



COLORADO

**Department of
Regulatory Agencies**

Colorado Office of Policy, Research &
Regulatory Reform

2021 Sunset Review

Colorado Interagency Working Group on School Safety

Education Data Advisory Committee

Health Care Work Force Data Advisory Group

Juvenile Justice Reform Committee

School Safety Resource Center Advisory Board

Strategic Action Planning Group on Aging



October 15, 2021



COLORADO

**Department of
Regulatory Agencies**

Executive Director's Office

October 15, 2021

Members of the Colorado General Assembly
c/o the Office of Legislative Legal Services
State Capitol Building
Denver, Colorado 80203

Dear Members of the General Assembly:

The General Assembly established a sunset review process for advisory committees and boards in 1986 as a way to analyze and evaluate their efficacy and to determine whether they should continue. Pursuant to section 2-3-1203, Colorado Revised Statutes, the Colorado Office of Policy, Research and Regulatory Reform (COPRRR) at the Department of Regulatory Agencies undertakes a review process culminating in the release of multiple reports each year on October 15.

A national leader in regulatory reform, COPRRR takes the vision of their office, the department, and more broadly of our state government seriously. Specifically, the office contributes to the strong economic landscape in Colorado by ensuring that we have thoughtful, efficient, and inclusive regulations that reduce barriers to entry into various professions, and that open doors of opportunity for all Coloradans.

As part of this year's reviews, COPRRR has completed its evaluations of the Colorado Interagency Working Group on School Safety, Education Data Advisory Committee, Health Care Work Force Data Advisory Group, Juvenile Justice Reform Committee, School Safety Resource Center Advisory Board and Strategic Action Planning Group on Aging. I am pleased to submit this written report, which will be the basis for COPRRR's oral testimony before the 2022 legislative committees of reference.

The report discusses the effectiveness of the committees in carrying out the intention of the statutes and makes recommendations as to whether they should be continued.

To learn more about the sunset review process, among COPRRR's other functions, visit coprrr.colorado.gov.

Sincerely,

Patty Salazar
Executive Director





2021 Sunset Reviews of Advisory Committees

Sunset the Colorado Interagency Working Group on School Safety.

The Working Group was established in Senate Bill 20-023 to increase coordination of school safety programs. The Working Group was never funded and never met, so it should be sunsetted.

Continue the Education Data Advisory Committee.

The EDAC was created in 2007 as part of the Data Reporting and Technology Act. By analyzing mandates from a multidisciplinary perspective, performing cost-benefit analyses and recommending change when needed, the EDAC is a proven asset to the Colorado Department of Education and should be continued.

Sunset the Health Care Work Force Data Advisory Group.

The Advisory Group was established in House Bill 12-1052 to consult with the Primary Care Office regarding the collection and compilation of professional health care data on a statewide basis for the development of the Colorado Health Systems Directory, which has been created and is being utilized. The Advisory Group has completed its work and should be sunsetted.

Sunset the Juvenile Justice Reform Committee.

The Reform Committee was created in Senate Bill 19-108 to improve outcomes for youth in the juvenile justice system. It is expected to complete all of its statutorily required duties prior to its scheduled repeal and, therefore, should be sunsetted.

Continue the School Safety Resource Center Advisory Board.

The Advisory Board was established along with the School Safety Resource Center in Senate Bill 08-001 to prevent and prepare for acts of violence and other emergencies that occur in schools. The work of making schools safe is far from complete, and the Advisory Board provides diverse perspectives on how to address this issue.

Sunset the Strategic Action Planning Group on Aging.

The Planning Group was established in House Bill 15-1033 as part of the Colorado Comprehensive Strategic Action Plan on Aging Act and its primary task was to develop a strategic action plan on aging. It has fulfilled its mission and should be sunsetted.

Table of Contents

Background	1
Introduction	1
Sunset Process	1
Colorado Interagency Working Group on School Safety	2
Creation, Mission and Make-Up	2
Responsibilities of the Working Group	2
Revenues and Expenditures	3
Meetings of the Working Group	3
Proposals and Their Status	3
Reasons to Sunset the Working Group	3
Analysis and Recommendation	3
Education Data Advisory Committee	4
Creation, Mission and Make-Up	4
Responsibilities of the EDAC	4
Revenues and Expenditures	5
Meetings of the EDAC	6
Proposals	7
Reasons to Continue the EDAC	9
Analysis and Recommendation	9
Health Care Work Force Data Advisory Group	10
Creation, Mission and Make-Up	10
Responsibilities of the Advisory Group	11
Revenues and Expenditures	11
Meetings of the Advisory Group	11
Proposals and Their Status	12
Reasons to Sunset the Advisory Group	12
Analysis and Recommendation	13
Juvenile Justice Reform Committee	14
Creation, Mission and Make-Up	14
Responsibilities of the Reform Committee	15
Revenues and Expenditures	15
Meetings of the Reform Committee	16
Proposals and Their Status	17
Reasons to Sunset the Reform Committee	19
Analysis and Recommendation	20
School Safety Resource Center Advisory Board	21
Creation, Mission and Make-Up	21
Responsibilities of Advisory Board	23
Revenues and Expenditures	23
Meetings of the Advisory Board	23
Proposals and Their Status	24

Reasons to Continue the Advisory Board.....	24
Analysis and Recommendation	24
Strategic Action Planning Group on Aging.....	25
Creation, Mission and Make-Up.....	25
Responsibilities of the Planning Group.....	27
Revenues and Expenditures	28
Meetings of the Planning Group	29
Proposals and Their Status	32
Reasons to Sunset the Planning Group	34
Analysis and Recommendation	35

Background

Introduction

As part of the sunset review of an advisory committee, the advisory committee that is scheduled to repeal must submit to the Department of Regulatory Agencies, through the Colorado Office of Policy, Research and Regulatory Reform (COPRRR), on or before July 1 of the year preceding the year in which the advisory committee is scheduled to repeal:¹

- The names of current members of the advisory committee;
- All revenues and all expenditures, including advisory committee expenses, *per diem* paid to members, and any travel expenses;
- The dates all advisory committee meetings were held and the number of members attending the meetings;
- A listing of all advisory proposals made by the advisory committee, together with an indication as to whether each proposal was acted upon, implemented or enacted into statute; and
- The reasons why the advisory committee should be continued.

