard Four – Knowledge of Content

Item	Factor loading
How prepared – utilize content knowledge	.864
How prepared – enhance content by utilizing model content standards	.864

Table 16 — Standard Five – Knowledge of Classroom and Instructional Management

Item	Factor loading
How prepared – differentiate intervention strategies	.827
How prepared – utilize knowledge of cognitive processes	.821
How prepared – work with parents as partners	.740
How prepared – maintain appropriate student records	.697

Table 17 — Standard Six – Knowledge of Individualization of Instruction

Item	Factor loading
How prepared - employ a wide range of techniques	.820
How prepared – design/modify instruction as needed	.849
How prepared – develop and implement an IEP	.780
How prepared – consider student medical condition	.795

Table 18 — Standard Seven – Knowledge of Technology

Item	Factor loading
How prepared – use technology in the classroom	.857
How prepared – utilize technology to communicate information	.845
How prepared – use technology to utilize assessment data	.815
How prepared – instruct students in technology	.877

Table 19 — Standard Eight – Democracy, Educational Governance and Teaching Careers

Item	Factor loading
How prepared – contribute to developing productive students	.565
How prepared – respond to influences on educational practice	.647
How prepared – promote teaching as a worthy career	.650
How prepared – take control of my professional development	.549

Table 20 — Results of Reliability Analysis – Chronbach's alpha = .930

Questions	Alpha if item deleted
How prepared – design standards based instructional plans	.925
How prepared – develop reliable and valid assessment tools	.924
How prepared – use assessment data for instruction	.924
How prepared – use assessment data for feedback tool	.925
How prepared – utilize content knowledge	.925
How prepared – enhance content by utilizing model content standards	.925
How prepared – differentiate intervention strategies	.925
How prepared – utilize knowledge of cognitive processes	.925
How prepared – work with parents as partners	.927
How prepared – maintain appropriate student records	.927
How prepared - employ a wide range of techniques	.924
How prepared – design/modify instruction as needed	.926
How prepared – develop and implement an IEP	.927
How prepared – consider student medical condition	.929
How prepared – use technology in the classroom	.926

How prepared – utilize technology to communicate information	.927
How prepared – use technology to utilize assessment data	.929
How prepared – instruct students in technology	.927
How prepared – contribute to developing productive students	.927
How prepared – respond to influences on educational practice	.926
How prepared – promote teaching as a worthy career	.928
How prepared – take control of my professional development	.927

Table 21 — Standard Descriptives

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation
Standard 1: Literacy in elementary*	2.909	0.861
Standard 1: Literacy in secondary**	3.027	0.881
Standard 2: Mathematics in elementary*	2.893	0.831
Standard 2: Mathematics in secondary**	2.897	0.906
Standard 3: Standards and Assessment	2.816	1.160
Standard 4: Content	3.029	1.140
Standard 5: Classroom Management	2.761	0.903
Standard 6: Individualized Instruction	2.437	1.203
Standard 7: Technology	2.753	1.308
Standard 8: Teaching Careers	2.854	1.223

* Only asked of elementary teachers, n = 170, ** Only asked of secondary/multilevel teachers, n = 308.

Table 22 — Analysis of Variance; Level of preparedness by training

Variable	SS	MS_b	MS_w	F	p
Standard 1**	6.9	1.382	0.722	1.915	.095
Standard 1***	33.5	6.692	0.636	10.528	.000*
Standard 2**	0.8	0.164	0.714	0.230	.949
Standard 2***	4.2	0.848	0.806	1.053	.387
Standard 3	35.5	7.103	1.138	6.242	.000*
Standard 4	34.7	6.942	1.083	6.410	.000*
Standard 5	16.3	3.266	0.539	6.060	.000*
Standard 6	15.5	3.102	1.018	3.048	.010*
Standard 7	15.1	3.027	1.347	2.247	.049*
Standard 8	12.5	2.495	1.145	2.180	.055

* $p < .05$, ** Only asked of elementary teachers, n = 170, *** Only asked of secondary/multilevel teachers, n = 308.

Table 23 — Post-Hoc Test for Standard One – Knowledge of Literacy, elementary teachers

(I) Training	(J) Training	Difference
CO Undergraduate	Other Undergrad	0.0752
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	0.0019
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	-0.5185
	TIR	0.8386
	Alternative	0.3148
Other Undergraduate	CO Undergrad	-0.0752
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	-0.0733
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	-0.5937
	TIR	0.7634
	Alternative	0.2396
CO Post-Baccalaureate	CO Undergrad	-0.0019
	Other Undergrad	0.0733
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	-0.5204
	TIR	0.8367
	Alternative	0.3127
Other Post-Baccalaureate	CO Undergrad	0.5185
	Other Undergrad	0.5937
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	0.5204
	TIR	1.3571
	Alternative	0.8333
TIR	CO Undergrad	-0.8386
	Other Undergrad	-0.7634
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	-0.8367
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	-1.3571
	Alternative	-0.5238
Alternative	CO Undergrad	-0.3148
	Other Undergrad	-0.2396
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	-0.3129
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	-0.8333
	TIR	0.5238

