SB-196 Inclusive Higher Education Pilot Program Annual Report December 2016

Cordelia Robinson Rosenberg, Ph.D., RN
JFK Partners
Professor of Pediatrics and Psychiatry
University of Colorado School of Medicine

December 27, 2016

SB-196 Inclusive Higher Education Pilot Program
Annual Report December 2016

Senate Bill 16-196 created a pilot program to establish inclusive higher education programs at the University of Northern Colorado, University of Colorado at Colorado Springs, and Arapahoe Community College for students with intellectual and developmental disabilities (I/DD).

SB 16-196 came about through collaborative effort of parents of students with intellectual and developmental disabilities (I/DD) and other committed stakeholders who formed a nonprofit, IN! Colorado Initiative for Inclusive Higher Education. The leadership of IN! was inspired by a movement across the country to create opportunities in institutions of higher education (IHE) (both two and four-year programs) for students with intellectual and developmental disabilities to experience and gain from inclusive higher education programs.

The creation of such higher education opportunities was stimulated by the Federal 2008 Higher Education Opportunity Act. Under this Act Congress appropriated $10.6 million toward creating a model program for states to use to foster the development of such efforts. Under this funding, the Transition Post-Secondary Education Program for Students with Intellectual Disabilities (TPSID), 27 IHE receive funding for "creating, expanding or enhancing high quality inclusive higher education experiences to support positive outcomes for individuals with I/DD." [1]

Under the TPSID program Congress also appropriated funding for a National Coordinating Center to support the TPSID projects. This center, Think College, became a resource for the IN!/families as they began their pursuit of inclusive postsecondary opportunities in Colorado. The Think College materials, and reports and the visits to IHE around the country helped IN! develop a vision of post-secondary education opportunities including college dorm experiences.

The IN! group, with active participation from the state Arc chapter and JFK Partners, CU School of Medicine, Colorado's University Center of Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research and Service and with the encouragement of Sen. Bill Cadman, Senate President began to pursue state of Colorado funding to initiate "pilot programs" at Colorado's IHE. As one of the first steps in planning for the legislation several people from the IN! board met with Kachina Weaver from the Colorado Department of Higher Education to determine whether the CDHE could be the home agency if a bill was passed. This location was agreed to and legislation was pursued.

---

[1] Colorado State University received one of these grants but the program has not met the needs of the families who started IN! as the students admitted under the program need to meet the standard admission requirements.

SB 16-196 was signed into law by Governor Hickenlooper on June 6, 2016. The act included the following provisions:

- State funds were provided to three "Pilot" IHE, Arapahoe Community College, University of Colorado at Colorado Springs and University of Northern Colorado, to initiate and develop the programs.
- Funding for the program from the legislation is intended to continue for four years.
- JFK partners is expected to provide a written report evaluating the pilot programs to CDHE yearly and CDHE shall include this report in its' yearly presentation to the House and Senate Education Committees.
- The goal is to grow to a total of 40 students served in this program at each institution over four years.
- Funding of $75,000 goes to each of the IHE for the "Pilot" program and $25,000 goes to the University of Colorado School of Medicine JFK Partners to Evaluate the Program.

SB 16-196 specified requirements for the "Pilots" including:

(a) Include an institutional assessment to determine training needs, technical assistance, and other capacity needed to provide a higher education program for students with intellectual and developmental disabilities;

(b) Identify state and institution regulations, policies, and practices that foster or impede inclusive higher education;

(c) Offer programming and necessary supports for students with intellectual and developmental disabilities that allow a student to take for credit or to audit a minimum of two on-campus undergraduate courses each semester in his or her chosen area of interest, and to take a course each semester that is designed to meet the needs of students with intellectual and developmental disabilities, resulting upon completion in the award of a certificate from the institution;

(d) To the greatest extent possible, integrate students socially and academically into the normative offerings of the institution and give the student all of the rights and responsibilities of a typically matriculating student;

(e) Include peer mentoring;

(f) Coordinate with available vocational rehabilitation supports through the department of labor and employment;

(g) Be outcome focused, preparing the student for gainful competitive employment;

(h) Include admissions standards that do not require a student to participate in a curriculum-based, achievement college entrance exam that is administered nationwide;

(i) Require the institution of higher education, if the institution has determined that the pilot program is sustainable, to become a certified transition program, as defined in the "higher education opportunity act", pub. L. 110-315, giving students in the program access to federal financial aid opportunities; and

(j) Require the institutions of higher education to develop a five-year plan for sustainability, including enrollment projections for the inclusive higher education program.

Evaluation Approach

The Evaluation of SB 16-196 involves the active participation of the multiple stakeholders at the three pilot schools and IN! as a private nonprofit group of committed stakeholders. The Evaluation Plan (Attachment A) includes 4 strategies.

Work has begun on all four strategies:

Strategy 1. Adaption and review of program standards. The intent of the legislation was that the Pilots were to use the newly developed Inclusive Higher Education, Think College program standards as SB 16-196 Pilot program standards as applicable. Each of the Pilot schools has reviewed the Think College (best practice standards) and assessed their status vis-à-vis the standards and has set goals where they wish to improve their standing. These self-assessments have been submitted to the evaluator (CU SOM/JFK faculty member, Cordelia Robinson Rosenberg, PhD, RN).