Importantly, sunset reviews of advisory committees do not, generally, analyze the underlying program to which the committee is expected to render advice or recommendations. If an advisory committee is sunset, the underlying program will continue.

Sunset Process

As with sunset reviews of programs, agency officials and other stakeholders can submit input regarding an advisory committee through a variety of means, including at coprrr.colorado.gov.

The Education Data Advisory Committee shall terminate on July 1, 2022, and the Colorado Interagency Working Group on School Safety, Health Care Work Force Data Advisory Group, Juvenile Justice Reform Committee, School Safety Resource Center Advisory Board and Strategic Action Planning Group on Aging shall terminate on September 1, 2022, unless continued by the General Assembly. It is the duty of COPRRR to conduct an analysis and evaluation of these advisory committees pursuant to section 2-3-1203, Colorado Revised Statutes.

The purpose of these reviews is to determine whether these committees should be continued for the protection of the public and to evaluate their performance. COPRRR's findings and recommendations are submitted via this report to the legislative committees of reference of the Colorado General Assembly.

¹ § 2-3-1203(2)(b)(I) and (II), C.R.S.

Colorado Interagency Working Group on School Safety

Creation, Mission and Make-Up

The Colorado Interagency Working Group on School Safety (Working Group) was established via Senate Bill 20-023 to increase coordination of school safety programs. The Working Group was housed in the Department of Public Safety (DPS). The mission of the Working Group was to enhance school safety through cost-effective use of public resources. To achieve this, the Working Group intended to focus on evidence-based best practices.²

Section 24-25-103(2), Colorado Revised Statutes (C.R.S.), states that the Working Group consists of 14 members, and they are as follows:

- The Executive Director of DPS, or a designee;
- The Commissioner of Education, or a designee;
- The Executive Director of the Department of Public Health and Environment, or a designee;
- The Executive Director of the Department of Human Services, or a designee;
- The Attorney General, or a designee;
- The Director of the School Safety Resource Center;
- The Director of the Division of Fire Prevention and Control, or a designee;
- The State Architect, or a designee;
- A school district superintendent who serves an urban or suburban school district, appointed by an organization that represents school executives;
- A school district superintendent who serves a rural school district, appointed by an organization that represents school executives;
- A chief of police, appointed by an organization that represents Colorado chiefs of police;
- A county sheriff, appointed by an organization that represents Colorado county sheriffs; and
- Two members who are either a student or a parent who attended a school or had a child attend a school at the time a school shooting occurred at the school—one appointed by the Senate Majority Leader and one appointed by the Senate Minority Leader.

Responsibilities of the Working Group

The Working Group is statutorily required to:

- Study and implement recommendations of the State Auditor’s report regarding school safety released in September 2019;

² § 24-25-103(1), C.R.S.

-
- Consider the organization of school safety programs and recommend reorganization, if necessary;
 - Identify shared metrics to examine the effectiveness of school safety programs;
 - Facilitate interagency coordination and communication;
 - Increase transparency and accessibility of state grants and resources;
 - Facilitate and address data sharing; and
 - Address the challenges faced by school safety programs in a coordinated way.

Revenues and Expenditures

Senate Bill 20-023 created a cash fund to allow DPS and the Working Group to accept gifts, grants, and private donations. DPS did not receive any funds.

Also, the General Assembly authorized the appropriation of money to the Working Group for a consultant, if requested. A consultant was never requested.

Senate Bill 20-023 included a fiscal note for 0.5 full-time equivalent employees for \$106,748 for DPS, but funds were not made available during the legislative session, partially due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The bill was only to be implemented if DPS identified sufficient funding to cover the costs associated with the Working Group, which it did not.

Meetings of the Working Group

Since the establishment of the Working Group, it has never met.

Proposals and Their Status

The Working group did not meet, so no proposals were created, and thus, there is no status to report.

Reasons to Sunset the Working Group

The Working Group was created to enhance school safety through the cost-effective use of public resources, while focusing on evidence-based best practices. However, the Working Group never met, and therefore, never made any proposals.

Analysis and Recommendation

Therefore, the General Assembly should sunset the Working Group. Since its creation via Senate Bill 20-023, it was never funded and it never met.

Education Data Advisory Committee

Creation, Mission and Make-Up

The Education Data Advisory Committee (EDAC) was created in 2007 by section 304 of Article 2, Title 22, Colorado Revised Statutes (C.R.S.), as a component of the Data Reporting and Technology Act (DRTA).³ The intent of DRTA is to:⁴

- Improve the collection of educational data by streamlining the submission and reporting of data;
- Create shared goals and shared expectations for data collection and technology for elementary and secondary education in Colorado;
- Require school districts and public schools to submit data that is relevant to student achievement and that will enhance and improve the manner in which school districts and public schools provide and evaluate student instruction;
- Explore the possibility of implementing a single statewide education data collection system with the purpose of reducing the manpower and cost of submitting required data to the Colorado Department of Education (CDE); and
- Deploy the single statewide education data collection system as a system of data exchange that is based on automatic file exchanges rather than manual processes requiring personnel to upload electronic files via messaging, web uploads, or other file transfer methods requiring human intervention.

DRTA directs the State Board of Education (Board) to designate five school districts, two boards of cooperative services, and one charter school to send representatives to the EDAC. The designated entities are directed by DRTA to be representative of the state as to size and population, and they should in turn designate a volunteer to serve on the EDAC.⁵ The EDAC currently consists of 13 members, three of whom are nonvoting members. DRTA does not limit EDAC membership; it directs that certain types of entities be represented. Given that the EDAC is an advisory committee, the Board adds members based on a perceived need of expertise.

Responsibilities of the EDAC

DRTA assigned several responsibilities to the EDAC. In keeping with the DRTA mission, the EDAC duties are focused on either analysis or reporting. The responsibilities include:⁶

³ § 22-2-301, C.R.S.

⁴ § 22-2-302(2), C.R.S.

⁵ § 22-2-304(1), C.R.S.

⁶ § 22-2-304(2), C.R.S.

