# Teacher Recruitment Education & Preparation (TREP) Program Slot Allocation Model (Approved February 2022)

## Background

Colorado Senate Bill SB21-185 established the TREP program under C.R.S. 22-35-108.5 as a subsection of the Concurrent Enrollment Programs Act, with the objectives of:

* increasing the number of students entering the teaching profession;
* increasing the percentage of students who participate in postsecondary educator preparation programs, especially among low-income and traditionally underserved populations;
* creating a more diverse teacher workforce to reflect the ethnic diversity of the state;
* decreasing the amount of time required for a student to complete a postsecondary educator preparation degree or certificate; and
* increasing the opportunities to participate in teaching career pathways.

Modeled after the ASCENT program, the bill set a minimum funding for the 2022-2023 school year at 200 slots for student participation. It is up to the legislature to determine funding for future years, but, like the ASCENT program, it is anticipated that demand for funding may exceed the number of available funded slots.

It is the intent of this slot allocation model to apportion the number of available slots to requesting Local Education Providers (LEPs) in a manner most consistent with the legislative intent while ensuring all LEPs in Colorado have access to the program.

## Key Assumptions

1. Only LEPs who comply with CDE processes and deadlines are eligible to participate in any year.
2. Past participation in the TREP program will not convey any advantage to any LEPs in the future.
3. LEPs may only request slots for students who are both eligible for the TREP program and have applied to the LEP to participate in the TREP program for the following year. LEPs will provide the Department with a list of student names, with accompanying documentation of each student’s qualification for TREP, as well as aggregate demographic data for the pool of applicants.

## Allocation Process

The slot allocation process will follow multiple allocation steps until all available slots have been allocated and awarded to the requesting LEPs, as follows:

Step 1. All participating LEPs with at least one eligible student will be allocated 1 slot automatically.

Step 2. Allocate the next round of slots to LEPs based on the remaining number of slots requested in proportion to the total number of remaining slots requested from all LEPs. In this step, fractional slots will be rounded down in all cases to ensure this step cannot over-allocate slots.

Step 3. Any slots not allocated in steps 1-2 will be allocated one each to LEPs with the highest percentages of eligible students from traditionally underrepresented backgrounds.

Step 4. Any slots not allocated in steps 1-3 will be allocated one each to LEPs with the lowest percentage of slots allocated vs. slots requested.

## Example Calculation

In this example there are 200 slots funded by the legislature, and 10 LEPs have requested a total of 290 slots. TREP slots will be allocated as follows:

Step 1: Each of the 10 LEPs who requested slots are allocated 1 slot in this step. This leaves 190 slots remaining to be allocated and 280 slots requested that have not been filled yet.

Step 2: Calculate the percentage of unfilled requests by LEP. For example, for LEP 10 it’s 6/280 = 2.1%. Apportion the 190 slots left unallocated by step 1 based on these percentages, rounded down. Again, for LEP 10 it’s 2.1% of 190 unallocated slots remaining, or 4 more slots. LEP 10 now has 5 slots out of their requested 7, 1 from step 1 and 4 from step 2. After repeating this calculation for all of the applying LEPs, there are 5 slots that remain unallocated and 95 slot requests that have not been filled.

Step 3: Allocate the 5 slots remaining after step 2, 1 each, to the 5 LEPs highlighted in yellow based on their percentages of underserved populations of candidates, highest percentages first.

Step 4: There are no more unallocated slots after step 3, so step 4 is not applied in this example.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assumptions:** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |
| **Slots Funded for the Year** | | **200** |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |
| **Guaranteed Minimum # of Slots** | | **1** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |
| **Example LEPs** | **Slots Requested** | **Step 1 Guaranteed Minimum Slots** | **Slots Requested not filled in step 1** | **% of All Slots Requested but not filled in step 1** | **Step 2 # of Slots Allocated by %** | **Total Slots Allocated in steps 1-2** | **# of unfilled slots requested after steps 1-2** | **% of slot requests filled** | | **% of Under-represented candidates** |
| LEP 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 1 | 0 | 100.0% | | 100% |
| LEP 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0.4% | 0 | 1 | 1 | 50.0% | | 85% |
| LEP 3 | 30 | 1 | 29 | 10.4% | 19 | 20 | 10 | 66.7% | | 65% |
| LEP 4 | 20 | 1 | 19 | 6.8% | 12 | 13 | 7 | 65.0% | | 25% |
| LEP 5 | 25 | 1 | 24 | 8.6% | 16 | 17 | 8 | 68.0% | | 32% |
| LEP 6 | 80 | 1 | 79 | 28.2% | 53 | 54 | 26 | 67.5% | | 90% |
| LEP 7 | 10 | 1 | 9 | 3.2% | 6 | 7 | 3 | 70.0% | | 83% |
| LEP 8 | 110 | 1 | 109 | 38.9% | 73 | 74 | 36 | 67.3% | | 98% |
| LEP 9 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 1.4% | 2 | 3 | 2 | 60.0% | | 60% |
| LEP 10 | 7 | 1 | 6 | 2.1% | 4 | 5 | 2 | 71.4% | | 70% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |
| **Total** | **290** | **10** | **280** |  | **185** | **195** | **95** |  | |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |
| **Remaining Slots Available after Allocation Step** | | **190  after step 1** |  |  |  | **5  after step 2** |  |  | |  |