Strategy 2. Documentation of Stakeholder Satisfaction with "Pilots". Campus-based stakeholder groups have been identified: 1) the Pilot students; 2) parents of Pilot student; 3) other students including peer mentors; 4) Pilot faculty and staff; 5) faculty with Pilot student in their class; and 6) other stakeholders, administrators etc.

Strategy 3: Establish a Cross Pilot database. Common data regarding characteristics of the students participating in the Pilot will be collected. The Think College National Coordinating Center (NCC) Annual Report (http://www.thinkcollege.net/images/stories/year4_Final.pdf) has been used to identify key variables to be documented about the students. NCC reports will be used to guide the design of a cross site database to be developed. In addition to information about the students, data will be collected regarding the activities in which they participate, supports they receive, etc. The Evaluator will work with Pilots to design the database. The Evaluator will receive deidentified data.

Strategy 4 Twice yearly meetings of Evaluator, Pilot staff and IN Board Members. One of the expectations in the design of the Colorado IHEA and IN was that the Pilots would benefit from experiences of one another. Pilots, Evaluator and IN! staff will meet twice yearly to share experiences, issues and solutions.

Preliminary Findings as of December 2016

Students Admitted to Pilot Program. Students were admitted to each of the three "pilot" IHE for fall semester 2016. The initial plan called for four students per school. **Arapahoe Community College** admitted five students and have

named the opportunity Elevate ACC. There is not a residential program at ACC. **University of Colorado at Colorado Springs** has admitted three students and the students live at home but hope to have a campus life experience in the 17-18 academic year. **University of Northern Colorado, UNC GOAL** admitted four students and all four are living in dorms on campus.

Strategy 1. Adaption and review of program standards.
The SB 16-196 requirements were compared to the Think College Standards. This activity confirmed congruence between SB 16-196 requirements and Think College Standards. This crosswalk is presented in the Evaluation plan. Each Pilot school has completed a self-appraisal on their plans compared to the Think College Standards. The composite of the responses against the standards is included here as Attachment B. All three programs indicate that their current status on most benchmarks is in progress or fully implemented. A notable area of lack of implementation is opportunities for work experience for the Pilot students. Given the short time span for implementing the program between passage of legislation and the start of the fall semester this lag is understandable.

The next step in using the Think College Standards as a process evaluation tool will be to implement meetings at each school between the Evaluator, Pilot staff and other stakeholders as appropriate to review and progress mode on the standards and set specific goals. It is expected that work opportunities for the Pilot students will be a priority in these meetings.

Strategy 2. Documentation of stakeholder satisfaction with the program.
The initial approach adopted for this strategy was to develop interview questions for six different stakeholder groups. These questions, which are the same for each IHE are included here as Attachment C, using UNC as the example. The six stakeholder groups include: 1) Pilot students; 2) Pilot student parents; 3) Pilot faculty/staff; 4) other students including peer mentors; 5) Faculty with Pilot students in class and 6) other stakeholders such as department administrator.

These questions were reviewed by Pilot staff and agreed-upon as relevant by mid-November. Each Pilot director sent a letter to the various stakeholders inviting them to participate in giving feedback. They were asked to give their permission back by email as to whether they were willing to be contacted for an interview. All the parents and Pilot students agreed as did a number of administrators and program staff. To date (12/27/16) face-to-face or phone interviews have been conducted with 7 of 12 Pilot parents and 6 of 12 Pilot students. Interviews have also been conducted with three program staff and three peer mentors. Many others have volunteered and plans are in place to conduct more interviews by the end of January 2017. Efforts will be made to insure that all parents and all Pilot students are interviewed. Also efforts will be made to interview at least one regular faculty member with a Pilot student in his or her class at each IHE. Enough interviews have occurred with parents and students to form some preliminary impressions.

Pilot students. The Pilot students are very pleased to be in college and they indicate that they are learning a lot but the work is hard. Some find the expectation for composition difficult and something for which they are not prepared. Some of the Pilot students are more naturally outgoing than others and so indicate a higher level of social integration into campus life. For those living in the dormitory the transitions have been both challenging and exciting. All are eager to return for the spring semester.

Parents of Pilot students. Interviews have been held with all four of the UNC parents, 2 of the 3 UCCS parents (the third parent is also program coordinator) and one of the ACC parents, are willing to be interviewed.

For the most part the parents feel they have seen real growth in their students across domains of academics, social development and independence. A theme across all three Pilot programs is the need for greater clarity regarding avenues of communication. This issue of communication is most prominent or the UNC Pilot which includes residential life. The expectation on the part of UNC faculty and staff is that communication to the parents goes through the Pilot student, as is expected for typical students. The parents for the most part were not prepared to rely on communication from their student and in fact shared some instances of miscommunication and missed deadlines.

While the lack of clarity in roles and communication is most acute in the UNC Pilot it was an issue for parents in the other Pilots as well. Parents expressed an interest in problem solving and coming to agreements about communication. Establishing a shared understanding of how to prevent missteps in the future is an important next step for the Pilots.

Another theme from the parents was that of needing to better understand funding options for their student. Parents reported mix of support from Voc Rehab, CCB's, unique scholarships. The opportunity came up so suddenly that they had little time to prepare. There are some steps the IHE can take to make opportunities available but they will take time. Integration of these opportunities and supporting them is something that IN! has agreed to touch on in collaboration with the IHE.