-
- Review the statutory and regulatory data reporting requirements⁷ and determine whether the benefits derived are outweighed by the increased administrative costs;
 - Identify data reporting requirements that are duplicative or obsolete and may be combined, eliminated, or otherwise streamlined;
 - Review each data reporting request made of public schools and school districts and notify school districts and public schools that the request is mandatory by statute or rule, required to acquire a benefit, or is voluntary;
 - Review all proposed data reporting requirements, inform the General Assembly or the enacting state or federal agency of the estimated costs and make recommendations whether the proposed requirements are already included in existing law or regulation and whether the proposed requirements are necessary and appropriate;
 - Advise CDE on the impact of data practices and technology on school districts and public schools;
 - Periodically review the rules for implementing the federal Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974, and recommend to the Board an interpretation that will facilitate the exchange of information to the greatest extent possible;
 - Review the processes and timing for collecting student demographic data and make recommendations to the Board for efficiently updating the data as necessary;
 - Recommend to the Board and to the appropriate legislative committees of reference, annually or more often if necessary, the repeal or amendment of statutory and regulatory data reporting requirements identified as duplicative, obsolete, or inefficient;⁸ and
 - Identify reporting requirements that may be consolidated into a single report or a single submission for purposes of streamlining data submission for school districts and public schools.⁹

Revenues and Expenditures

The EDAC does not generate any revenue. All EDAC expenses are covered by CDE. The volunteer EDAC members receive no *per diem* and travel is not reimbursed.

During fiscal year 19-20, the EDAC spent \$1,475 on meals for the EDAC members and approximately \$2,293 on printing. During fiscal year 20-21, the EDAC spent \$190 on meals for the one EDAC meeting held in person.

⁷ § 22-2-304(5), C.R.S. - Statutory and regulatory data reporting requirements include all data reporting requirements that apply to school districts and public schools imposed by federal or state statute or by rule of a federal or state agency, including but not limited to the Department of Human Services, the Department of Public Health and Environment, and the Department of Health Care Policy and Financing.

⁸ § 22-2-304(3)(a), C.R.S.

⁹ § 22-2-304(4), C.R.S.

Meetings of the EDAC

The EDAC meets 10 times per year, excluding July and August. The meetings are scheduled to run from 9:30 am to 4:00 pm. Previous to the COVID-19 pandemic, the EDAC held seven live meetings in Denver. Beginning with the April 2020 meeting, all meetings were held remotely via the internet, including the June retreat.

Table 1 provides the meeting dates for fiscal year 19-20 and the number of voting members in attendance at each meeting.

Table 1
EDAC Meetings
Fiscal Year 19-20

Meeting Date	Location	Number of Members in Attendance
September 6, 2019	Denver	9
October 4, 2019	Denver	7
November 1, 2019	Denver	8
December 6, 2019	Denver	7
January 10, 2020	Denver	7
February 7, 2020	Denver	6
March 6, 2020	Denver	6
April 3, 2020	Remote	9
May 1, 2020	Remote	9
June 5, 2020, <i>Retreat</i>	Remote	10

Table 1 indicates that average attendance was approximately eight voting members.

Table 2 shows the meeting schedule for fiscal year 20-21.

Table 2
EDAC Meetings
Fiscal Year 20-21

Meeting Date	Location	Number of Members in Attendance
September 4, 2020	Remote	7
October 2, 2020	Remote	6
November 6, 2020	Remote	10
December 4, 2020	Remote	8
January 15, 2021	Remote	8
February 5, 2021	Remote	8
March 5, 2021	Remote	7
March 19, 2021	Remote	8
April 9, 2021	Remote	6
May 7, 2021	Remote	8
June 4, 2021, <i>Retreat</i>	Colorado Springs	7

Table 2 indicates that average attendance was approximately eight voting members. Meetings were held remotely on the internet until the end of the sunset review cycle. The June EDAC retreat was held in person in Colorado Springs. Table 2 also indicates two meetings were held in March to meet an April 1st deadline for the review of all mandatory data collections.

Proposals

The EDAC reviews data collection requests and mandates (collectively, “data collections”) that are sent to local education agencies in Colorado. It analyzes data collections for redundancy, efficiency, and cost versus benefit. If the EDAC approves a data collection, it places a stamp on it indicating if a form is Mandatory, Required to Obtain a Benefit, or Voluntary. Table 3 shows the results of the data collections reviewed for the period examined for this sunset review.

Table 3
Form Compliance Evaluations
Fiscal Years 19-20 and 20-21

Fiscal Year	Mandatory	Required to Obtain a Benefit	Voluntary	Data Collection Reviews
19-20	77	80	32	189
20-21	81	77	21	179

The EDAC proposes policy modifications to the Board and the General Assembly’s Education Committees in its annual report. The *EDAC 2018-19 Annual Report*, submitted March 2020, made six recommendations to specifically repeal or revise statutes and another six recommendations to reevaluate existing data collections in an ongoing manner.

The *EDAC 2019-20 Annual Report*, submitted January 2021, reported that the previous year’s recommendations centered around changing statute were enacted and reduced the data collection burdens placed on local school districts. The six recommendations that focused on reevaluating existing data collections led to in the sunseting of some required reports, reassessing data collections of dubious worth, instituting a suspension on data collection, gauging new collections, and generally lessening the burdens associated with data collections. The report made three additional recommendations. As with many initiatives, the COVID 19 pandemic influenced adoption and implementation. The recommendations and results were:

- *Repeal the Principal Preparation Program Survey.* No action was taken to repeal the Principal Preparation Program Survey. However, the EDAC and CDE continue to collaborate to eliminate this requirement because both believe it is duplicative.
- *Repeal Kindergarten School Readiness Assessments.* Kindergarten Readiness Assessments were not repealed. Nonetheless, the Board took action to make kindergarten readiness reporting more relevant and meaningful to local education agencies.
- *Establish a Collaborative relationship between CDE and the General Assembly to ensure data collections are limited to legislative intent.* COVID-19 impacted collaboration between the General Assembly and CDE but both are committed to verifying that data collections are limited to legislative intent.

Reasons to Continue the EDAC

The EDAC was created to examine the effects of data collection on Colorado kindergarten through 12th grade public education. Data collected by CDE and other agencies at every level of government are scrutinized by the EDAC to determine costs versus benefits derived from individual mandates. The EDAC then suggests the most effectual ways of collecting data, concludes if proposed new collections are necessary and may propose alternatives, and recommends process improvements to CDE. Since its inception, EDAC efforts have reduced the burden on local school districts in measurable ways. The EDAC helps ensure that the education data that are collected are valuable and meaningful.

