



COLORADO

Department of
Higher Education



COLORADO

Department of Education

**REPORT BY THE REAUTHORIZATION TEAM OF
EDUCATOR PREPARATION AT THE
UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN COLORADO**

REPORT SUBMITTED TO THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN COLORADO
FEBRUARY 11, 2019

Part I. Introduction

This report summarizes the findings of the state reauthorization team for the University of Northern Colorado's (UNC) educator preparation programs by the Colorado Department of Education (CDE) and the Colorado Department of Higher Education (DHE).

A. Introduction and Background

The educator preparation unit and programs at UNC were reviewed for reauthorization in fall 2018 with a site visit on November 5-7, 2018, and subsequent stakeholder conversations through December 5, 2018. The previous reauthorization review at the UNC took place on March 13, 2013. Pursuant to Colorado Revised Statute §23-1-121, institutions of higher education with approved educator preparation programs must be evaluated not more frequently than once every five years. As UNC had planned to pursue national accreditation by the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), this visit was scheduled to align with the CAEP site visit. UNC has since withdrawn from CAEP; therefore, the reauthorization team conducted the current review independently.

Educator Preparation Program Reauthorization Process

The following delineates the path of an educator preparation program submitted for reauthorization to CDE and DHE:

- Endorsement matrices, syllabi, and accompanying documentation are due to CDE June 30 for fall reauthorization visits and October 31 for spring reauthorization visits. Content reviews are completed months prior to the visit and provide focus areas for site visit team.
- Institutional reports are submitted to CDE and DHE 60 days prior to the scheduled site visit. If the institution is pursuing national accreditation through a recognized accrediting agency, report submission for national accreditation may be substituted for state institutional reports.
- DHE reviews the submitted evidence prior to the site visit to identify the unit and programs strengths and areas for improvement.
- DHE compiles a list of missing information needed to document the performance criteria listed above and specific questions to clarify information submitted in the proposal.
- Reauthorization site visits are jointly conducted by CDE and DHE. The site visit consists of an entrance interview, unit and program review including conversations with stakeholders, and an exit interview.
- CDE and DHE jointly compile information from the institutional report and site visit reviews, including content review information from the educator quality standards. CDE and DHE submit the draft report to the IHE within 60 days of the site visit.
- The IHE shall respond to the draft report in a rejoinder and provide additional information or address any concerns within 30 days of receiving the draft report.
- DHE and CDE finalize the reauthorization report.
- CDE forwards the report and a recommendation to the State Board of Education (SBE) for their consideration.
- SBE forwards their recommendation on program content to the DHE, which then forwards the recommendation to the Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) for their final determination of reauthorization. Please note: Pursuant to C.R.S. §23-1-121, if the state board of education recommends that a program not be approved, the commission shall follow said recommendation by refusing initial approval of said program or placing said program on probation.
- The CCHE determines reauthorization of educator preparation programs.

Reauthorization Site Team Members

The reauthorization site review team consisted of representatives from DHE, CDE, one representative from the Colorado Council of Deans of Education, one instructional coach, and one representative from a local school district. The members included:

Brittany Lane, Ph.D., Director of Educator Preparation, Colorado Department of Higher Education;
Mary Bivens, M.A., Director of Educator Development, Colorado Department of Education;
Jennifer Kral, Educator Preparation Principal Consultant, Colorado Department of Education;
Robert Nava, Ph.D., Associate Dean, School of Education, Metropolitan State University;
Katie Mauro, Instructional Coach, Jefferson County School District;
Stacie Datteri, Assistant Superintendent for Academic Achievement, Weld County School District 6;
Ellen Hunter, Literacy Specialist with ESSU, Colorado Department of Education; and
Alex Frazier, Principal Literacy Consultant P-3 Office, Colorado Department of Education.

Site Visit Meetings and Protocol

The reauthorization review team received the institutional report in advance, prepared and submitted by the UNC. The site review occurred November 5-7, 2018, during which time the team members met with the following:

- College of Education and Behavioral Sciences (CEBS) Leadership:
 - Eugene Sheehan, Ph.D., Dean
 - Corey Pierce, Ph.D., Associate Dean
 - Jingzi Huang, Ph.D., Associate Dean and Director – School of Teacher Education
 - Charlie Warren, University Licensure Officer
 - Brian Rose Ph.D., Faculty, School of Teacher Education
- Nancy Sileo, Ph.D., Associate Provost for Academic Affairs
- Linda Black, Ph.D., Associate Provost, Dean, Graduate School
- Advising and Admissions Staff
- Chairs, faculty, and field supervisors across all educator preparation programs in the Colleges of Education and Behavioral Sciences, Natural and Health Sciences, Performing and Visual Arts, and Humanities and Social Sciences
- Current candidates and alumni in early childhood, elementary, K-12, secondary, educational leadership, and special education, as well as pre-service special service providers
- Cooperating teachers and principals.