Peer Mentors. Peer mentors are in place on all three campuses. The two interviewed at UCCS were graduate students who accompany the Pilot student to class and also have both study and social activity time with the students. The model seems to be working well at UCCS but the program will need to monitor whether the approach requires enough independence for the Pilot students.

Summary, overall satisfaction with the experience for the stakeholders interviewed today is high. The students are enthusiastic and parents are pleased with progress but have some concerns with program approach.

Through these interviews and interaction with faculty and staff for all three programs it became clear that the residential component adds multiple levels

of complexity to the program and that the budget, while probably adequate for UCCS (until it has a residential program) and ACC, is totally inadequate to maintain the UNC program level into the spring semester. While the UNC GOAL is working to provide as much independence as possible for the Pilot students there are also safety considerations that require more extensive staffing.

Strategy 3. Establish a cross Pilot database. A draft database using RedCap has been developed. This database will include documentation of Pilot student demographics, course enrollment, modification/accommodations, and student employment experience. It is patterned after the data set used by Think College for the schools with TSPID funding with the exception that eventually Colorado will be able to submit data to the national data set.

Strategy 4. Twice yearly meetings of Evaluator. Pilot staff and IN! Board members. During this initial phase this group has met several times to develop the Evaluation Plan and share experiences. Priorities going forward will be to develop a shared agenda for Pilot refinement.

Summary.
The SB 16-196 Pilot programs are proceeding with considerable enthusiasm and also hard work on the part of all of the stakeholders. IN! Colorado Initiative for Inclusive Higher Education played a crucial role in creating the opportunity and plans to continue to work with the Pilots and also other IHE in Colorado to develop the program at other schools.

Evaluation Plan for
Colorado Senate Bill 16-196

Pilot Program for Inclusive Higher Education for Students with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities

Cordelia Robinson Rosenberg, Ph.D., RN
Professor of Pediatrics and Psychiatry
Director of Advocacy, JFK Partners
University of Colorado School of Medicine

Overview

In the 2016 session the Colorado legislature passed Senate Bill 16–196 authorizing a Pilot Program for Inclusive Higher Education for Students with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities the Act was signed into law on June 6, 2016. The Inclusive Higher Education Act (IHEA) authorized funding for two four-year Institutions of Higher Education (IHE), University of Colorado, Colorado Springs (UCCS) and University of Northern Colorado (UNC) and one two year Community College, Arapahoe Community College to carry out pilot projects admitting and supporting students with Intellectual and/or Developmental Disabilities (I/DD) in pursuit of a course of post-secondary education. In addition funding was authorized for JFK Partners a program of the University of Colorado School of Medicine, Anschutz Medical Campus, Colorado's federally funded University Center of Excellence in Developmental Disabilities, Education, Research and Service, to "evaluate the development and implementation of the Inclusive Higher Education pilot program at the pilot sites and provide a written report concerning the evaluation to the Department of Higher Education. The Department of Higher Education shall report on the pilot program as part of the department's annual presentation to its legislative committee of reference. The article is repealed effective July 1, 2021. Senate Bill 16–196 is included as Attachment A.

Requirements of the Colorado Inclusive Higher Education Act (IHEA) of 2016

(SB 16-196 articulated expectation for the Pilot Program to be assessed with the evaluation 23-75-104) The Institutions of Higher Education participating in the Pilot program shall develop pilot programs at the pilot sites that provide Institutions of Higher Education opportunities for students with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities. The Inclusive Higher Education pilot program at each pilot site may:

(a) Include an institutional assessment to determine training needs, technical assistance, and other capacity needed to provide a Higher Education program for students with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities;

(b) Identify state and institution regulations, policies, and practices that foster or impede inclusive higher education;

(c) Offer programming and necessary supports for students with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities that allow a student to take for credit or to audit a minimum of two on-campus Undergraduate courses each semester in his or her chosen area of interest, and to take a course each semester that is designed to meet the needs of students with intellectual and Developmental Disabilities, resulting upon completion in the award of a Certificate from the institution;

(d) To the greatest extent possible, integrate students socially and academically into the normative offerings of the Institution and give

1

the student all of the rights and responsibilities of a typically matriculating student;

(e)   Include peer mentoring;

(f)   Coordinate with available vocational rehabilitation supports through the Department of Labor and Employment;

(g)   Be outcome focused, preparing the student for gainful competitive employment;

(h)   Include admissions standards that do not require a student to participate in a curriculum-based, achievement college entrance exam that is administered nationwide;

(i)   Require the Institution of Higher Education, if the Institution has determined that the pilot program is sustainable, to become a certified transition program, as defined in the "Higher Education Opportunity Act", pub. L. 110-315, giving students in the program access to federal financial aid opportunities; and

(j)   Require the Institution of Higher Education to develop a five-year plan for sustainability, including enrollment projections for the inclusive higher education program.