The chief benefit of the EDAC is its membership. Volunteer representatives from boards of educational cooperatives and school districts from all over Colorado come together to discuss important matters. Expertise in human resources, special education, charter schools, assessment, data management, technology, budget and finance, federal programs, and both urban and rural interests are present on the EDAC. The members meet on a nearly monthly basis, intent on reducing the burdens of data collection on Colorado's public education system.

Analysis and Recommendation

The EDAC provides valuable services to the education community, CDE, the General Assembly, and therefore to the citizens of Colorado. By analyzing mandates from a multidisciplinary perspective, performing cost-benefit analyses and recommending change when needed, the EDAC is a proven asset to CDE and public education. It has reduced the workload placed on local education agencies and confirms necessary data are compiled for essential analysis. The EDAC is critical to Colorado's education data collection, management, and security.

For these reasons, the General Assembly should continue the EDAC.

Health Care Work Force Data Advisory Group

Creation, Mission and Make-Up

In 2012, the Health Care Work Force Data Advisory Group (Advisory Group) was established as a result of the passage of House Bill 12-1052 to provide consultation regarding the collection and compilation of professional health-care data on a statewide basis for the development of the Colorado Health Systems Directory (Directory). The development of the Directory has helped to determine where health-care provider shortages are occurring throughout Colorado in order to allocate additional resources to underserved populations.

The Advisory Group is designated to provide, among other things, recommendations regarding the structure and content of health-care professional licensure data¹⁰ that must be collected by the Director of the Division of Professions and Occupations (DPO) within the Department of Regulatory Agencies (DORA) in consultation with the Director at the Primary Care Office (Director and Office, respectively) within the Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE).

The Director is responsible for the designation of Advisory Group members comprised of:¹¹

- The Director of DPO, or a designee;
- Representatives from affected health-care professions; and
- Individuals with health care workforce expertise in the areas of planning, research, and analysis.

Additionally, one representative from DORA is determined by the Executive Director of the agency.¹²

Presently, the Advisory Group consists of 77 members, including representation from the Colorado Rural Health Center, which is the non-profit organization specified in statute to convene the Advisory Group.¹³

¹⁰ § 12-30-106(3)(a)(IV), C.R.S.

¹¹ § 12-30-106(3)(a)(I), C.R.S.

¹² *ibid.*

¹³ § 12-30-106(3)(a)(II), C.R.S.

Responsibilities of the Advisory Group

The Director of DPO is responsible for the collection of health-care workforce data from health-care professionals, including professionals eligible for the Colorado Health Service Corps, licensed practical and professional nurses, and licensed pharmacists.¹⁴ The data collected includes, but is not limited to:¹⁵

- Address of the practice affiliated with each health-care professional;
- Number of hours of direct patient care provided at each practice location;
- Specialties of each health-care professional, if applicable;
- Education and training of each health-care professional relating to their profession; and
- Year of birth of each health-care professional.

The Advisory Group has provided substantial input regarding data elements, structure, governance, privacy, and design specifications related to the utilization of this licensure data, which was merged with records from other databases including insurance and Medicaid data to develop the Directory. Specifically, the Advisory Group assisted with the development of a data dictionary relating to the data points collected and how each data point was defined.

Revenues and Expenditures

The Group does not generate any revenue, nor does it have any separate expenditures. Members of the Advisory Group meet on a voluntary basis and receive no compensation or reimbursement for any expenses related to the performance of their duties.¹⁶

Meetings of the Advisory Group

Table 1 provides the Advisory Group meeting dates and the number of members in attendance at each meeting.

¹⁴ § 12-30-106(1), C.R.S.

¹⁵ § 12-30-106(2), C.R.S.

¹⁶ § 12-30-106(3)(a)(III), C.R.S.

Table 1
Advisory Group Meetings
Fiscal Years 13-14 through 17-18

Meeting Date	Number of Members in Attendance
May 29, 2014	14
July 22, 2014	16
September 23, 2014	21
November 18, 2014	24
August 3, 2015	25
January 28, 2016	18
March 31, 2016	35
December 6, 2017	34

The Advisory Group typically meets in person on an as-needed basis and meetings are open to the public, with an average attendance from fiscal year 13-14 through 17-18 of approximately 23 members per meeting. There are no quorum requirements for the Advisory Group, and members participate at will.

The Advisory Group has not met in recent years, but plans are being developed for Advisory Group members to meet periodically in the future so that they may receive status updates regarding the Directory.

Proposals and Their Status

The Advisory Group met on an as-needed basis from April 2014 through December 2017, and although no formal recommendations were made, the Advisory Group did provide input regarding data elements, structure, governance, privacy, and design specifications related to the development of the Directory.

Reasons to Sunset the Advisory Group

The Advisory Group completed its designated work within the first few years of its enactment and held active meetings from April 2014 through December 2017.

The Director intends to continue to hold informal meetings in the future to provide updates to interested Advisory Group members. However, these additional meetings will be arranged for informational purposes only, which would not require a statutory mandate.

Analysis and Recommendation

The Advisory Group has completed the work it was tasked to perform, and the Directory is currently being utilized. There is no further reason to keep the Advisory Group active in statute since future meetings may be scheduled to provide status updates to Advisory Group members regarding any changes to the Directory. Therefore, the General Assembly should sunset the Advisory Group.

Juvenile Justice Reform Committee

Creation, Mission and Make-Up

The Juvenile Justice Reform Committee (Reform Committee), housed in the Department of Public Safety, was created in Senate Bill 19-108 (SB19-108) for the purpose of improving outcomes for youth in the juvenile justice system.

