



COLORADO

Department of Education

DESIGNATED AGENCY

REAUTHORIZATION GUIDE

Introduction

The Colorado Department of Education reauthorization process is an in-depth review of alternative educator preparation programs (EPP) with the goal of continuous improvement to meet the standards established for each endorsement through the [CDE Rules and Regulations](#).

CDE Reauthorization Goals:

- Evaluate alignment of educator preparation program content to the CDE Rules and Regulations.
- Evaluate quality and depth of candidate experience so as to ensure CDE Rules and Regulations are met within the educator preparation program.
- Evaluate impact of completers/teacher candidates on student learning.
- Provide opportunities for reflection about the educator preparation program and support a process of continuous improvement.

In the program report, your designated agency (DA) will document the process you have developed to analyze your educator preparation program with the goal of continual improvement. The program report provides your DA with an in-depth opportunity to measure the key program outcomes of each endorsement area against the standards established through the CDE Rules and Regulations. You will also submit select data your designated agency uses to analyze your program on an ongoing basis. *All submissions are required six weeks prior to your site visit. Matrices must be submitted during the window as described in the Authorization/Reauthorization/Adding Endorsements pages on the website.*

Requirements

- Program Report
- Key Program Outcomes
 - Coursework/training evidence
 - Data/evidence of candidates' learning/performance

The program report (PR) template should be used by designated agencies submitting for reauthorization with the Colorado Department of Education (CDE) and hosting a State Review Team on-site visit. This PR template includes the prompts or questions to which the designated agencies should respond six weeks prior to the site visit.

This report is meant to be a summary introduction to the designated agency. Key program outcomes (coursework/training evidence and data/evidence of candidate learning/performance) are submitted to CDE separate from this report. Please see the [Reauthorization Checklist](#) on how to prepare materials for the key program outcomes and submission to CDE.

The on-site review to follow will include a thorough examination of the evidence. In writing responses for this report, designated agencies may refer to handbooks and any other documents that are either linked, included as appendices, or available online. Tables, figures, and links to key electronic exhibits may be included for each prompt.

The program report (PR) can be written in the template provided, which includes space to upload tables, figures, and lists of key exhibits. At least six weeks prior to your site visit, submit the PR electronically (including any supplemental documents that serve as evidence) per Reauthorization

Checklist directions. Upon receiving the PR and key program outcomes, the CDE and a team will conduct a document review prior to the site visit.

Key Outcomes: Additional Submissions

In addition to the Program Report, the CDE requires that you submit the following key outcomes:

Coursework/Training Evidence

- **Standards Matrices**

- Matrices with information on course/training outcomes aligned to the CDE Rules and Regulations. This can include assignments, tests or exams, notecatchers, readings, lesson plans, etc. Matrices will be due ahead of all other materials per the authorization/reauthorization/adding and endorsement timelins.
- **Rationale:** Provides the CDE with an opportunity to evaluate the alignment of all required coursework in each endorsement area to the CDE Rules and Regulations.
- **Suggestions:** Your EPP may choose to complete one standards matrix or a number of matrices depending on the number and type of endorsements for which your EPP is approved, the organizational structure of your EPP, similarities between the systems and processes used to operate various endorsement areas, or other factors that affect the extent to which certain faculty/staff actually work together with particular endorsement areas. For instance, if you prepare elementary and secondary teachers, your EPP may choose to fill out two separate matrices if the curriculum and instruction these teacher candidates receive is different. Another option would be to use one matrix but highlight the different groups in different colors. For instance, within the same matrix, you could choose to use three different colors to highlight the course(s)/training and outcome(s)/evidence that: elementary teacher candidates receive; secondary teacher candidates receive; or all teacher candidates receive. Matrix columns cannot be changed, but rows can be expanded

Example #1: to allow for more space.

#	Standard Description	Course	Outcome(s)/Evidence
8.02(10)	The elementary educator is able to develop fluent, automatic reading of text:		
8.02(10)(a)	understanding the role of fluency in word recognition, oral reading, silent reading, comprehension of written discourse and motivation to read.	TED 330	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading: Reutzel/Cooter (2013), Chapter • Notecatcher on Reutzel/Cooter Ch. 7
8.02(10)(b)	understanding reading fluency as a stage of normal reading development, as the primary symptom of some reading disorders and as a consequence of practice and instruction.	TED 331	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Text level identification assignment • Guided reading lesson plan designed for instructional level text

Example #2:

#	Standard Description	Course	Outcome(s)/Evidence
9.07(1)	The special education generalist is knowledgeable about student literacy and the development of reading, writing, communicating and listening skills in order to provide specially designed instruction and facilitate access to the general education curriculum in a variety of settings, and is able to:		
9.07 (1)(a)	plan and organize reading and writing instruction and interventions informed by a variety of ongoing student assessment.	Orton Gillingham training Six Traits Writing professional development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assignment: Conduct an full and complete assessment for reading on a student who has strong literacy skills and one who has weak strategy skill; develop an intervention plan; provide interventions • Assignment: Conducting a full and complete assessment for writing on a student who has strong literacy skills and one who has weak literacy skills; develop an intervention plan; provide interventions
9.07 (1)(b)	use knowledge of typical and atypical language and cognitive development to guide the choice of instructional strategies and interventions in meeting the learning needs of individual students.	TEP 4581: Colorado Mountain College	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lecture: "Understanding typical and atypical human growth and development" Reading: "Identifying effects of cultural and linguistic differences on growth and development." • Exit slip assessing knowledge acquired from lecture and reading

- **Endorsement Coursework Sequencing Tables**
 - Separate tables with required coursework for each endorsement area, including course number, course title, number of credits, and sequence.
- **Rationale:** Provides the CDE with an overview of the experience of the candidate as they progress through the endorsement area.

Example:

Required Coursework for Elementary Education (K-6) Endorsement

Course Number	Course Title	Credits	Sequence
EDUC 325	Math Content for Elementary Teachers	3	Year 1-FA
EDUC 335	Mathematics Methods for Elementary Teachers	3	Year 1- SP

- **Syllabi/Training Modules**
 - Submission of all syllabi, training module outlines, and/or detailed professional development agendas for required training, including assignments and outcomes. All syllabi, training modules outlines, and professional development agendas must include

tables that list CDE Rules and Regulations aligned with course outcomes. Each standard must be fully delineated and not only referenced by the standard number.

- **Rationale:** Provides the CDE with an opportunity to review how CDE Rules and Regulations fit within the structure of each course and how the alignment of coursework to CDE Rules and Regulations is communicated to candidates, adjunct faculty, and other stakeholders.

Data/Evidence of Candidate Learning/Performance

- Evidence used by the DA to inform a continuous process of improvement.
- **Rationale:** If data are aligned with CDE Rules and Regulations, these forms of data enable the CDE and DA faculty/personnel to evaluate the content of the endorsement for strengths and areas of growth.
- **Acceptable Forms**
 - **Candidate performance assessments**

Example: Lesson demonstration with peers that an instructor has evaluated based on a rubric

Suggestions: Include a variety of performance levels from candidates who achieved mastery to candidates who demonstrated a need for improvement.
 - **Candidate work samples**

Example: Lesson plans created by candidates

Suggestions: Include a variety of performance levels from candidates who achieved mastery to candidates who demonstrated a need for improvement.
 - **Fieldwork evaluation ratings**

Example: Excel spreadsheet that lays out numerical ratings of candidates based on specific performance indicators

Suggestions: Include all candidates' ratings.
 - **Fieldwork qualitative descriptions**

Example: A table of comments about candidate performance based on specific indicators from your fieldwork observation tool.

Suggestions: Include a variety of descriptions that indicate performance levels from candidates who achieved mastery to candidates who demonstrated a need for improvement.
 - **Stakeholder survey results**

Example: Results of a survey sent to completers, employers, or district administrators

Suggestions: Stakeholder survey report that includes both ratings and comments of all survey responders.
 - **Stakeholder focus group findings**

Example: Meetings with completers, employers, or district administrators.

Suggestions: Ask targeted questions that provide the DA with specific input on strengths of and areas of growth. As well, provide opportunities for stakeholders to make more general observations or voice issues that may not even be a current consideration. Include the record, notes, or minutes that detail stakeholder comments and the summary of findings.

Submission and Review of Materials

At least 60 days prior to your site visit, submit the IR electronically (including any supplemental documents that serve as evidence) to the [reauthorization submission site](#). Your DA may choose a blind review process or a double-blind review process. For either process, the content reviewers of your materials will be anonymous. For a double-blind review, the EPP would need to remove all identifiers from all materials in order to increase the likelihood of anonymity for the DA.

Upon receiving the PR and key program outcomes, the CDE and a team will conduct a document review prior to the site visit. Content review teams consist of internal and external experts. Internal experts are CDE colleagues such as experts in literacy, the content areas, and special education. External experts are practitioners, teacher educators and leaders from around the state. The Educator Development Specialist in the CDE Educator Talent unit synthesizes all feedback from the review team. If questions arise, the CDE will compile a request for additional information from the institution of higher education (IHE).