Plan for a Formative (descriptive) Evaluation for the Colorado Inclusive Higher Education Act (IHEA) of 2016

Evaluation Strategy 1: Adaption and Review of Program Standards. The evaluation will be guided by the provisions of the Colorado IHEA. In addition the evaluation will draw upon the experience documented through the Think College National Coordinating Center (NCC) at the Institute for Community Inclusion, University of Massachusetts Boston (www.thinkcollege.net). The NCC is authorized and funded under the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008 through which the Transition Post-Secondary Education Program for Students with Intellectual Disability (TPSID) program was created in 2010. Through the TPSID program a number of 2 and 4 year IHE across the country have received funding to implement inclusive education for students with I/DD. The experience and tools developed through these institutions and documented through the Think College National Coordinating Center will be used in addition to the provision of the Colorado IHEA to design this program evaluation.

Think College Standards. In regards to program documentation the NCC in collaboration with the participating IHE funded under the TPSID program developed a set of Standards (S), Quality Indicators (QI), and Benchmarks (B) for Inclusive Higher Education. These Standards, Quality Indicators, and Benchmarks informed the expectations that are outlined in Colorado IHEA of 2016. Table 1 lists the requirements in the Colorado Act aligned where applicable to the Think College Standards (TCS). There is correspondence

between the expectation in the Colorado Act and the Think College Standards. However the Think College Standards along with Quality Indicators and Benchmarks provide considerably more detail. Therefore these Think College Standards will be used to outline the expectations for documentation to be obtained for the Colorado IHEA Pilots. The Think College Standards are included here in Attachment B.

The Pilots have already indicated their intent to use the TCS to guide the design and documentation of the program. The Pilots will be requested to perform a baseline assessment/description of their efforts and review progress vis a vis the standards at the end of each semester. In addition to using the state of implementation scale in the TCS, (0=not planning to implement, 1=no progress, 2=in progress, 3=fully implemented) each Pilot will be asked to document any policies, issues or circumstances that impact the Pilot either positively or negatively. Consistent with TCS #8, Ongoing Evaluation, the program will be asked to document any program changes.

Strategy 2: Documentation of stakeholder satisfaction with program. In addition to the primary stakeholders, students in the Pilot programs, there are other groups of stakeholders whose perspectives are essential to evaluating the success of the Pilots. These additional stakeholder groups include: Parents of the enrolled students, Pilot staff (paid and volunteer), peer students, faculty, and administrative staff. During the initial semester, evaluation will consist of the Evaluator interviewing representatives of each stakeholder group with the intent of identifying key questions each group has that may impact satisfaction and also program recommendations. During the spring semester of the 16-17 AY the content from these interviews will be used to design brief satisfaction questionnaires for each stakeholder group. Program evaluation forms developed by existing programs will be reviewed and adapted as appropriate. Whenever possible existing evaluation forms from each IHE will be used.

Strategy 3: Establish a Cross Pilot database. Common data regarding characteristics of the students participating in the Pilot will be collected. The Think College National Coordinating Center Annual Report will be used to identify key variables to be documented about the students. In addition NCC reports will be used to guide the design a cross site database to be developed. In addition to information about the students, data will be collected regarding the activities in which they participate, supports they receive, etc. The Evaluator will work with Pilots to design the database. The Evaluator will receive deidentified data. This report is included here as Attachment C.

Strategy 4 Twice yearly meetings of Evaluator, Pilot staff and IN Board Members. One of the expectations in the design of the Colorado IHEA and IN was that the Pilots would benefit from experiences of one another. We will have a twice yearly meeting to share experiences, issues and solutions.

Table 2 shows a timeline for implementation of these strategies.

Summary. The Colorado IHEA evaluation approach is intended to be a collaborative and formative effort. Collaboration among the Pilots, Evaluator and the IN board. Formative for the first year as the Pilots encounter issues and successes that can inform the evaluation design.

Table 1 Alignment of Colorado Inclusive Higher Education Provisions and Think College Standards

Colorado IHEA	Think College Standards
a. Institutional Assessment to determine training needs, TA and other capacity needs	**Standard 1 Inclusive Academic Access** QI1.2 Address issues that may impact college course participation, including access to supports such as accommodations, technology, peer supports
b. State and IHE polices, regulations that enhance or impede Inclusive Higher Education	**Standard 6 Coordination and Collaboration** QI6.1 Establish connections and relationships with key college/ university departments QI6.2 Have a designated person to coordinate program-specific services of the comprehensive postsecondary education program
c. Programming and Supports to: 1. Audit or credit at least two on campus courses each semester under	**Standard 1 Inclusive Academic Access** QI1.1 Provide access to a wide variety of college course types
2. Take specially designed course each semester	**Standard 4 Self Determination** QI4.1 Ensure student involvement in and control of the establishment of personal goals QI4.2 Ensure the development and promotion of self-determination skills
3. Earn Certificate	**Standard 5 Alignment With College Systems And Practices** QI5.1 Identify outcomes or offer an educational credential QI5.2 Provide access to academic advising QI5.3 Provide access to college campus resources
d. Students have rights and responsibilities of a typically matriculating student	**Standard 2 Career Development** QI2.1 Provide students with the supports and experiences necessary to seek and sustain competitive employment **Standard 3 Campus Membership** QI3.1 Provide access to and support for participation in existing social organizations, facilities, etc.