The team reviewed UNC's institutional report, course syllabi, student records, field placement locations and operations, and a wide range of other data prior to, over the course of, and subsequent to the site visit.

During the on-site visit, current students and alumni were interviewed regarding their experience within the educator preparation program at UNC. Resulting comments and feedback have been incorporated into this report.

Historical Context: University of Denver Educator Preparation Program

The following description is taken from UNC's institutional report:

UNC began as a State Normal School in 1889 and has prepared teachers to work in schools since its inception. UNC is a comprehensive baccalaureate and specialized graduate research university with

a continuing commitment to its historical role in the preparation of educators. This focus is indeed ingrained in UNC's historical practice. In fact, during the tenure of George W. Frasier, UNC president from 1924 to 1948, it was said that " ...faculty members were not only expected to make professional contributions but were to concentrate on their teaching responsibilities as well; everyone taught classes, including Frasier, his administrative staff, and the chairs of the departments."

UNC continues this commitment to the preparation of educators through a teacher-scholar model, in which faculty are encouraged to use their scholarship to inform their teaching and vice versa. Additionally, particularly in the College of Education and Behavioral Sciences, faculty are expected to demonstrate high quality pedagogy. Faculty across campus are reminded of the need for excellence in teaching because so many of our undergraduates are in educator preparation programs.

While UNC offers programs of study on the main campus in Greeley, there are also branch campuses in Colorado Springs, Denver, and Loveland. In addition, UNC offers a variety of online programs focused on educator preparation and development.

The Colorado Springs campus offers programs in counseling and psychology and teaching. More specifically, this campus offers degrees in Elementary Education with licensure and School Counseling. The Denver campus offers graduate degrees in Counseling and School Psychology, Special Education, and Educational Leadership, along with undergraduate initial licensure programs in Early Childhood, Elementary, and Special Education. The Loveland campus offers an M.A. degree in Elementary Education.

UNC also offers many online programs. These programs include an online program for rural leadership and an ongoing online program as well as four hybrid programs that include face-to-face classes at Northwest BOCES, Eagle, Denver, and Longmont. UNC has used online programs to reach students for high-need programs. For example, the School of Special Education has online Master's Degree programs in Special Education-Generalist and Early Childhood Special Education so students around the state can earn their teaching license without having to travel to campus.

Part II. Reauthorization Findings:

A. Introduction

The reauthorization team was impressed overall, with:

- *The pride in the institution.* From university administration to new students, all are very proud of UNC's legacy of commitment to preparing teachers and other educators.
- *The expansion of the Educational Leadership and Policy Studies program.* The strength of the program was valued amongst all stakeholders for growing leaders in the region and across the state.
- *Responsiveness to the needs of the state.* UNC is committed to address hard-to-fill positions and program needs across the state.
- *The quality of field supervisors.* Field supervisors collectively come with hundreds of years of experience, passion for aspiring teachers, and commitment to overall program improvement.

Alumni and current students told the reauthorization team they appreciated:

- *The strength of faculty and student relationships.* Many students and outside-district staff remarked on how connected faculty are to their students and how evident that is in their relationships.
- *The quality of the faculty.* Students mentioned how thankful they were to learn from faculty with such depth in their fields. From seeing their names on research to serving national organizations, students are impressed with faculty and eager to learn from them.
- *Observing faculty model strategies, skills, and techniques the students are being taught to use in their*

own classrooms. When asked about the strengths of their programs, several students discussed how faculty post learning targets, have clear and high expectations, and are open to students directing their own learning.

- *Lowry campus.* Lowry campus faculty and program offerings were highly valued by candidates as they rated their experiences on this extended campus to be of high quality overall.
- *Theory into Practice.* Candidates valued the efforts to balance and integrate theory into practice throughout the programs.