Section 24-33.5-2401, Colorado Revised Statutes (C.R.S.), states that the Reform Committee consists of 30 members:

- The Governor, or his or her designee;
- Four members of the General Assembly, each appointed by the leadership in the Senate and the House of Representatives (House);
- Two judges who handle juvenile matters in the City and County of Denver or at the district court level, appointed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court;
- The Director of the Division of Youth Services (Youth Services), or his or her designee;
- The Director of the Division of Criminal Justice, or his or her designee;
- The Executive Director of the Department of Human Services, or his or her designee;
- The State Court Administrator, or his or her designee;
- The Attorney General, or his or her designee;
- Two state prosecutors with experience in juvenile prosecution and diversion issues, appointed by the Executive Director of the Colorado District Attorneys' Council;
- A representative appointed by the Office of the State Public Defender and a representative appointed by the Office of the Alternate Defense Counsel, who specialize in juvenile defense;
- Two people who oversee local juvenile diversion programs, one appointed by the Speaker of the House and one appointed by the House Minority Leader;
- The Executive Director of the Office of the Child's Representative, or his or her designee;
- The Colorado Child Protection Ombudsman, or his or her designee;
- A representative of an organization advocating for victims of crimes with experience in juvenile cases, appointed by the House Minority Leader;
- A mental health professional who works with juveniles, appointed by the Senate Majority Leader;
- Two employees of counties with experience in juvenile assessments or placement, one from a Class A or B county and one from a Class C or D county, appointed by a statewide organization of counties;
- Two people who are representatives of nonprofit organizations that provide programs to prevent or address juvenile delinquency, one appointed by the Senate Minority Leader and the other appointed by the Speaker of the House;

-
- One juvenile or former juvenile who was charged with a delinquent act, appointed by the House Minority Leader; and
 - Three people who oversee juvenile probation appointed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

The appointing authorities are advised to consider geographic diversity of the membership when making appointments.¹⁷

Responsibilities of the Reform Committee

By September 1, 2019, the Reform Committee is statutorily required to select a validated risk and needs assessment tool to be used prior to disposition, in Youth Services and in juvenile probation departments. The Reform Committee may select more than one validated assessment tool.

By January 1, 2021, the Reform Committee must complete the following duties:

- Determine the population of juveniles subject to the assessment tool;
- Determine who is responsible for conducting the assessments and when and how often an assessment must be performed;
- Adopt policies related to the collection of the assessment results and how results may be shared;
- Adopt policies for the use of the assessment tool, such as guidance for determining supervision levels, length of supervision, conditions of probation and case planning;
- Create a plan for a validation study of the assessment tool;
- Create a plan for the collection and annual reporting of the results of the assessments; and
- Determine, and report to the Office of State Planning and Budgeting, the fiscal cost of collecting and reporting the results of the assessments.

Revenues and Expenditures

The Reform Committee costs are paid for by the General Fund and cover the cost of refreshments and consultant fees for meeting facilitation. Members of the Reform Committee are not paid a *per diem* allowance and their expenses are not covered by the state.

¹⁷ § 24-33.5-2401, C.R.S.

The Reform Committee spent approximately \$129,000 on consultant fees and \$260 on refreshments in fiscal year 19-20 and \$77,500 on consultant fees in fiscal year 20-21. The consultants were paid to provide meeting facilitation and support to the Reform Committee and its working groups including, among other things:

- Assisting with the development of meeting agendas and materials;
- Developing notes and key takeaways for each meeting;
- Assisting working groups with preparing, presenting and achieving consensus on recommendations for the Reform Committee;
- Updating and tracking the Reform Committee’s action plan;
- Researching potential assessment tools;
- Training committee members on assessment tool research;
- Guiding and supporting pilot testing of a screening tool;
- Assisting with the development of performance measures;
- Assisting with the development of an evaluation plan for service providers; and
- Reporting on progress.

Meetings of the Reform Committee

Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, Reform Committee meetings were held at the Department of Public Safety in Lakewood and subsequent meetings were held virtually.

Table 1 provides the Reform Committee meeting dates and the number of members in attendance at each meeting.

Table 1
Reform Committee Meetings
Fiscal Years 19-20 and 20-21

Meeting Date	Number of Members in Attendance
June 25, 2019	24
July 23, 2019	24
August 22, 2019	24
October 22, 2019	22
January 28, 2020	19
March 24, 2021	19
May 26, 2020	20
June 23, 2020	24
July 28, 2020	23
September 22, 2020	19
October 27, 2020	23
November 24, 2020	22
December 22, 2020	23
March 23, 2021	16
June 22, 2021	19

In 2019 and 2020, the Reform Committee meetings were typically held monthly, but in 2021, the committee moved to quarterly meetings. On average, 21 members attended each meeting.

Proposals and Their Status

The Reform Committee was tasked with completing the following task by September 1, 2019:

- Select an assessment tool.

Status: Completed. The Reform Committee selected the Youth Level of Supervision assessment tool for State Judicial Probation and the Youth Assessment Screening Instrument for Youth Services.

The Reform Committee was tasked with completing the following tasks by January 1, 2021:

-
- Select a mental health screening tool to be used by juvenile diversion programs, probation and Youth Services.

Status: Completed.

- Select a validated risk screening tool for juvenile diversion programs.

Status: Completed.

- Identify and share outcome measures for juvenile diversion programs, juvenile probation and Youth Services.

Status: Completed.

- Adopt a common definition of recidivism to be used by juvenile diversion programs, juvenile probation and Youth Services.

Status: Completed.

- Identify shared outcome measures that service providers receiving state funds must track and report to juvenile probation and Youth Services.

Status: Completed.

- Establish policies for evaluating the effectiveness of service providers.

Status: Completed.

- Determine the population of juveniles for which risk and needs assessments must be conducted prior to disposition, in Youth Services custody and under probation supervision.

Status: Completed.

- Determine the timeframe prior to disposition and regular intervals thereafter that an assessment must be conducted.

Status: Completed.

- Establish policies for the utilization of the assessment tool to guide supervision levels, length of time on supervision, develop individualized conditions of probation and develop case plans.

Status: Completed.

- Develop a plan to conduct a validation study of the risk assessment tool.

Status: Completed.

- Approve a funding formula to be used to allocate state diversion funds across each of the 22 judicial districts.

Status: Completed.

- Develop a plan to collect and report data on the results of the assessments.

Status: Ongoing.

- Calculate the cost of annually collecting and reporting data.

Status: Ongoing.

- Develop a plan for the Department of Human Services and the Judicial Branch to report outcome measures.

Status: Ongoing.

The General Assembly assigned 15 tasks to the Reform Committee. At this time, three tasks remain, and the Reform Committee is expected to complete these tasks by December 31, 2021.