	Standard 5 Alignment With College Systems And Practices QI5.5 Adhere to the college's schedules, policies and procedures, public relations and communications
e. Experience peer mentoring	Not directly addressed in TCS but consistently reported as an effective strategy by other IHE.
f. Coordinate with Voc Rehab supports (DLE) Create Benchmarks	Not explicitly address in TCS but an expectation of HEOA
g. Participate in outcome focused program preparing for gainful competitive employment	**Standard 4 Self Determination** QI4.1 Ensure student involvement in and control of the establishment of personal goals QI4.2 Ensure the development and promotion of self-determination skills for students **Standard 5 Alignment With College Systems And Practices** QI5.2 Provide access to academic advising
h. Admission standards do not require a National College Entrance Exam	Not directly addressed in program standards but an expectation of the HEOA
i. IHE becomes a Certified Transition Program	Not explicit in TCS but will be addressed in evaluation strategies
j. Develop a 5 year plan for sustainability	Not explicit in TCS but will be addressed in evaluation strategies

Table 2: Colorado Inclusive Higher Education Program Evaluation Timeline

Evaluation Strategy	16 -17			17 – 18			18 – 19			19 – 20			20 – 21		
	F	W	S	F	W	S	F	W	S	F	W	S	F	W	S
1. Document Pilots Against Think College Standards															
1.1 Pilots self-assesses using standards	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
1.2 Evaluator meets with Pilot to review	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
1.3 Pilots set objectives based upon assessment	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
2. Document Stakeholder satisfaction															
2.1 Evaluator interviews respective stakeholders	X	X													
2.2 Evaluator and Pilots select satisfaction questions		X													
2.3 Satisfaction assessment strategies implemented			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
3. Establish a Cross Pilot database															
3.1 Review NCC recommended data elements	X														
3.2 Evaluator and Pilots discuss feasibility of data elements		X													
3.3 Design the database		X													
3.4 Pilots submit data			X	X		X	X		X	X		X	X		X
3.5 Provide Annual Report of data elements			X			X			X			X			X
4. Pilots, Evaluator and IN meet twice yearly															
4.1 Agenda developed	X		X	X		X	X		X	X		X	X		X
4.2 Meeting held	X		X	X		X	X		X	X		X	X		X
4.3 Discussion documented	X		X	X		X	X		X	X		X	X		X
4.4 Recommended actions documented	X		X	X		X	X		X	X		X	X		X
4.5 Actions Reported	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

F = Fall (Aug-Dec)

W = Winter (Jan-Mar)

S = Spring (Apr-July

Composite Think College Standards Responses

Instructions: Complete the following grid by indicating a level of implementation score for each benchmark

Unit of measure: Level of implementation

0 = not planning to implement

1 = no progress

2 = in progress but not fully implemented

3 = fully implemented

STANDARD 1 INCLUSIVE ACADEMIC ACCESS: To facilitate quality academic access for students with intellectual disabilities, the comprehensive postsecondary education program should:				
Quality Indicator 1.1 Provide access to a wide array of college course types that are attended by students without disabilities, including:				
Benchmarks	**Implementation Scale**			
	UCCS	ACC	UNC	NOTES
1.1A: Enrollment in noncredit-bearing, non-degree courses (such as continuing education courses) attended by students without disabilities.	3	3	3	
1.1B: Auditing or participating in college courses attended by students without disabilities for which the student does not receive academic credit.	0	3	3	
1.1C: Enrollment in credit bearing courses offered by the institution attended by students without disabilities, when aligned with the student's postsecondary plans.	0	3	3	
1.1D: Access to existing courses rather than separate courses designed only for students with intellectual disabilities.	3	3	3	
1.1E: College course access that is not limited to a pre-determined list.	3	3	3	
1.1F: Participation in courses that relate to their personal, academic and career goals as established through person-centered planning.	3	3	3	
1.1G: Collection of objective evaluation data on college course participation.	1	3	3	

Quality Indicator 1.2 Address issues that may impact college course participation, including:

Benchmarks	Implementation Scale			
	UCCS	ACC	UNC	NOTES
1.2A: College policies regarding placement tests, ability to benefit testing and prerequisites that negatively impact college course participation access.	3	3	3	
1.2B: Access to and instruction in the use of needed public or personal transportation, such as public buses, taxis, para-transit, ride-sharing with other students and other naturally occurring transportation options.	2	3	3	
1.2C: Access to college Disability Services for accommodations typically provided by that office.	1	3	3	
1.2D: Access to and instruction in the use of needed technology.	2	3	3	
1.2E: Access to educational coaches who receive ongoing training and supervision.	2	3	2	
1.2F: Access to peer support such as mentors, tutors, and campus ambassadors.	3	3	2	
1.2G: Faculty training in universal design for learning principles.	1	3	1	Training is provided for faculty in which students are enrolled in their class. UCCS

Quality Indicator 1.3 Provide students with the skills to access on-going adult learning opportunities, including:

Benchmarks	Implementation Scale			
	UCCS	ACC	UNC	NOTES
1.3A: Knowledge of the adult learning opportunities available in their community, such as college courses, community education, etc.	1	3	2	
1.3B: Knowledge of resources available to assist them to access or fund adult learning opportunities in their community.	1	3	2	