Few faculty members mentioned university-wide strengths however, faculty appreciated the following practices in the College of Education and Behavioral Sciences (CEBS):

- *Undergrads come back.* Related to the mission and reputation of the college, faculty are very proud that candidates return to UNC for further coursework in endorsements and advanced degrees.
- *Connectedness with each other.* Faculty suggest positive collegiality is a significant strength of the department to include their ability to reach out to each other for support, conduct research together, and consistency; for example, knowing what field supervisors will be looking for during observations.

B. Level of Proficiency

The following table is a summary of each indicator the site review team uses to review educator preparation programs, pursuant to C.R.S. §23-1-121(2). Based on the site review findings outlined in the following report, each measure is given an overall rating of: proficient, partially proficient, or not proficient. Table 1 shows the level of proficiency for each performance-based measure.

Table 1: UNC’s Level of Proficiency

Educator Preparation Performance Measures	Proficient	Partially Proficient	Not Proficient
A. Admissions Systems: The unit maintains a comprehensive admissions system that includes screening of a candidate’s dispositions for the field in which he or she is seeking licensure, consideration of a candidate’s academic preparation for entry into his or her desired endorsement area or areas, and preadmission advising for students who are considering becoming candidates.	X		
B. Ongoing Advising and Screening of Candidates: The unit provides ongoing advising and screening of candidates by practicing educators or college and university faculty members.	X		
C. Coursework and Field-Based Training Integrate Theory and Practice: The coursework and field-based training integrates theory and practice and educates candidates in methodologies, practices, and procedures of teaching standards-based education, specifically in teaching the content and skills defined in the Colorado Academic Standards.	X		

D. Supervised Field-Based Experience: Each teacher candidate in an initial licensure program completes a minimum of 800 hours; each principal and administrator candidate completes a minimum of 300 hours; and each candidate for other advanced degrees or add-on endorsements completes appropriate supervised field-based experience that relates to predetermined learning standards and includes best practices and national norms. related to	X		
E. Content and skills required for licensure: Demonstrate content skills required for licensure , as determined by the State Board of Education.		X	
F Comprehensive, Ongoing Assessment: There is comprehensive and ongoing evaluation of each candidate’s subject matter and professional knowledge and ability to demonstrate skill in applying the professional knowledge.		X	

C. Recommendation

The reauthorization team recommends reauthorization of the educator preparation programs at the University of Northern Colorado contingent upon successful implementation of the Areas for Improvement (AFI) highlighted in this report. Evidence of implementation of the AFIs must be demonstrated by February 2020 on which date members of the reauthorization site visit review team will conduct a follow-up visit. Full reauthorization is granted through fall 2023 and applies to the following endorsement areas listed in Table 2.

Table 2: Approved Endorsement Areas for UNC

Administrator (3.04)	Music (4.15)
Audiologist (7.01)	Nurse (7.05)
Business (4.05)	Orientation and Mobility Specialist (7.03)
Counselor (7.09)	Physical Education (4.16)
Culturally and Linguistically Diverse (4.22)	Principal (3.03)
CLD Bilingual Ed Specialist (4.23)	Psychologist (7.06)
Dance (4.20)	Reading Teacher (6.03)
Drama Theatre Arts (4.07)	Science (4.17)
Early Childhood Education (4.01)	Social Studies (4.18)
Early Childhood Special Education (5.09)	Special Education, Director (6.05)
Early Childhood Special Education, Specialist (5.05)	Special Education, Generalist (5.08)
Elementary Education (4.02)	Special Education, Specialist (5.02)
English Language Arts (4.09)	Special Ed Specialist – Visually Impaired (5.03)
Gifted Education Core (5.06)	Special Ed Specialist – Deaf/Hard of Hearing (5.04)
Gifted Education Specialist (5.07)	Speech – Language Pathologist (7.08)
Gifted Education, Director (6.06)	Visual Arts (4.04)
Mathematics (4.14)	World Language (4.10)

Part III. Report by Reauthorization Site Review Team

A. Statutory Performance Measures

Statutory Performance Measure A: Admissions Systems: The unit maintains a comprehensive admissions system that includes screening of a candidate's dispositions for the field in which he or she is seeking licensure, consideration of a candidate's academic preparation for entry into his or her desired endorsement area or areas, and preadmission advising for students who are considering becoming candidates.

Summary finding: The reauthorization team finds UNC's educator preparation programs are proficient on Performance Measure A. *Performance indicators: A1, A2, A3; C.R.S. 23-1-121(a).*

The reauthorization team appreciates the use of the Professional Dispositions Qualities (PDQ) rubric early and often to assess the personal and professional characteristics of candidates to ensure they are suited to working with K-12 students. Candidates appear to be responding based off feedback from faculty, supervisor, cooperating teacher, and self-assessment.