While the work of the Reform Committee was statutorily required to be completed by January 1, 2021, the conditions created by the COVID-19 pandemic necessitated some adjustments to the timeline in order to provide sufficient time for the thoughtful and proper implementation of the Reform Committee's goals, and the sponsors of SB19-108 agreed to the adjusted timeline.

Reasons to Sunset the Reform Committee

Over the past 10 years, states have been using data and research to transform juvenile justice systems. These changes are aimed at achieving better outcomes for youth while maintaining community safety. Rather than incarcerating youth for minor offenses, for instance, judges may instead direct low-risk juvenile offenders to community-based alternatives. States that have enacted such reforms have seen sharp declines in the number of incarcerated youth, resulting in savings that are being redirected to provide services to youth and their families in the community. States also experienced improved outcomes among juvenile offenders, such as more juveniles successfully completing probation.¹⁸

¹⁸ The Pew Charitable Trusts. *How State Reform Efforts Are Transforming Juvenile Justice*. Retrieved September 10, 2021, from <https://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/articles/2019/11/26/how-state-reform-efforts-are-transforming-jvenile-justice>

The Reform Committee which was charged with establishing similar statewide reforms in Colorado will have completed all of the tasks assigned to it prior to the repeal of the authorizing statute. The reforms established by the Reform Committee and required by statute will continue beyond the statutory repeal date, but the responsible agencies, not the Reform Committee, are tasked with implementing these reforms.

According to the Department of Public Safety, once the assigned tasks have been completed, the Reform Committee will not have any additional work, so there are no reasons to continue it. If, for some reason, the Reform Committee is unable to complete the few remaining tasks assigned to it prior to repeal, the Department of Public Safety could always convene an *ad hoc* advisory committee.

Analysis and Recommendation

The work of the Reform Committee is critical for youth involved in the juvenile justice system since it has the potential to improve outcomes for juvenile offenders while at the same time preserving public safety.

It is likely there is still much to be done to improve the juvenile justice system in Colorado, but the Reform Committee is expected to complete all of its statutorily required duties prior to repeal. As there is currently no additional work for the Reform Committee to do, the General Assembly should sunset it.

School Safety Resource Center Advisory Board

Creation, Mission and Make-Up

The School Safety Resource Center and the School Safety Resource Center Advisory Board (Center and Advisory Board, respectively) were established in 2008 via Senate Bill 08-001. The Center and Advisory Board were created to, among other things, prevent and prepare for acts of violence and other emergencies that occur on school campuses. To achieve this, the Center and Advisory Board were created to,¹⁹

foster a cooperative effort among schools, law enforcement agencies, emergency first responders, behavioral health experts, parents and community members to identify, gather and apply the necessary resources.

The Center and Advisory Board were also created to implement emergency response and crisis management measures in all communities within the state to protect students and school personnel.²⁰

Following a sunset review of the Advisory Board in 2016, the General Assembly, via Senate Bill 17-291, continued the Advisory Board for five years, until September 1, 2022. The Center and Advisory Board are housed in the Department of Public Safety (DPS).

The mission of the Center is to assist local schools and communities in creating a safe and positive school environment in Colorado. The Advisory Board was established to recommend policies for the Center.

The Center supports schools and local agencies to address all types of emergencies and crisis situations. The Center accomplishes this by providing free consultation, resources, training and technical assistance to pre-kindergarten through 12th grade and higher education institutions and community partners throughout Colorado.

Section 24-33.5-1804(2)(a), Colorado Revised Statutes (C.R.S.), states that the Advisory Board consists of not less than 14 members, and membership includes:

- One member representing the Department of Education, appointed by the Commissioner of Education (Commissioner);
- One member who possesses professional expertise in behavioral health representing an elementary school or a school district, appointed by the Commissioner;
- One member who is a school administrator, appointed by the Commissioner in consultation with a statewide association of school executives;
- One member who represents state universities and colleges, appointed by the Executive Director of the Colorado Commission on Higher Education;

¹⁹ § 24-33.5-1801(2)(a), C.R.S.

²⁰ § 24-33.5-1801(2)(b), C.R.S.

-
- One member who represents community colleges and local district colleges, appointed by the State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education;
 - One member who is a member of a parents' organization, appointed by the Governor;
 - One member who is a district attorney, appointed by the Governor;
 - One member representing the unit within the Department of Human Services (DHS) that administers behavioral health programs and services, including those related to mental health and substance abuse, appointed by the Executive Director of DHS;
 - One member representing the Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE), appointed by the Executive Director of CDPHE;
 - One member representing the Department of Law, appointed by the Attorney General;
 - One member representing DPS, appointed by the Executive Director of DPS;
 - One member with professional experience in school security, appointed by the Executive Director of DPS;
 - One member representing law enforcement, appointed by the Executive Director of DPS; and
 - One member who is a school resource officer, appointed by the Executive Director of DPS in consultation with a statewide association representing school resource officers.

The Advisory Board has the authority to add additional members with a majority vote and approval of the Executive Director of DPS.²¹ Through this process, the Advisory Board has added five members:

- A representative of the Colorado School Districts Self-Insurance Pool, appointed by the Executive Director of DPS;
- A school principal, appointed by the Executive Director of DPS;
- A classroom teacher, appointed by the Executive Director of DPS;
- A representative of the Colorado Association of School Boards (CASB), appointed by CASB; and
- A school administrator from the Front Range, appointed by the Commissioner.

Each member serves a two-year term.²² If any member vacates his or her office during the appointed term, the Executive Director of DPS must appoint a replacement for the duration of the term.²³

²¹ § 24-33.5-1804(2)(c), C.R.S.

²² § 24-33.5-1804(2)(a), C.R.S.

²³ § 24-33.5-1804(3), C.R.S.

Responsibilities of Advisory Board

The Advisory Board is statutorily required to recommend policies for the Center, with the intent of increasing the effectiveness of school safety in all schools in Colorado, pre-Kindergarten through higher education.

Revenues and Expenditures

The Advisory Board costs are paid for by the Center. Costs include only travel expenses for Advisory Board members to attend meetings. The members are not allocated *per diem*.

In August 2019, an Advisory Board member was reimbursed \$385.84 for mileage expenses while traveling from Cortez to Denver to attend an Advisory Board meeting.

Meetings of the Advisory Board

Table 1 provides the Advisory Board meeting dates and the number of members in attendance at each meeting.