* $p < .05$

Table 24 — Post-Hoc Test for Standard One – Knowledge of Literacy, secondary/multi-level teachers

(I) Training	(J) Training	Difference
CO Undergraduate	Other Undergrad	0.2574
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	-0.0759
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	0.0267
	TIR	1.2574*
	Alternative	0.5908*
Other Undergraduate	CO Undergrad	-0.2574
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	-0.3333
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	-0.2308
	TIR	1.0000*
	Alternative	0.3333
CO Post-Baccalaureate	CO Undergrad	0.0757
	Other Undergrad	0.3333
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	0.1026
	TIR	1.3333*
	Alternative	0.6667*
Other Post-Baccalaureate	CO Undergrad	-0.0267
	Other Undergrad	0.2308
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	-0.1026
	TIR	1.2308*
	Alternative	0.5641
TIR	CO Undergrad	-1.2574*
	Other Undergrad	-1.0000*
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	-1.3333*
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	-1.2308*
	Alternative	-0.6667*
Alternative	CO Undergrad	-0.5908
	Other Undergrad	-0.3333
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	-0.6667*
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	-0.5641
	TIR	0.6667*

* $p < .05$

Table 25 — Post-Hoc Test for Standard Two Knowledge of Mathematics, elementary teachers

(I) Training	(J) Training	Difference
CO Undergraduate	Other Undergrad	-0.0316
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	-0.0110
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	-0.0962
	TIR	0.2372
	Alternative	0.1705
Other Undergraduate	CO Undergrad	0.0316
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	0.0206
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	-0.0645
	TIR	0.2688
	Alternative	0.2022
CO Post-Baccalaureate	CO Undergrad	0.0110
	Other Undergrad	-0.0206
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	-0.0851
	TIR	0.2482
	Alternative	0.1816
Other Post-Baccalaureate	CO Undergrad	0.0962
	Other Undergrad	0.0645
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	0.0851
	TIR	0.3333
	Alternative	0.2667
TIR	CO Undergrad	-0.2372
	Other Undergrad	-0.2688
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	-0.2488
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	-0.3333
	Alternative	-0.0667
Alternative	CO Undergrad	-0.1705
	Other Undergrad	-0.2022
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	-0.1816
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	-0.2667
	TIR	0.0667

* $p < .05$

Table 26 — Post-Hoc Test for Standard Two – Knowledge of Mathematics, secondary/multi-level teachers

(I) Training	(J) Training	Difference
CO Undergraduate	Other Undergrad	-0.0301
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	-0.0292
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	-0.1505
	TIR	0.4828
	Alternative	0.1337
Other Undergraduate	CO Undergrad	0.0301
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	0.0009
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	-0.1204
	TIR	0.5129
	Alternative	0.1638
CO Post-Baccalaureate	CO Undergrad	0.0292
	Other Undergrad	-0.0009
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	-0.1213
	TIR	0.5121
	Alternative	0.1629
Other Post-Baccalaureate	CO Undergrad	0.1505
	Other Undergrad	0.1204
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	0.1213
	TIR	0.6333
	Alternative	0.2842
TIR	CO Undergrad	-0.4828
	Other Undergrad	-0.5129
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	-0.5121
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	-0.6333
	Alternative	-0.3491
Alternative	CO Undergrad	-0.1337
	Other Undergrad	-0.1638
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	-0.1629
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	-0.2842
	TIR	0.3491

* $p < .05$

Table 27 — Post-Hoc Test for Standard Three – Knowledge of Standards and Assessment

(I) Training	(J) Training	Difference
CO Undergraduate	Other Undergrad	0.2950
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	0.2099
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	0.1630
	TIR	1.1539*
	Alternative	0.5968*
Other Undergraduate	CO Undergrad	-0.2950
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	-0.0851
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	-0.1320
	TIR	0.8588*
	Alternative	0.3017
CO Post-Baccalaureate	CO Undergrad	-0.2099
	Other Undergrad	0.0851
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	-0.0469
	TIR	0.9440*
	Alternative	0.3868
Other Post-Baccalaureate	CO Undergrad	-0.1630
	Other Undergrad	0.1320
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	0.0469
	TIR	0.9908*
	Alternative	0.4337
TIR	CO Undergrad	-1.1539*
	Other Undergrad	-0.8588*
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	-0.9440*
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	-0.9908*
	Alternative	-0.5571
Alternative	CO Undergrad	-0.5968*
	Other Undergrad	-0.3017
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	-0.3868
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	-0.4337
	TIR	0.5571