The CEBS admissions process is clear to those seeking enrollment. The review team recognizes that admission requirements to the program, to include GPA, are flexible, thus creating an opportunity to attract diverse candidates into the field.

It appears, however, that the recruitment strategy of the CEBS is very passive and relies heavily on the reputation of the institution. Efforts to include those intended to attract students to the Future Teacher Conference and the Center for Urban Education are promising; however, others—Holmes Scholar Program and Cumbres—lack support or evidence that they are effective. Furthermore, the reauthorization team is concerned about the lack of diversity among faculty and lack of a concrete plan to address it. An increase in efforts to recruit more diverse faculty could lead to more student diversity. The reauthorization team also found little or no evidence showing candidates are being specifically recruited for high needs areas like math, science, special education, and school counseling.

The reauthorization team found insufficient evidence to demonstrate adequate supports are being provided to retain current candidates. Though several institutional level services are offered, the review team was unable to ascertain the existence and effectiveness of college or program level support provided to ensure candidate success, with the exception of Praxis practice seminars.

Data must be readily available at the program level so that faculty and staff can use it to identify areas where candidates may be struggling with or leaving from the program. Limited evidence is shown for the use of data to identify stumbling-block courses and to track struggling candidates. The reauthorization team is concerned about the retention rate of candidates, to include those selected for Project Teach Find.

Recommendations and Areas for Improvement for A: Admissions Systems:

Recommendation: The reauthorization team would like to reengage the University in their role and mission to prepare educators. The team recommends more intentional efforts to recruit and retain diverse candidates and faculty.

Recommendation: Consider examining additional supports to offer current students to promote retention.

Recommendation: Ensure CEBS has access to data so that faculty and staff can readily examine it to make programmatic changes to include data from education programs in other colleges. Also consider using a common completer survey to aid in improving response rates, as well, for program comparison.

Statutory Performance Measure B: Ongoing Advising and Screening of Candidates: The unit provides ongoing advising and screening of candidates by practicing educators or college and university faculty members.

Summary finding: The reauthorization team finds UNC’s educator preparation programs proficient on Performance Measure B. *Performance indicators: B1; C.R.S. 23-1-121(b)*

The CEBS has multiple systems to advise candidates. Student-level course data is kept and used by faculty to identify when students might drop below expectations. This data, in addition to that obtained from the PDQ, is used to give candidates feedback and counsel them out of the program when necessary.

The secondary/K-12 students say that their advising is adequate; however, survey data suggest students do not feel supported. Special service provider (SSP) and ECE candidates report that they receive inconsistent information from faculty and staff and largely rely on peers who work with faculty to learn about decisions being made. Multiple students requested more time to meet with advisors as both advising staff and elementary education students report there is not enough time for the current approach. New initiatives to convene a student success task force to address different advising philosophies sound promising. Candidates reported they must sign up in pairs for advising time each semester, thus, between the two of them, they have only 15 minutes to meet with their advisor.

Recommendations and Areas for Improvement for B: Advising, Ongoing Screening and Counseling:

Recommendation: The reauthorization review team recommends support for a more robust system for advising education candidates, so they have sufficient access to adequate, clear, and consistent advising.

Recommendation: Create a schedule that allows elementary candidates sufficient time to meet with advisors individually during peak advising times.

Statutory Performance Measure C: Coursework and Field-Based Training Integrate Theory and Practice: Coursework and field-based training integrates theory and practice and educates candidates in methodologies, practices, and procedures of teaching standards-based education, specifically in teaching the content and skills defined in the Colorado Academic Standards.

Summary finding: The reauthorization team finds UNC proficient on Performance Measure C: Coursework and Field-Based Training Integrates Theory and Practice. *Performance indicators: C1, C2, C.R.S. 23-1-121(c)*,

The integration of theory into practice and responsiveness to the state’s needs are strengths of many of UNC’s educator preparation programs. Candidates demonstrate a good understanding of the Teacher and Principal Quality Standards, as well as Colorado Academic Standards. Additionally, candidates and cooperating teachers remarked on how relevant they feel candidates’ coursework is.