STANDARD 2 CAREER DEVELOPMENT: To facilitate career development leading to competitive employment for students with intellectual disabilities, the comprehensive postsecondary education program should:				
Quality Indicator 2.1 Provide students with the supports and experiences necessary to seek and sustain competitive employment, including:				
Benchmarks	**Implementation Scale**			
	UCCS	ACC	UNC	NOTES
2.1A: The provision of person-centered planning to identify career goals.	1	3	3	
2.1B: Access to job coaches and developers who receive ongoing training and supervision.	1	3	1	
2.1C: Participation in time-limited internships or work-based training in settings with people without disabilities.	1	2	2	
2.1D: Opportunity to participate in academically focused service learning experiences.	1	3	2	
2.1E: Participation in paid work experiences related to personal choice and career goals, such as paid internships, work-study, service learning or other paid work on or off campus.	1	2	1	
2.1F: Connection with community rehabilitation and other adult service providers to sustain employment.	1	3	3	
2.1G: The collection of objective evaluation data on student employment.	1	3	O	

STANDARD 3 CAMPUS MEMBERSHIP: To facilitate campus membership for students with intellectual disabilities, the comprehensive postsecondary education program should:				
Quality Indicator 3.1: Provide access to and support for participation in existing social organizations, facilities and technology, including:				
Benchmarks	**Implementation Scale**			
	UCCS	ACC	UNC	NOTES
3.1A: Campus programs, such as clubs and organizations, community service, religious life, student government, Greek system, co-curricular experiences, service learning, study abroad, student sports and entertainment events, recreational facilities and programs, etc.	2	3	3	
3.1B: Residence life facilities and activities, including, when desired, the off campus housing office.	1	0	3	
3.1B: Technology for social communication, including email, texting, cell phone, Facebook, Twitter, Skype).	3	3	3	
3.1C: Social activities facilitated by students without disabilities who serve as natural supports.	2	3	2	

STANDARD 4: SELF DETERMINATION: To facilitate the development of self-determination in students with intellectual disabilities, the comprehensive postsecondary education program should:				
Quality Indicator 4.1: Ensure student involvement in and control of the establishment of personal goals that:				
Benchmarks	**Implementation Scale**			
	UCCS	ACC	UNC	NOTES
4.1A: Reflect student interests and desires as indicated by person centered planning.	3	3	3	
4.1B: Are reviewed regularly and modified as needed to reflect changes in student interests and preferences.	2	3	2	
4.1C: Address accommodation and technology needs.	2	3	3	
4.1D: Lead to outcomes desired by the student.	3	3	3	
4.1E: Reflect family input when desired by the student.	3	3	3	
Quality Indicator 4.2: Ensure the development and promotion of self-determination skills for students with intellectual disabilities as evidenced by students:				
Benchmarks	**Implementation Scale**			
	UCCS	ACC	UNC	NOTES
4.2A: Monitoring their own progress toward their personal goals.	2	3	2	
4.2B: Directing their choice of courses, activities, and employment experiences.	2	3	3	
4.2C: Involvement in course registration, accommodation requests, and payment of tuition.	2	3	2	
4.2D: Being involved in all aspects of employment, such as creating a resume, setting up job interviews, follow up phone calls, negotiating job change, etc.	1	2	2	
4.2E: Interacting directly with faculty and employers including the articulation of needed accommodations.	1	3	2	
4.2F: Managing personal schedules that include courses, employment, and social activities.	2	3	2	

Quality Indicator 4.3: Have a stated process for family involvement that reflects:				
Benchmarks	**Implementation Scale**			
	UCCS	ACC	UNC	NOTES
4.3A: Clearly defined roles and responsibilities for parents and students.	2	3	1	
4.3B: A process for the provision of information to parents on resources, effective advocacy and transition planning.	2	3	1	
4.3C: Student control over how parents are involved with their experience	1	3	2	
4.3D: Adherence to the guidelines set forth by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)	3	3	3	

STANDARD 5: ALIGNMENT WITH COLLEGE SYSTEMS AND PRACTICES: To facilitate alignment with college systems and practices for students with intellectual disabilities, the comprehensive postsecondary education program should:

Quality Indicator 5.1: As required in the HEOA, identify outcomes or offer an educational credential (e.g., degree or certificate) established by the institution for students enrolled in the program, including assurance that:

Benchmarks	Implementation Scale			
	UCCS	ACC	UNC	NOTES
5.1A: Outcomes established by the program for achievement of an educational credential are measurable.	1	2	1	
5.1B: Program outcomes are publicly available (e.g. brochure, website, program application).	1	3	2	
5.1C: Courses and internships are related to achieving and maintaining gainful employment.	3	3	3	
5.1D: Outcomes/credentials established by the program also addresses engagement in college community life, service opportunities, etc.	1	3	2	

Quality Indicator 5.2: Provide access to academic advising that:

Benchmarks	Implementation Scale			
	UCCS	ACC	UNC	NOTES
5.2A: Uses person centered planning in the development of a students' course of study (curriculum structure).	1	2	3	
5.2B: Reflects the institution's policy for determining whether a student enrolled in the program is making satisfactory academic progress.	1	3	3	
5.2C: Is aligned with the educational credential established by the institution for students enrolled in the program.	1	2	3	