Table 1
Advisory Board Meetings
Fiscal Years 19-20 through 20-21

Meeting Date	Number of Members in Attendance
August 2019	14
October 2019	17
February 2020	15
April 2020	18
October 2020	16
February 2021	17
April 2021	15

The Advisory Board typically meets two or three times per fiscal year, and average attendance from August 2019 to April 2021 was approximately 16 members per meeting.

Proposals and Their Status

During the timeframe examined for this sunset review (fiscal years 19-20 and 20-21), the Advisory Board put forward no new proposals. However, individual Advisory Board members have collaborated with Center staff on initiatives such as: trainings, conference presentations, assisting with introductions to local school officials and supporting regional workshops with expertise, resources and marketing.

Reasons to Continue the Advisory Board

During a sunset review of an advisory board, it is important to establish whether the advisory board has completed the tasks assigned to it by the General Assembly, and whether there is continued work for it to accomplish.

During the timeframe examined for this sunset review (fiscal years 19-20 and 20-21), the Advisory Board did not recommend any proposals to the Center related to revising or implementing new policies to increase the effectiveness of school safety. Nevertheless, many of the Advisory Board's previous recommendations remain valid and appear to be working well.

Additionally, it is important to note that individual Advisory Board members have provided a number of ideas and perspectives to Center staff to increase school safety. Thus, Advisory Board members serve as a valuable resource to the Center staff.

Analysis and Recommendation

Given that the overall work of making schools safe is far from complete, and the fact that the Advisory Board provides the Center with diverse perspectives on how to address this challenging issue, the General Assembly should continue the Advisory Board.

Strategic Action Planning Group on Aging

Creation, Mission and Make-Up

The Strategic Action Planning Group on Aging (Planning Group) was established in House Bill 15-1033 as part of the Colorado Comprehensive Strategic Action Plan on Aging Act (Aging Act). The Planning Group exercises its powers and performs its duties independently from the Department of Local Affairs, which acts solely as the Planning Group's fiscal agent.²⁴

In passing the Aging Act, the General Assembly recognized that, among other things:²⁵

- Colorado and the nation face a historic demographic shift as an unprecedented number of workers retire and longevity increases;
- The aging of the state's population will have wide-ranging economic, workforce and social effects on all of society;
- The aging of the state's population will create opportunities to learn from that population;
- The aging of the state's population will place significant financial pressure on families, have significant positive and negative long-term impacts on various sectors of the state's economy and will place unprecedented demands on public sector programs and budgets (i.e., Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, housing, transportation and health care); and
- The aging of the state's population could significantly impact future state income and sales tax revenues, as well as local sales and property tax revenue.

The Planning Group consists of 23 Governor-appointed members:²⁶

- Four who represent consumers. These four must include two from nonprofit organizations representing or advocating for older adults, one representative of an area agency on aging and three consumers of services for older adults;
- Five who represent private, public and community-based health care and long-term care, service or support providers for older adults;
- One with knowledge and experience in long-term care, services and supports who is not a provider of such services;
- One who is a county commissioner;
- One who represents Colorado's business community;

²⁴ § 24-32-3405(1), C.R.S.

²⁵ § 24-32-3402(1), C.R.S.

²⁶ § 24-32-3404(2)(a), C.R.S. Of note, section 24-32-3404(2)(a), C.R.S., states that the Planning Group consists of 23 members, whereas section 34-32-3404(2)(b)(I)(C), C.R.S., states that it consists of 21 voting members but the statute provides no indication as to who is or is not a voting member. Additionally, section 24-32-3404(2)(a)(I), C.R.S., states that there are four members who represent consumers, but goes on to enumerate six.

-
- Three with knowledge and experience with state and local budgets and fiscal policy, or who represent nonprofit organizations that have experience with fiscal and statewide policy issues;
 - One who represents institutions of higher education in a field related to older adults; and
 - Five from the executive branch: the executive directors of the Department of Human Services, Department of Health Care Policy and Financing, Department of Public Health and Environment and Department of Transportation, as well as the Chair of the Commission on Aging, or any designees of such individuals.

In making these appointments, the Governor must consider representation for members of diverse racial, cultural, income, gender and ability groups,²⁷ and consult with the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the minority leader of each chamber, to help to ensure that:²⁸

- There is at least one appointment from a rural area,
- At least five different Congressional districts are represented, and
- No more than 10 of the members are from the same political party and that the two major political parties have equal representation.

Members may serve no more than two, four-year terms.²⁹ They do not receive compensation, but may be reimbursed for actual and necessary expenses.³⁰

Notwithstanding the Governor's appointing authority with respect to the Planning Group, the Planning Group itself has made these appointments since 2019.

Additionally, the Aging Act requires the Planning Group to establish specific subcommittees, which may comprise members who are not members of the Planning Group, to focus on:³¹

- Transportation,
- Housing,
- Workforce development,
- Access to health care,
- Long-term care and other human services, and
- Retirement security.

The Planning Group must also establish a technical advisory committee consisting of the State Demographer and subject matter experts from local government and nongovernmental organizations.³²

²⁷ § 24-32-3404(2)(b)(II), C.R.S.

²⁸ § 24-32-3404(2)(b)(I), C.R.S.

²⁹ § 24-32-3404(2)(f), C.R.S.

³⁰ § 24-32-3404(2)(e), C.R.S.

³¹ § 24-32-3404(2)(h), C.R.S.

³² § 34-32-3404(2)(h)(III), C.R.S.

Responsibilities of the Planning Group

The Planning Group's primary statutory task is to develop a strategic action plan on aging in Colorado through 2030 by November 1, 2016 (action plan). The action plan is required to address:³³

- *Demographic, economic, fiscal and budget data analysis*, including anticipated demographic shifts, projected impacts on state and local tax revenues and budgets; projected effects of state and local budgetary shortfalls, potential impacts on Medicaid and other safety net programs, analysis of any retirement savings gaps and retirement security among older adults, projected cost trends of long-term care, services and supports; analysis of potential demand for community-based and other types of services and supports to keep older adults in their residences for as long as possible and analysis of any private sector initiatives to address retirement preparedness and long-term care, services and support for older adults;
- *Actionable recommendations*, including options to address the long-term impacts of demographic shifts, options to address disproportional regional demographic shifts, options to improve financial security and retirement preparation, options to strengthen and improve service quality and infrastructure for long-term services and supports, options to improve the accessibility and sustainability of affordable housing and transportation services and possible legislation and regulatory changes to implement the Planning Group's recommendations; and
- *Plans for updates to the action plan.*

In developing the action plan, the Planning Group is required to examine the impacts of the aging demographic shift on:³⁴

- The economy, workforce and businesses and market-based products and services;
- State and local revenue, budgets and fiscal policies;
- Medicaid and other safety-net programs;
- Family caregiving and private and public options for long-term care, services and supports;
- The effects of potential federal entitlement reforms on Colorado; and
- Transportation services and infrastructure.