* $p < .05$

Table 28 — Post-Hoc Test for Standard Four – Knowledge of Content

(I) Training	(J) Training	Difference
CO Undergraduate	Other Undergrad	0.6096*
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	0.2828
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	0.4520
	TIR	0.9211*
	Alternative	0.5448*
Other Undergraduate	CO Undergrad	-0.6096*
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	-0.3267
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	-0.1576
	TIR	0.3115
	Alternative	-0.0648
CO Post-Baccalaureate	CO Undergrad	-0.2828
	Other Undergrad	0.3267
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	0.1691
	TIR	0.6382
	Alternative	0.2620
Other Post-Baccalaureate	CO Undergrad	-0.4520
	Other Undergrad	0.1576
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	-0.1691
	TIR	0.4691
	Alternative	0.0928
TIR	CO Undergrad	-0.9211*
	Other Undergrad	-0.3115
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	-0.6382
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	-0.4691
	Alternative	-0.3763
Alternative	CO Undergrad	-0.5448*
	Other Undergrad	0.0648
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	-0.2620
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	-0.0928
	TIR	0.3763

* $p < .05$

Table 29 — Post-Hoc Test for Standard Five – Knowledge of Classroom and Instructional Management

(I) Training	(J) Training	Difference
CO Undergraduate	Other Undergrad	0.0410
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	-0.0206
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	-0.0889
	TIR	0.8195*
	Alternative	0.2211
Other Undergraduate	CO Undergrad	-0.0410
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	-0.0616
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	-0.1299
	TIR	0.7785*
	Alternative	0.1801
CO Post-Baccalaureate	CO Undergrad	0.0206
	Other Undergrad	0.0616
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	-0.0683
	TIR	0.8401*
	Alternative	0.2417
Other Post-Baccalaureate	CO Undergrad	0.0889
	Other Undergrad	0.1299
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	0.0683
	TIR	0.9085*
	Alternative	0.3100
TIR	CO Undergrad	-0.8195*
	Other Undergrad	-0.7785*
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	-0.8401*
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	-0.9085*
	Alternative	-0.5984*
Alternative	CO Undergrad	-0.2211
	Other Undergrad	-0.1801
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	-0.2417
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	-0.3100
	TIR	0.5984*

* $p < .05$

Table 30 — Post-Hoc Test for Standard Six – Knowledge of Individualized Instruction

(I) Training	(J) Training	Difference
CO Undergraduate	Other Undergrad	0.0588
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	-0.0620
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	-0.1016
	TIR	0.7371*
	Alternative	0.2685
Other Undergraduate	CO Undergrad	-0.0588
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	-0.1208
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	-0.1604
	TIR	0.6782*
	Alternative	0.2097
CO Post-Baccalaureate	CO Undergrad	0.0620
	Other Undergrad	0.1208
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	-0.0396
	TIR	0.7991*
	Alternative	0.3305
Other Post-Baccalaureate	CO Undergrad	0.1016
	Other Undergrad	0.1604
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	0.0396
	TIR	0.8387*
	Alternative	0.3701
TIR	CO Undergrad	-0.7371*
	Other Undergrad	-0.6782*
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	-0.7991*
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	-0.8387
	Alternative	-0.4686
Alternative	CO Undergrad	-0.2685
	Other Undergrad	-0.2097
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	-0.3305
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	-0.3701
	TIR	0.4686

* $p < .05$

Table 31 — Post-Hoc Test for Standard Seven – Knowledge of Technology

(I) Training	(J) Training	Difference
CO Undergraduate	Other Undergrad	0.0670
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	-0.0189
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	0.8318*
	TIR	0.3020
	Alternative	0.2334
Other Undergraduate	CO Undergrad	-0.0670
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	-0.0859
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	0.7648
	TIR	0.2351
	Alternative	0.1665
CO Post-Baccalaureate	CO Undergrad	0.0189
	Other Undergrad	0.0859
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	0.8507*
	TIR	0.3209
	Alternative	0.2523
Other Post-Baccalaureate	CO Undergrad	-0.8318*
	Other Undergrad	-0.7648
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	-0.8507*
	TIR	-0.5297
	Alternative	-0.5983
TIR	CO Undergrad	-0.3020
	Other Undergrad	-0.2351
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	-0.3209
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	0.5297
	Alternative	-0.0686
Alternative	CO Undergrad	-0.2334
	Other Undergrad	-0.1665
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	-0.2523
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	0.5983
	TIR	0.0686

* $p < .05$

Table 32 — Post-Hoc Test for Standard Eight - Democracy, Educational Governance and Teaching Careers

(I) Training	(J) Training	Difference
CO Undergraduate	Other Undergrad	0.0511
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	-0.0429
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	0.4886
	TIR	0.6191
	Alternative	0.1159
Other Undergraduate	CO Undergrad	-0.0511
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	-0.0941
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	0.4375
	TIR	0.5679
	Alternative	0.0648
CO Post-Baccalaureate	CO Undergrad	0.0429
	Other Undergrad	0.0941
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	0.5316
	TIR	0.6620
	Alternative	0.1588
Other Post-Baccalaureate	CO Undergrad	-0.4886
	Other Undergrad	-0.4375
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	-0.5316
	TIR	0.1304
	Alternative	-0.3727
TIR	CO Undergrad	-0.6191
	Other Undergrad	-0.5679
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	-0.6620
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	-0.1304
	Alternative	-0.5032
Alternative	CO Undergrad	-0.1159
	Other Undergrad	-0.0648
	CO Post- Baccalaureate	-0.1588
	Other Post- Baccalaureate	0.3727
	TIR	0.5032