Candidates report they are being taught the right content but wish they had more depth in a few areas, namely, cultural responsiveness, assessment, and what we will herein refer to as “school systems.” The reauthorization team understands that faculty weave CLD throughout each class in some fashion, yet candidates request there be more explicit instruction on appropriate strategies and opportunities to practice applying them. Stakeholders recognize that candidates have instruction in assessment, which includes learning how to give different assessments. There seems to be consensus that candidates should have more practice interpreting the results and knowing how to adjust instruction based on those results.

Interestingly, several candidates, mentors, and district supervisors request that candidates be taught more about “school systems.” These stakeholders called for courses to cover topics that will better prepare candidates to understand—as one principal put it— “how schools work.” For example, candidates should be led through the processes of co-teaching and collaborating across content areas, having difficult conversations with parents and families, and understanding the different roles of other educators and personnel in the building. Surprisingly, both special education and special service provider alumni lamented that others in K-12 schools do not seem to understand their part in a student’s education. They went on to suggest that more classes be combined on like topics—perhaps even special assignments. For example, both groups discussed how valuable it would be to examine IEPs *together*.

Recommendations and Areas for Improvement for C: Coursework and Field-Based Training **Integrate Theory and Practice:**

Recommendation: Examine data regarding courses that address CLD, assessment, and school systems to determine in which areas more depth can be explored.

Statutory Performance Measure D: Supervised Field-Based Experience: Each teacher candidate in an initial licensure program completes a minimum of 800 hours; each principal and administrator candidate complete a minimum of 300 hours; and each other advanced degree or add-on endorsement candidate completes appropriate supervised field-based experience that relates to predetermined learning standards and includes best practices and national norms related to the candidate’s endorsement.

Summary finding: The reauthorization team finds UNC proficient on Performance Measure D.
Performance Indicators: DI, C.R.S. 23-1-121(d).

Students, alumni, and school district personnel alike are thankful for the field experiences candidates get to experience as pre-service educators. Across the programs the team heard from, field experiences are offered in a thoughtful way and aligned to course content and sequencing. While opportunities exist for students to apply theory into practice in field experiences, candidates report that additional and/or deeper experiences would be beneficial. For example, K-12/secondary candidates mentioned they did not feel like they have had enough experience with ELLs and students in special education, and special education candidates fear they have insufficient experience in diverse settings, being prepared to write IEPs, and feeling confident on how to support students who have behavior disabilities. The State appreciates UNC’s commitment to participate in statewide initiatives to examine yearlong residency models of preparation for candidates’ student teaching.

The reauthorization team probed faculty, students, and staff for evidence of a cohesive vision for the preparation of education candidates from the many colleges across the university that prepares them. For example, there is inconsistency in and outside the CEBS for finding placements for both early field experiences and student teaching. Some candidates report that they are required to choose practicum settings from a printed matrix that works to ensure candidates gain experience with diverse learners in diverse school settings; others leave it to the candidates’ discretion. Similarly, elementary undergraduate candidates report feeling very supported in their placements; however, K-12/secondary candidates do not receive that same level of feedback.

Recommendations and Areas for Improvement for D: Supervised Field-Based Experience

Recommendation: Due to the lack of consistency between educator preparation programs, the CEBS requires more oversight of educator preparation programs across the university. Consider examining different organizational structures that would allow UNC to consolidate decision making in order to align policies and practices.

Recommendation: Consider more in-depth field experiences including yearlong residency for student teachers.

Statutory Performance Measure E: Content and Skills Required for Licensure: Each candidate, prior to graduation, must demonstrate the skills required for licensure, as determined by the State Board of Education.

Summary finding: The reauthorization team finds the educator preparation programs at UNC partially proficient on Performance Measure E. *Performance Indicators: E1, C.R.S. 23-1-121(e)*,

All program endorsement matrices, syllabi and accompanying documentation was due to CDE prior to June 30, 2018. A bulk of the submission was provided by the deadline, although some of those submissions were incomplete or documents were provided. However, the CDE team was unable to access the documents. Work back and forth from July through November ensued with the CDE and UNC to get complete submissions. The final piece of documentation was received in late November 2018. The CDE had all materials submitted for a peer review process in late summer of 2018 through early winter 2018. This peer review process helped determine areas of focus during the site visit, as well as providing feedback for the institution. The CEBS identified an approved syllabi template for the School of Education; however, there was inconsistency seen on submitted documentation with very few instruments aligned to the comprehensive template.