Quality Indicator 5.3: Provide access to college campus resources, including:				
Benchmarks	**Implementation Scale**			
	UCCS	ACC	UNC	NOTES
5.3A: Admissions, registration and orientation.	2	3	3	
5.3B: College identification cards.	3	3	3	
5.3C: Health and counseling centers, athletic center, information technology, career services, dining services, Greek system, clubs, student organizations, student government, etc.	2	3	3	
5.3D: Co-curricular activities including practicum and learning communities.	1	3	3	
5.3E: Support for participating in existing on and off-campus university housing owned or university-affiliated housing.	1	0	2	
5.3F: Orientation, training and resources for parents of incoming students.	1	3	3	
5.3G: Campus shuttle buses to different campuses and the community.	3	0	3	
Quality Indicator 5.4: Collaborate with faculty and staff, including:				
Benchmarks	**Implementation Scale**			
	UCCS	ACC	UNC	NOTES
5.4A: Accessing existing professional development initiatives on campus (i.e. workshops on Universal Design principles).	1	3	2	
5.4B: Offering expertise of the program staff and students to faculty, other college personnel and students through trainings, course presentations, etc.	1	3	2	

Quality Indicator 5.5: Adhere to the college's schedules, policies and procedures, public relations and communications as evidenced by:				
Benchmarks	**Implementation Scale**			
	UCCS	ACC	UNC	NOTES
5.5A: Review of the college's code of conduct with students.	1	3	3	
5.5B: Participation of students in courses and/or social events during afternoons, evenings, and weekends.	3	3	3	
5.5C: Participation of students in graduation exercises and experiences.	1	2	1	
5.5D: Observation of college vacations and holidays, not local education agencies (if dual enrollment) or that of outside agencies.	3	3	3	
5.5E: Recognition of students with intellectual disabilities as a representative population in the IHE's diversity plan.	1	2	1	
5.5F: The presence of students with ID on campus reflects the college's commitment to diversity and has a presence in college communications, strategic plan, mission statement, president's messages, system reviews.	2	3	1	

STANDARD 6: COORDINATION AND COLLABORATION: To facilitate collaboration and coordination, the comprehensive postsecondary education program should:			

Quality Indicator 6.1: Establish connections and relationships with key college/university departments, as evidenced by:

Benchmarks	Implementation Scale			
	UCCS	ACC	UNC	NOTES
6.1A: Students with ID effectively using campus resources, such as disability services, financial aid services, course registration, academic advising, health services and career services.	1	3	2	
6.1B: Program staff effectively using college infrastructure such as IT support, maintenance, etc.	1	3	3	
6.1C: Program staff being aware of the governance and administrative structures of the college or university that may impact the program.	2	3	3	
6.1.D: Program staff participating in faculty/staff governance, or committees as part of their contribution to the college.	1	3	2	

Quality Indicator 6.2: Have a designated person to coordinate program-specific services of the comprehensive postsecondary education program, including:

Benchmarks	Implementation Scale			
	UCCS	ACC	UNC	NOTES
6.2A: Scheduling and implementing interagency team meetings.	1	3	1	
6.2B: Conducting person-centered planning and assuring that the results of those meetings are infused into the students' daily activities.	1	3	3	
6.2C: Assuring that data collection and program evaluation activities occur.	1	3	2	
6.2D: Providing outreach to families.	3	3	2	
6.2E: Providing training and supervision for educational coaches, job coaches and job developers.	3	3	1	

STANDARD 7: SUSTAINABILITY: To facilitate sustainability, the comprehensive postsecondary education program should:

Quality Indicator 7.1: Utilize diverse sources of funding, including:

Benchmarks	Implementation Scale			
	UCCS	ACC	UNC	NOTES
7.1A: Maintaining a relationship to the campus financial aid office.	3	3	2	
7.1B: Ensuring that eligible students and families apply for financial aid.	1	3	2	
7.1C: Providing information to students on sources of funds for tuition and other costs, such as National Service grants, work-study, use of Medicaid waiver funds, vocational rehabilitation, etc.	3	3	2	
7.1D: Using state funds, IDEA funds, developmental services agency funds, family funds, private and federal grant funds to provide core funding for the program.	3	3	2	

Quality Indicator 7.2: Have a planning and advisory team which:

Benchmarks	Implementation Scale			
	UCCS	ACC	UNC	NOTES
7.2A: Includes representatives from the college including administrators (deans, provosts, department chair), disability services, faculty, as well as disability specific agencies, relevant community agencies, local business leaders, workforce development providers, families, and students.	1	2	1	
7.2B: Supports collaboration both between the college and the program and with outside entities.	1	2		
7.2C: Addresses program policies and practices (costs, access, partnerships) and student outcomes (data review) to ensure sustainability.	1	2	2	
7.2D: Communicates regularly.	1	2	2	

STANDARD 8: ONGOING EVALUATION: To facilitate quality postsecondary education services for students with intellectual disabilities, the comprehensive postsecondary program should:				
Quality Indicator 8.1: Conduct evaluation on services and outcomes on a regular basis, including:				
Benchmarks	**Implementation Scale**			
	UCCS	**ACC**	**UNC**	**NOTES**
8.1A: Collection of data from key stakeholders, such as students with and without disabilities, parents, faculty, disability services and other college staff.	1	3	1	
8.1B: Collection of student satisfaction data.	1	3	O	
8.1C: Collection of student exit data.	1	1	O	
8.1D: Collection of student follow-up data.	1	1	O	
8.1E: Review of all data compiled by the advisory team and other stakeholders.	1	1	O	
8.1F: Implementation of program changes as a result of data review.	1	3	O	

IN Evaluation
UNC GOAL - Student

1. How is your college experience going? Is it not good, okay, good, great.

2. Why?

3. Where are you living? What do you like about where you are living? Is there anything you would like to change about where you are living?