* $p < .05$

Table 33 — Ranking of teacher preparation tools by perceived value by teachers

Rank	Tool	% of teachers who found The tool very valuable
1	Constructive feedback from cooperating teacher	75.7
2	Regular evaluation from cooperating teacher	70.5
3	Exposure to a variety of teaching situations	61.3
4	Regular communication with your principal	60.1
5	Extra preparation time	60.0
6	Regular meetings with mentor teacher	57.9
7	Constructive feedback from faculty supervisor	57.0
8	Common planning time with other teachers	52.1
9	Regular evaluations from faculty supervisor	49.7
10	Coaching by regular observing teacher	43.9
11	Observation of model lessons by teacher leader	39.2
12	Extra classroom assistance	33.1
13	Seminars for beginning teachers	29.1

Table 34 — Open ended response categories – Most beneficial aspect of teacher preparation program

Category	% of respondents
Classroom experience	35.5
Working with mentor/experienced teachers	19.6
Classroom management tips and techniques	12.0
Specific courses	9.1
Work specific to district/state expectations	7.9
Professors	6.2
Colleagues	5.3
Content preparation	2.6
Life experiences	.6
Adult learning friendly	.6
Few meetings	.3
Portfolios	.3

Table 35 — Open ended response categories – Least beneficial aspect of teacher preparation program

Category	% of respondents
Irrelevant/redundant courses an work	49.3
Not enough classroom management	11.9
University – professors and administration	7.6
Mentor	7.2
Literacy course	6.8
Induction	4.7
Not enough classroom time	2.9
Methods courses	2.5
Not enough about government requirements	2.5
Not enough time for homework	2.2
Assessment courses	1.1
Pedagogy courses	.7
CCHE policy changes	.4
Distance learning	.4

Appendix B: First-year Teacher Survey Instrument

1. How many years have you been teaching, excluding student teaching or paraprofessional work?

- ❍ One year, including this year
- ❍ More than one year

If more than one year, end survey.

2. What type of license do you hold?

- ❍ Provisional
- ❍ Alternate
- ❍ TIR Authorization
- ❍ Emergency Authorization

3. In what area(s) are you endorsed/licensed? Please indicate your "Primary" field, and then any other endorsements/licenses you hold.
Allow only one entry in each column
"Primary" must not be blank
The "Additional" Columns can have blanks

	Primary	Additional	Additional
Agriculture	❍	❍	❍
Art	❍	❍	❍
Bilingual education		❍	❍
Business/marketing	❍	❍	❍
Consumer & Family studies/home economics	❍	❍	❍
Drama	❍	❍	❍
Drivers Education	❍	❍	❍
Early childhood	❍	❍	❍
Elementary	❍	❍	❍
English as Second Language	❍	❍	❍
English Language Arts	❍	❍	❍
Foreign Language	❍	❍	❍
Gifted and Talented	❍	❍	❍
Health	❍	❍	❍

Mathematics	❍	❍	❍
Music	❍	❍	❍
Physical Education	❍	❍	❍
Science	❍	❍	❍
Social Studies	❍	❍	❍
Special Education	❍	❍	❍
Speech	❍	❍	❍
Technology Education	❍	❍	❍
Trade & Industry Education	❍	❍	❍
Other-please specify_____ _____ _	❍	❍	❍

4. First year teachers sometimes teach in areas outside of their endorsement/licensure areas. Regardless of your endorsement/licensure area, what subjects are you teaching this year? Please note, this information will never be released in any way that would personally identify you.

Allow multiple choices

- ❑ Agriculture
- ❑ Art
- ❑ Bilingual education
- ❑ Business/marketing
- ❑ Consumer & Family studies/home economics
- ❑ Drama
- ❑ Drivers Education
- ❑ Early childhood
- ❑ Elementary
- ❑ English as Second Language
- ❑ English Language Arts
- ❑ Foreign Language
- ❑ Gifted and Talented
- ❑ Health
- ❑ Mathematics
- ❑ Music
- ❑ Physical Education
- ❑ Science
- ❑ Social Studies
- ❑ Special Education
- ❑ Speech
- ❑ Technology Education
- ❑ Trade & Industry Education
- ❑ Other-please specify _____

5. In what type of building do you teach?

- ❍ Preschool or Elementary only
- ❍ Secondary only
- ❍ Multi-level (e.g., K-8, K-12)

If Elementary only, then go to Q 6 & 7 and Skip Q 8 & 9,
If Secondary or Multi-Level, skip Q 6 & 7 and go to Q 8 & 9