As a result of the peer reviews several items needed clarification, so a meeting between CDE and UNC was held on October 2, 2018. During this meeting one area of concern was the ECE/ECE SPED/ECE SPED Specialist master's program. From this discussion it was determined that a two-year program leading to three endorsement areas, including the specialist designation, seemed to be an insufficient time, and there was limited access to alignment to all the endorsement standards found in those three areas.

The CDE's commitment to ensuring quality preparation for reading instruction, as well as the feedback from the peer reviews, resulted in a revision to the site visit schedule. An additional focus for review of Special Education, Early Childhood Education, and Elementary Education's literacy courses and instruction were added to the site visit schedule. In addition to the six site team members, there were two reading specialists from the CDE, Ellen Hunter and Alex Frazier, who joined to meet with literacy faculty members and candidates from the three identified endorsement areas. During visits with stakeholders, all members of the state review team asked intentional questions to gauge depth and quality of readiness for candidates in the area of reading instruction.

There were numerous areas of concerns regarding the alignment to the literacy standards, both on the submission from the university as well as from stakeholder meetings centered around reading instruction. First, the syllabi were inconsistently aligned to the Colorado Academic Standards, course objections, and/or inappropriately identified course outcomes. Also, on the endorsement matrices and syllabi there appeared to be a lack of sufficient time to provide depth around research-based reading instruction. An example of that would be a single course meeting numerous/most of the reading instruction endorsement standards. Another area of concern arose during conversations with current candidates, alumni, and faculty about the shared understanding of what research-based reading instruction is and how it is being delivered in the three identified endorsement programs. Stakeholders also had limited ability to identify and address reading assessment for students. Running records and interest surveys were the only reading assessments identified by current candidates and recent graduates.

A more detailed finding of the peer review and site visit summary can be found in Appendix A.

Recommendations and Areas for Improvement for E: Content and Skills Required for Licensure

Areas for Improvement:

- Use of approved syllabi template for all programs ensuring alignment to Colorado Academic Standards and endorsement standards, meaningful course objectives, and outcomes.
- Creation of a process for CEBS to have routine annual updating, approval, and submission of syllabi, including schools outside of CEBS
- Resubmission of course sequencing schedules and syllabi for Elementary, Early Childhood, and Special Education on approved UNC template for reauthorization follow-up visit
- Reevaluate the ability to offer candidates a pathway to have three endorsements in the ECE program which was identified as a concern on October 2, 2018. Resubmit to CDE for approval as part of reauthorization follow-up visit.
- Increase time and depth of teaching on research-based reading instruction for candidates. Further detail can be found in Appendix A.

UNC's reauthorization is contingent on implementation of the previous areas for improvement which will be assessed at a February 2020 follow-up reauthorization visit.

Statutory Performance Measure F: Comprehensive, Ongoing Assessment: Comprehensive and ongoing evaluation of each candidate's subject matter and professional knowledge and ability to demonstrate skill in applying the professional knowledge base.

Summary finding: The reauthorization team finds the educator preparation programs at UNC partially proficient on Performance Measure F. *Performance Indicators: F1, F2, F3, C.R.S. 23-1-121(f).*

Overall, there was insufficient evidence of the use data to assess and evaluate candidates and programs. Current candidates were asked, "Other than grades, how are you evaluated throughout your program, and how do you know how you are doing?" Some candidates still talked about grades and some referenced Degree Works and plans of study to indicate they were on track. And though all candidates reported they had received feedback on teaching demonstrations, none of them could describe how they are assessed or how they are doing. Similarly, faculty were asked how they use data to plan instruction. Secondary math and elementary education faculty were responsive and had some good examples, but others were inconsistent. The review team did not see any expectations from CEBS regarding the use of data to drive program improvements. There was no evidence that CEBS seeks information on how each program uses student data or how data is used to track recruitment, advising, and retention efforts. Difficulties accessing data were reported by faculty and staff, indicating some data requires compilation from another department.

Data analysis used for continuous improvement is important to evaluate candidates, as well as the programs that prepare them. How does UNC know that they are preparing effective teachers?

Recommendations and Areas for Improvement for F: Comprehensive, Ongoing Assessment:
Area for improvement: Data must be accessible at the program level and used for planning and continuous program improvement.

Action needed: The CEBS of UNC must have demonstrable systems in place for accessing, analyzing, and using data to inform program improvement at the classroom, program, and school levels. Please submit a plan to CDHE by August 1, 2019.