4. What classes are you taking?

5. What do you like about your classes? What do you wish was different about your classes?

6. Are you receiving the supports you need for your classes? What help are you getting for your homework and classwork?

7. Do you feel the professors welcome you in class?

8. Do you feel your classmates accept you in class?

9. Are you receiving the supports you need for your day to day activities? Getting to and from class and activities? Maintaining your calendar/schedule?

10. Are you receiving the supports you need for social activities?

11. What additional supports if any would you like?

12. Do you think you were prepared for college? Totally, for some parts, needed more preparation

13. Has it been easy or difficult to adjust to college? What has been easy? What has been difficult?

14. What suggestions do you have for other students considering attending college?

15. What are the three things you like best about college?

16. What are the things you like least?

17. What goals have you set for work after college?

18. It has been only a short time so far but have your goals changed at all since you started college?

19. If so in what way?

20. How often does your family contact you and how? Is it too much? Too little? Just right?

21. How much contact do you have with students not in GOAL? Is it the right amount?

22. Is there anything else you would like to say about your experience at UNC?

IN Evaluation
UNC GOAL - Parents

1. Overall how is this experience with Higher Education going for your student? For you?

2. Were you able to prepare your student for college life? With respect to what you did? What the program did?

3. Are there suggestions you have for other families considering application to the program?

4. How well did UNC GOAL prepare your student to transition from home to college?

5. What would you suggest that UNC GOAL could do to improve orientation to UNC GOAL?

6. Is there an appropriate balance in the experience between academics, work experience, skills of daily living and social life at UNC?

7. What are your priorities for your student's experience?

8. Are there experiences you expected your student to have that are not being provided or your student is having difficulty accessing?

9. Has your relationship with your student changed? If so how?

10. Do you have goals for yourself in relation to your students' enrollment in higher education?

11. Are there any additional impacts you see from your students' enrollment? On your student? On you? On your family?

12. Do you have other children who have gone to college?

13. If so what if any differences do you see in your role as a parent of a student in UNC GOAL?

14. Are there any recommendations you have for UNC GOAL?

15. What is important to consider that hasn't already been asked?

IN Evaluation
UNC GOAL – Pilot Faculty and Staff

1. What is your role in UNC GOAL?

2. Have you had adequate preparation for your role?

3. What additional preparation, if any, would you like?

4. Why were you interested in working with UNC GOAL?

5. How do you feel UNC GOAL is going?

6. What changes if any would you recommend going forward?

7. What, if any, policies or procedures need to be developed going forward?

8. How well is communication with UNC GOAL parents working?

9. What needs to be done to better prepare UNC GOAL students?

10. What individual groups have been particularly supportive of UNC GOAL?

11. Have there been any groups on or off campus that have not been supportive?

12. What additional resources, if any, are needed to implement UNC GOAL?

13. At this early point what reflections do you have on how UNC GOAL is working? Have there been any surprises?

IN Evaluation
UNC GOAL – Faculty with Student Enrolled in Class

1. First can I get you to tell me a little about yourself and your background? How long have you been teaching at University of Northern Colorado? Have you taught elsewhere? If so how many years?

2. What has been your previous experience if any with students with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities?

3. How, if at all, have you adjusted your class to accommodate the UNC GOAL students?

4. Have the modifications made for the student by GOAL Staff seemed appropriate?

5. Are there things that need to be done to help you as a professor to support UNC GOAL students?

6. Do you feel other students in the class are accepting of the students of UNC GOAL in your class?

7. Do you have any reservations about having UNC GOAL students in future classes? If so what are they? What might be done to address them?

8. Has your perception as an educator changed after have an UNC GOAL student in your class? How so?

9. What recommendations do you have for UNC GOAL going forward?

10. Are there additional considerations regarding UNC GOAL?

IN Evaluation
UNC GOAL – Non-UNC GOAL Student

1. Please tell me a little about yourself? How many years have you attended college? What is your major? How did you learn about UNC GOAL?

2. What role are you playing, i.e. peer mentor, tutor?

3. What preparation has UNC GOAL or ACC provided to you for this role?

4. Do you feel the preparation is adequate? Is there more you would like?

5. Have you had previous experience in this kind of role? If so where and when?

6. Are you receiving course credit or payment for your role in UNC GOAL? How important is that credit or payment for you to do this work?

7. What has been the benefit to you for doing this work? Will you continue to do so next semester? Next year?

8. Are you serving in this role because you anticipate a career working with people with disabilities?

9. Have there been any surprises for you in your work with UNC GOAL students?

10. Is there anything else you would like to comment on? Is there a quote you can offer to fellow students?

11. Are there any recommendations you have for UNC GOAL?

IN Evaluation
UNC GOAL – Other Stakeholder

1. What is your role at University of Northern Colorado?

2. What role do you play with regard to UNC GOAL?

3. From your perspective, is UNC GOAL successful?

4. What recommendations do you have for UNC GOAL going forward?

5. What do you see as the top three benefits of UNC GOAL?

6. What are the disadvantages or needed revisions, if any, you would recommend for UNC GOAL?