For Q 6-31 , This should be at the top of each screen.
When you began this school year in your classroom, how well prepared were you to:

6. Provide literacy instruction

- ❍ Not at all prepared
- ❍ Somewhat prepared
- ❍ Adequately prepared
- ❍ Well prepared
- ❍ I cannot answer this item

7. Provide mathematics instruction

- ❍ Not at all prepared
- ❍ Somewhat prepared
- ❍ Adequately prepared
- ❍ Well prepared
- ❍ I cannot answer this item

8. Incorporate literacy in your content specialty, where appropriate

- ❍ Not at all prepared
- ❍ Somewhat prepared
- ❍ Adequately prepared
- ❍ Well prepared
- ❍ I cannot answer this item

9. Incorporate general mathematical concepts in your content specialty, where appropriate

- ❍ Not at all prepared
- ❍ Somewhat prepared
- ❍ Adequately prepared
- ❍ Well prepared
- ❍ I cannot answer this item

10. Design standards-based instruction plans.

- ❍ Not at all prepared
- ❍ Somewhat prepared
- ❍ Adequately prepared
- ❍ Well prepared
- ❍ I cannot answer this item

11. Develop valid and reliable assessment tools for the classroom

- ❍ Not at all prepared
- ❍ Somewhat prepared
- ❍ Adequately prepared
- ❍ Well prepared
- ❍ I cannot answer this item

12. Use assessment data as a basis for instruction

- ❍ Not at all prepared
- ❍ Somewhat prepared
- ❍ Adequately prepared
- ❍ Well prepared
- ❍ I cannot answer this item

13. Use assessment data as a feedback tool with various audiences (e.g., students, parents, guardians, professionals, administrators, and the community)

- ❍ Not at all prepared
- ❍ Somewhat prepared
- ❍ Adequately prepared
- ❍ Well prepared
- ❍ I cannot answer this item

14. Utilize my content knowledge to ensure student learning.

- ❍ Not at all prepared
- ❍ Somewhat prepared
- ❍ Adequately prepared
- ❍ Well prepared
- ❍ I cannot answer this item

15. Enhance content instruction by utilizing the Colorado Model Content Standards.

- ❍ Not at all prepared

- ❍ Somewhat prepared
- ❍ Adequately prepared
- ❍ Well prepared
- ❍ I cannot answer this item

16. Differentiate appropriate intervention strategies/practices to ensure a successful learning environment

- ❍ Not at all prepared
- ❍ Somewhat prepared
- ❍ Adequately prepared
- ❍ Well prepared
- ❍ I cannot answer this item

17. Utilize knowledge of the cognitive processes (e.g., critical and creative thinking, problem structuring and problem solving, invention, memorization and recall) associated with various kinds of learning.

- ❍ Not at all prepared
- ❍ Somewhat prepared
- ❍ Adequately prepared
- ❍ Well prepared
- ❍ I cannot answer this item

18. Work with parents as partners in student learning

- ❍ Not at all prepared
- ❍ Somewhat prepared
- ❍ Adequately prepared
- ❍ Well prepared
- ❍ I cannot answer this item

19. Maintain appropriate student records for student and school needs

- ❍ Not at all prepared
- ❍ Somewhat prepared
- ❍ Adequately prepared
- ❍ Well prepared
- ❍ I cannot answer this item

20. Employ a wide range of teaching techniques to adapt the classroom experience to the unique needs of specific learners.

- ❍ Not at all prepared
- ❍ Somewhat prepared
- ❍ Adequately prepared

- ❍ Well prepared
- ❍ I cannot answer this item

21. Design or modify standards-based instruction in response to the unique needs of specific learners.

- ❍ Not at all prepared
- ❍ Somewhat prepared
- ❍ Adequately prepared
- ❍ Well prepared
- ❍ I cannot answer this item

22. Develop and implement an Individualized Education Program (IEP) for my students

- ❍ Not at all prepared
- ❍ Somewhat prepared
- ❍ Adequately prepared
- ❍ Well prepared
- ❍ I cannot answer this item

23. Consider knowledge of individual students' medical conditions and medications and their possible effects on student learning and behavior, to tailor instruction when appropriate.

- ❍ Not at all prepared
- ❍ Somewhat prepared
- ❍ Adequately prepared
- ❍ Well prepared
- ❍ I cannot answer this item

24. Use technology in the classroom to improve student achievement

- ❍ Not at all prepared
- ❍ Somewhat prepared
- ❍ Adequately prepared
- ❍ Well prepared
- ❍ I cannot answer this item

25. Utilize technology to communicate information

- ❍ Not at all prepared
- ❍ Somewhat prepared
- ❍ Adequately prepared
- ❍ Well prepared
- ❍ I cannot answer this item

26. Use technology to utilize data driven assessments of learning, e.g., use Excel to analyze test scores for a group of students

- ❍ Not at all prepared
- ❍ Somewhat prepared
- ❍ Adequately prepared
- ❍ Well prepared
- ❍ I cannot answer this item