Part IV: Rejoinder and Next Steps

- University of Northern Colorado shall note any errors of fact in this report and respond in a rejoinder with any supplemental information requested within 30 days, pursuant to Colorado Department of Higher Education Policy I-P: Educator Preparation, subsection 6.01.05.01.
 - Please send all correspondence regarding areas A, B, C, D, and F to Dr. Brittany Lane, Director of Educator Preparation, DHE, Brittany.lane@dhe.state.co.us.
 - Materials and questions related to the CDE content review (Performance Measure E) should be sent to Mary Bivens, Director of Educator Development, CDE, bivens_m@cde.state.co.us.
- DHE and CDE will finalize the reauthorization report.
- CDE will forward the report and a recommendation to the State Board of Education (SBE) for their consideration.
- SBE will decide upon a recommendation and forward that recommendation to the DHE, which will then forward the recommendation to the Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) for their final determination of reauthorization. Please note: Pursuant to C.R.S. §23-1-121, if the state board of education recommends that a program not be approved, the commission shall follow such recommendation by refusing initial approval of said program or placing said program on probation.
- The CCHE will determine reauthorization of educator preparation programs.

The reauthorization team thanks UNC, the administration, faculty, staff, and students for participating in the reauthorization review and site visit. We look forward to working with the university to address the needs of the educator preparation programs now and in the future.

Appendix A

Literacy Summary Findings

Details and examples are provided to support UNC as they work to meet areas of improvement identified in Measure E of this report. These details and examples were compiled after review of all submitted syllabi, course schedules, and accompanying material provided by UNC prior to and during the November 2018 site visit. It also contains findings from interviews and time spent with teacher candidates, program faculty and UNC leadership.

Strengths:

- Faculty has an awareness of literacy content gaps and have identified limitations in the continuum of literacy coursework for elementary teachers.
- SPED literacy coursework by Urbach is clearly aligned with research and evidence-based literacy instruction.
- Teacher candidates share faculty is approachable and willing to support them.

Concerns:

- There is a lack of consistent philosophy regarding reading development, reading pedagogy, and reading assessment among faculty. Evidence of majority of faculty having contradictory philosophy to what is established in Colorado's Academic Standards, Elementary Teacher, and Reading Teacher Standards.
- Significant difference in the quality of evidence and transparency of quality for those enrolled in Urbach's courses around performance assessment vs. the others shared. When thinking of current practices in the field around Hattie's work for example – this is a missed opportunity to model good “end in mind” instruction practice. Demonstration of performance in most syllabi is vague and difficult to link to tangible mastery of actual course content.
 - Big emphasis on “beliefs” of students vs. defending their knowledge with science/research – this is misaligned to what we are asking of elementary students in CAS. A lower bar for education prep versus the students they'll be teaching is concerning.
- Elementary education – both undergraduate and graduate syllabi, staff interviews, student interviews, and course observation all indicate a misalignment to research and evidence-based literacy instruction.
 - Consistent four course for all Elementary Education - 320, 455, 314, & 350 – after these courses any remaining literacy courses align to their chosen program of study; New literacies (technology), Science, Mathematics, Social Studies, CLD, Special Education, Performing and Visual Arts
 - While interviewing faculty, the CDE discovered 3/4 literacy courses required for all elementary teacher candidates – students spend time on interest inventories and how to give them. There is no research to support this assessment practice. It was shared this is their major assessment emphasis in partnership with running records.
 - When only having four anchor courses, those courses must address all the standards to ensure students are ready for the field. There is a lot of overlap and emphasis on less urgent content to actually have candidates leave with a foundation to support then actual teaching of reading.
 - Example – *314 Literature for Children, Adolescents and Young Adults* though interesting, and informational and helpful to beginning teachers in understanding how to select and utilize authentic text. However, there is no corresponding course that actually talks about how to teach students to read – especially at the primary level. In addition a similar course is offered for the MA Reading Teacher and again no equal emphasis on the actual “learning to read” teaching.
 - At the graduate level – limited depth of science of reading, limited exposure to diagnostic assessment of reading challenges, repetition of some undergraduate coursework (i.e. children's lit.). There was nothing found to demonstrate Reading Teacher (MA in literacy) would be able to

successfully produce experts in literacy or differentiate within a general education classroom at the level being asked of educators today.