27. Instruct students in basic technology skills

- ❍ Not at all prepared
- ❍ Somewhat prepared
- ❍ Adequately prepared
- ❍ Well prepared
- ❍ I cannot answer this item

28. Contribute to developing productive citizens in a democratic society

- ❍ Not at all prepared
- ❍ Somewhat prepared
- ❍ Adequately prepared
- ❍ Well prepared
- ❍ I cannot answer this item

29. Respond to influences on educational practice (e.g., federal, state and local government)

- ❍ Not at all prepared
- ❍ Somewhat prepared
- ❍ Adequately prepared
- ❍ Well prepared
- ❍ I cannot answer this item

30. Promote teaching as a worthy career choice

- ❍ Not at all prepared
- ❍ Somewhat prepared
- ❍ Adequately prepared
- ❍ Well prepared
- ❍ I cannot answer this item

31. Take control of my professional development as a teacher

- ❍ Not at all prepared

- ❍ Somewhat prepared
- ❍ Adequately prepared
- ❍ Well prepared
- ❍ I cannot answer this item

32. Based upon the education and training I received in my undergraduate or post-baccalaureate program, I was _____ for teaching students in my classes during my first year.

- ❍ Not at all prepared
- ❍ Somewhat prepared
- ❍ Adequately prepared
- ❍ Well prepared
- ❍ I cannot answer this item

If Q 3 had any selection of Special Education, ask Q 33-35. If no Special Education marked, skip Q 33-35

33. Please indicate the level of students you teach.
- ❍ Mild/Moderate Needs
- ❍ Significant Support Needs
- ❍ Both of the above

34. Please indicate the setting in which you provide services. Choose all that apply.
- ❑ Resources
- ❑ Classroom inclusion (in general education)
- ❑ Self-contained
- ❑ Segregated (facility or alternate school)
- ❑ Other, please specify _____

35. What would you consider to be your specialization within special education? Choose all that apply.
- ❑ Audiology/Hearing
- ❑ Cognitive
- ❑ Perceptual/Communicative
- ❑ Emotional/Affective
- ❑ Mobility
- ❑ Speech/Language
- ❑ Vision
- ❑ Adaptive PE
- ❑ Other, please specify _____

36. What was your undergraduate major?
- ❍ Anthropology
- ❍ Biology

- ❍ Business
- ❍ Chemistry
- ❍ Classics (e.g., Latin)
- ❍ Communications
- ❍ Earth Sciences/Geology
- ❍ Economics
- ❍ Education
- ❍ Engineering
- ❍ English
- ❍ Environmental Sciences
- ❍ Fine Arts
- ❍ Foreign Language (e.g., French, German, Spanish, etc.)
- ❍ Geography
- ❍ History
- ❍ Humanities
- ❍ Interdisciplinary or Liberal Arts Degree
- ❍ Mathematics
- ❍ Philosophy
- ❍ Political Science
- ❍ Physical Education
- ❍ Physical Science
- ❍ Psychology
- ❍ Social Science
- ❍ Speech
- ❍ Special Education
- ❍ Other, please specify _____

37. At what institution did you complete your undergraduate degree?
    - ❍ Adams State College
    - ❍ Colorado College
    - ❍ Colorado Christian University
    - ❍ Colorado State University, Ft. Collins
    - ❍ Colorado State University, Pueblo
    - ❍ University of Denver
    - ❍ Fort Lewis College
    - ❍ Mesa State College
    - ❍ Metropolitan State College of Denver
    - ❍ Regis University
    - ❍ Rocky Mountain College of Art & Design
    - ❍ University of Colorado at Boulder
    - ❍ University of Colorado at Colorado Springs
    - ❍ University of Colorado at Denver
    - ❍ University of Northern Colorado
    - ❍ Western State College
    - ❍ Out of state
    - ❍ Other, please specify _____

38. Did you transfer from a different college?

- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

If Yes, go to Q39. If No, go to Q 40.

39. Please indicate the type of school from which you transferred. Choose one.

- ❍ Two year college
- ❍ Four year college or university

40. In order to apply for my Colorado teaching license, I: (choose one)

- ❍ 1.Completed an undergraduate (bachelor) degree in my content area with a teacher preparation program
- ❍ 2.Completed a post-baccalaureate teacher preparation program offered by a college or university
- ❍ 3. am participating in a Teacher-In-Residence program
- ❍ 4.am participating in an Alternative Teacher Licensing program

If 1, Skip 41, Go to Q 42
If 2, Go to Q 41 and continue
If 3 or 4, skip 41-46, go to 47

41. At what institution did you complete your post-baccalaureate program?
- ❍ Adams State College
- ❍ Colorado College
- ❍ Colorado Christian University
- ❍ Colorado State University, Ft. Collins
- ❍ Colorado State University, Pueblo
- ❍ University of Denver
- ❍ Fort Lewis College
- ❍ Johnson and Wales University
- ❍ Mesa State College
- ❍ Metropolitan State College of Denver
- ❍ Regis University
- ❍ Rocky Mountain College of Art and Design
- ❍ University of Colorado at Boulder
- ❍ University of Colorado at Colorado Springs
- ❍ University of Colorado at Denver
- ❍ University of Northern Colorado
- ❍ University of Phoenix
- ❍ Western State College
- ❍ Online program, please specify _____
- ❍ Out of state

For Q 42-54, this should be at the top of each screen:
How valuable or helpful to you was:

42. Regular evaluation from my college/faculty supervisor
- ❍ Not at all valuable or helpful
- ❍ A little valuable or helpful
- ❍ Somewhat valuable or helpful
- ❍ Very valuable or helpful
- ❍ Does not apply to me/did not receive

43. Constructive feedback from my college/faculty supervisor
- ❍ Not at all valuable or helpful
- ❍ A little valuable or helpful
- ❍ Somewhat valuable or helpful
- ❍ Very valuable or helpful
- ❍ Does not apply to me/did not receive

44. Regular evaluation from my cooperating teacher
- ❍ Not at all valuable or helpful
- ❍ A little valuable or helpful
- ❍ Somewhat valuable or helpful
- ❍ Very valuable or helpful
- ❍ Does not apply to me/did not receive

45. Constructive feedback from my cooperating teacher
- ❍ Not at all valuable or helpful
- ❍ A little valuable or helpful
- ❍ Somewhat valuable or helpful
- ❍ Very valuable or helpful
- ❍ Does not apply to me/did not receive

46. Exposure to a variety of teaching situations
- ❍ Not at all valuable or helpful
- ❍ A little valuable or helpful
- ❍ Somewhat valuable or helpful
- ❍ Very valuable or helpful
- ❍ Does not apply to me/did not receive

47. Extra preparation time
- ❍ Not at all valuable or helpful
- ❍ A little valuable or helpful
- ❍ Somewhat valuable or helpful
- ❍ Very valuable or helpful
- ❍ Does not apply to me/did not receive

48. Common planning time with teachers in my subject or grade level
- ❍ Not at all valuable or helpful
- ❍ A little valuable or helpful
- ❍ Somewhat valuable or helpful
- ❍ Very valuable or helpful
- ❍ Does not apply to me/did not receive

49. Seminars or classes for beginning teachers
- ❍ Not at all valuable or helpful
- ❍ A little valuable or helpful
- ❍ Somewhat valuable or helpful
- ❍ Very valuable or helpful
- ❍ Does not apply to me/did not receive

50. Extra classroom assistance (e.g., teacher aides)
- ❍ Not at all valuable or helpful
- ❍ A little valuable or helpful
- ❍ Somewhat valuable or helpful
- ❍ Very valuable or helpful
- ❍ Does not apply to me/did not receive

51. Regular communication with my principal, other administrators or department chair

- ❍ Not at all valuable or helpful
- ❍ A little valuable or helpful
- ❍ Somewhat valuable or helpful
- ❍ Very valuable or helpful
- ❍ Does not apply to me/did not receive

52. Regular meetings with my mentor teacher
    - ❍ Not at all valuable or helpful
    - ❍ A little valuable or helpful
    - ❍ Somewhat valuable or helpful
    - ❍ Very valuable or helpful
    - ❍ Does not apply to me/did not receive

53. Coaching by a teacher/coach who regularly observes my teaching
    - ❍ Not at all valuable or helpful
    - ❍ A little valuable or helpful
    - ❍ Somewhat valuable or helpful
    - ❍ Very valuable or helpful
    - ❍ Does not apply to me/did not receive

54. Observation of model lessons by a teacher leader
    - ❍ Not at all valuable or helpful
    - ❍ A little valuable or helpful
    - ❍ Somewhat valuable or helpful
    - ❍ Very valuable or helpful
    - ❍ Does not apply to me/did not receive

55. If you received some other type of support, please describe

    _____
    _____
    _____

56. What is your typical class size
    - ❍ 10 or fewer
    - ❍ 11-15
    - ❍ 16-20
    - ❍ 21-25
    - ❍ 26-30
    - ❍ 31-35
    - ❍ over 35

57. Please describe the **most** beneficial aspect of your teacher preparation program.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

58. Please describe the **least** beneficial aspect of your teacher preparation program.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

59. How could you have been more prepared for your first year of teaching?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

60. Do you plan to teach next year?

- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

If Yes, go to Q 61,
If No, skip 61, go to 62, then skip 63

61. Will you teach at the same school?

- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

If Yes, skip 62 go to 64
If No, go to 63.