- Interviewed teacher candidates from the beginning of the teacher prep through 3rd year and not one candidate had heard of the READ Act. Only a few could identify the 5 components of literacy and only with prompting from state review team members, and none could identify a researcher, journal, or professional network to deepen their own literacy knowledge.
 - Another example, “Names test” was given consistently as an example of the test utilized for a “phonics” test example – this is a surface level, not widely respected informal measure. This is a missed opportunity to use assessments teachers will be seeing when entering Colorado classrooms (i.e. any READ Act assessments which several are open source).

Wonderings:

- General education literacy faculty are teaching required literacy courses within special education.
 - Misalignment between general education literacy pedagogy and special education literacy pedagogy.
 - Candidates in SPED program appear to receive more literacy content from general education team vs. SPED team. SPED team is in clear alignment with evidence-based literacy instruction for both general and special education in literacy.
- Undergraduate Elementary Education -- There are 7 paths to select from, including literacy technology – could UNC consider an emphasis on primary K-2 literacy or literacy differentiation? Though many of the areas of specialization will support intermediate level teachers, these areas of specialization do not necessarily serve the needs of primary teachers. In addition, very few educators are entering primary or intermediate and remaining in those positions permanently. There needs to be a better utilization of the four anchor courses to ensure foundational knowledge is adequate and there needs to be a specialization in primary literacy instruction as an option for candidates wishing to teach in K-2 as well as those earning the Early Childhood Endorsement.
 - Faculty acknowledged there is no time to prepare teachers entering K-2 well.
 - It was also shared, they receive more letters about lack of preparedness from graduates who enter K-2 classrooms, than any other placements.

Syllabus Summary

- Originally provided access to syllabi through share point. At that time only three courses throughout all literacy programs (both undergraduate and graduate) were aligned to SBRR, with two of those three with only minimal alignment. We learned during site visit that one of those two is a course no longer offered.
- State review team received 11 additional syllabi after the site visit because many of the initial syllabi that were shared were outdated and/or no longer in use.
- Not one of the 4 required literacy course for general education separately or combined, provide adequate understanding in the science of reading instruction to be prepared for the workforce. General education is not aligned to SBRR.
- Several syllabi minimally referred to some scientifically-based reading research (SBRR) resources – however no evidence was found that they were actually utilized.
 - Disclaimer Urbach’s courses in literacy were 100% aligned to SBRR
 - Emergent Literacy (350) had a mix of both aligned and misaligned. After interviewing the adjunct professor teaching this course. She admitted she has had to bring in additional text and materials knowing what was outlined to be taught wouldn’t prepare them to implement literacy instruction and assessment to level needed in schools today.
 - 455 replaced 445, 445’s syllabi was more aligned with CAS and Elementary Teaching Standards than what appears in their new version.

- Below are examples of misaligned syllabi/pedagogy to demonstrate stark contrast between SPED and Gen Ed., (this is not an exhaustive list):
 - **410 Achieving Effective Instruction in Developmental Reading – assigned faculty not from SPED department** *Only SPED undergraduate are required to take this course – yet not aligned to what SPED faculty are teaching in courses being taught by SPED faculty*
 - Text being required is from 2004 – with the vast amount of research and publications in literacy over the last decade, this is a cause for concern
 - Vague evidence of performance
 - Leveled passages
 - no evidence of helping beginning teachers understand the appropriate use of varied texts (controlled text, decodable, predictable, and leveled – authentic)
 - with strong mention of leveled text – no documentation candidates are explained the research and limitations of the leveling systems for text
 - No alignment to the caliber being asked of Colorado educators as established by our Elementary Teacher Standards or the READ Act.
 - **411 Elementary Reading Diagnosis and Individualization – assigned faculty not from SPED department** *Only SPED undergraduate are required to take this course - yet not aligned to what SPED faculty are teaching in courses being taught by SPED faculty*
 - Miscue Analysis – aligned to 3 cueing system – no evidence in research to support this practice (for context – anything submitted to the CDE for review to date utilizing the 3 cueing system has not approved).
 - There is very little about the developmental process of learning to read. If teacher candidates do not understand the continuum of each literacy component, then there is no way to assess and support closing gaps in reading instruction.
 - Very concerned that there is no assessment for phonological awareness, and this is the number one indicator for later reading challenges.
 - **442 Language and Literacy for Students with Severe Delays – taught by SPED faculty**
 - Fully aligned to SBRR, CAS, and Elementary Teacher, Reading Teacher, Sped Generalist standards.
 - Only offered to SPED undergraduate teachers.
 - Very dense in content – perhaps to over compensate for what is not being covered, but critical in other courses.