62. What is your reason or reasons for leaving teaching?
Allow multiple selections

- ❑ Financial/Pay/Salary
- ❑ Lack of training in teacher preparation program
- ❑ Lack of training from school district
- ❑ Not enough support from school/administration
- ❑ Not enough support from parents at school
- ❑ Not enough support from community/lack of respect
- ❑ Not well suited to teaching/better at other profession
- ❑ Personal reasons (moving, spouse moving, pregnancy, health reason, etc.)
- ❑ Student discipline problems
- ❑ Teaching is not what I expected
- ❑ Too much time involved, high work load
- ❑ Too many students
- ❑ Too many responsibilities at work
- ❑ Promotion, changed position
- ❑ Too much emphasis on standardized testing
- ❑ Not enough positions available/school downsizing
- ❑ Other (specify) _____

63. What is your reason or reasons for leaving your school?
Allow multiple selections

- ❑ Financial/Pay/Salary
- ❑ Lack of training from school district
- ❑ Not enough support from school/administration
- ❑ Not enough support from parents at school
- ❑ Not enough support from community/lack of respect
- ❑ Personal reasons (moving, spouse moving, pregnancy, health reason, etc.)
- ❑ Student discipline problems
- ❑ Too much time involved, high work load
- ❑ Too many students
- ❑ Too many responsibilities at work
- ❑ Promotion, changed position
- ❑ Too much emphasis on standardized testing
- ❑ Not enough positions available/school downsizing
- ❑ Other (specify) _____

64. What additional comments do you have concerning the quality of your teacher preparation program

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

65. Please indicate your gender

- ❍ Male
- ❍ Female

66. Please indicate your ethnicity

- ❍ Asian
- ❍ African-American
- ❍ Hispanic
- ❍ Native American
- ❍ White/Caucasian
- ❍ Other
- ❍ I prefer not to answer

67. Please indicate your age

Age _____

68. Please enter your social security number without hyphens or spaces. Note: This information is simply to help us confirm that you are a first year teacher. It will be deleted from our files upon matching data with CCHE/CDE databases.

Social Security Number _____

Thank you for taking the time to answer these questions. When you click on the “submit” button your answers will be sent to the confidential CCHE database.

Appendix C: Technical Committee for First-year Teacher Survey Instrument

Heather Rooney
Assessment Policy Analyst, CCHE – Project Manager through May 14, 2004

Sonia Schaible-Brandon
Research Analyst, CCHE – Project Manager after May 14, 2004.

Dr. Rick Ginsberg
Director of Teacher Education, Colorado State University.

Dr. Barb Medina
Chair, Teacher Education, Adams State College.

Dr. Nancy Leech
Assistant Professor, School of Education, University of Colorado at Denver.

Dr. Kathy Green
Professor, School of Education, University of Denver.

Jason Glass
Sr. Data Consultant, Colorado Department of Education.

Patti Capps
Principal, Aurora Public Schools

Appendix D: Institutional Contact Information

Adams State College Department of Teacher Education 208 Edgemont Blvd Alamosa, CO 81102 (719) 587-7776 www.adams.edu/	Colorado Christian University School of Education 180 S. Garrison St. Lakewood, CO 80226 (303) 963-3140 www.ccu.edu/	Colorado College Department of Education 14 E. Cache La Poudre Colorado Springs, CO 80903 (719) 389-6473 www.ColoradoCollege.edu/	Colorado State University School of Education 100 Education Bldg. Ft. Collins, CO 80523-1588 (970) 491-5292 www.colostate.edu/
Fort Lewis College School of Education Durango, CO 81301 (970) 247-7157 www.fortlewis.edu/	Johnson and Wales University 7150 Mountview Blvd. Denver, CO 80220 (303) 256-9300 www.jwu.edu/denver/index.htm	Mesa State College Teacher Education and Licensure PO Box 2647 Grand Junction, CO 81502 (970) 248-1787 www.mesastate.edu/	Metropolitan State College of Denver Teacher Education Program PO Box 173362, Campus Box 10 Denver, CO 80204 (303) 556-3691 www.mscd.edu/
Regis University Department of Education 3333 Regis Blvd. Denver, CO 80221 (303) 458-4135 www.regis.edu/	University of Colorado - Boulder School of Education Campus Box 249 Boulder, CO 80309 (303) 492-6937 www.colorado.edu/	Univ of Colorado – CO Springs School of Education PO Box 7150 Colorado Springs, CO 80933-7150 (719) 262-4103 www.uccs.edu/	University of Colorado - Denver School of Education Campus Box 106, POB 173364 Denver, CO 80217-3364 (303) 556-2844 www.cudenver.edu/
University of Denver College of Education 2135 E. Wesley Ave Denver, CO 80208 (303) 871-2503 www.du.edu/	University of Northern Colorado College of Education 125 McKee Hall Greeley, CO 80639 (970) 351-2817 www.univnorthco.edu/	University of Phoenix 7800 E. Dorado Place Englewood, CO 80111 (303) 755-9090 www.uophx.edu	Colorado State University Pueblo Center for Teaching, Learning, Research 2200 Bonforte Blvd. Pueblo, CO 81001 (719) 549-2681 www.uscolo.edu/
Western State College Education Programs Gunnison, CO 81231 (970) 943-2030 www.western.edu/			