Additionally, the Planning Group was required to provide oral reports to the Joint Budget Committee (JBC) during the 2016 and 2017 legislative sessions.³⁵ The Planning Group provided an oral report to the full JBC in 2016 and met with individual JBC members in 2017.

³³ § 24-32-3406(1), C.R.S.

³⁴ § 24-32-3404(1)(a), C.R.S.

³⁵ § 24-32-3406(2), C.R.S.

Revenues and Expenditures

The Aging Act creates the Strategic Action Plan on Aging Cash Fund (Aging Cash Fund), which consists of any money appropriated by the General Assembly and any gifts, grants or donations received.³⁶

Subject to available appropriations, the Planning Group is authorized to contract with a third-party for data analysis and projection reporting.³⁷ Towards this end, over the years the Planning Group has contracted with the Colorado Health Institute, the Highland Group and the Colorado Futures Center at Colorado State University. Since all of these contracts occurred prior to fiscal year 19-20, expenditures are not reflected in the table below. However, the table does reflect these expenditures for the fiscal years indicated.

Additionally, the Planning Group is required to contract with a third-party project administrator and project assistant.³⁸ For most of the Planning Group's history, it has contracted with a multi-disciplinary team to perform these functions.

The Planning Group is specifically exempt from the state's Procurement Code.³⁹

Table 1 illustrates, for the fiscal years indicated, the Planning Group's expenditures and the nature of those expenditures.

Table 1
Planning Group Expenditures

Nature of Expenditure	FY 19-20	FY 20-21	Total
Administrator/Coordinator	\$60,704.85	\$74,830.37	\$135,535.22
Travel Reimbursement	\$1,262.90	\$0	\$1,262.90
Action Plan Printing	\$0	\$1,902.99	\$1,902.99
Total	\$61,967.75	\$76,733.36	\$138,701.11

The Planning Group has solicited grants on at least three separate occasions, with mixed success. In 2017, the Planning Group worked with the Governor's Office to secure \$450,000 from the NextFifty Initiative to support a Senior Policy Advisor on Aging in the Governor's Office.

In 2018, the Planning Group sought another grant from the NextFifty Initiative to fund Planning Group activities, it but did not secure the grant.

³⁶ § 24-32-3407(1), C.R.S.

³⁷ § 24-32-3404(3), C.R.S.

³⁸ § 34-32-3404(4), C.R.S.

³⁹ § 24-32-3405(5)(a), C.R.S.

Also in 2018, the Planning Group secured \$15,000 in funding from the Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG) to fund administrative support.

As a result, most of the Planning Group's expenditures have been funded with General Fund dollars.

Meetings of the Planning Group

The Planning Group meets on a monthly basis and most meetings last three hours. For most of the Planning Group's history, DRCOG has provided space in its offices in Denver for these monthly meetings. Since 2020, all monthly meetings have been held virtually, due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Table 2 provides the Planning Group's meeting dates, as well as the number of Planning Group members and the number of members of the public in attendance at each meeting.

Table 2
Planning Group Meetings

Meeting Date	Number of Members in Attendance	Members of the Public in Attendance
July 8, 2019	16	14
August 12, 2019	10	2
September 9, 2019	17	9
October 7, 2019	15	8
November 4, 2019	18	6
December 9, 2019	14	9
January 13, 2020	17	10
February 10, 2020	16	15
March 9, 2020	17	5
April 13, 2020	21	18
May 11, 2020	18	20
June 8, 2020	19	15
July 13, 2020	18	56
August 10, 2020	19	22
September 14, 2020	18	22
October 5, 2020	16	15
November 9, 2020	19	20
December 14, 2020	18	24
January 11, 2021	19	20
February 8, 2021	19	19
March 8, 2021	16	32
April 12, 2021	19	31
May 10, 2021	17	32
June 14, 2021	14	29

As Table 2 illustrates, for the two fiscal years examined, an average of 17 Planning Group members attended each meeting and an average of 19 members of public also attended.

Although the Planning Group’s chair is required to establish a meeting schedule, the Planning Group must meet at least 12 times per year,⁴⁰ which it did in fiscal years 19-20 and 20-21.

⁴⁰ § 24-32-3405(3), C.R.S.

Although the Planning Group is generally subject to the state's open meetings law and the Colorado Open Records Act, groups of no more than five of the Planning Group's members may meet and be exempt from the open meetings law, to gather and understand data and to organize and plan for the business of the Planning Group.⁴¹

In addition to its monthly meetings in Denver, the Planning Group holds regional meetings, the locations of which have included Aurora, Craig, Durango and Southwest Colorado, Grand Junction, La Junta, Montrose, Pueblo and Sterling, as well as Eagle, Grand, Jackson, Pitkin and Summit counties.

Finally, the Planning Group has created several committees, as required by statute, since its inception:

- Executive Committee - this committee was formed in 2015 and continues to meet twice a month.
- Technical Advisory Committee - this committee was formed in 2015 and met twice a month in 2016 and 2017. It has since been dissolved.
- Workforce Development Committee - this committee was formed in 2015. It met every two weeks in 2016, monthly in 2017 and 2018 and five times a year since 2019.
- Transportation Committee - this committee was formed in 2015 and met twice a month in 2016. It did not meet in 2017, it but resumed meeting in 2018 through 2019.
- Rural Transportation Committee - this committee was formed in 2020 and met every other month for that year only.
- Education and Engagement Committee - this committee was formed in 2019 and met every other month for that year only.
- Long-Term Care Committee - this committee was formed in 2016 and met twice a month until it was dissolved at the end of 2016.
- Long-Term Services and Supports Committee - this committee was created in 2020 and continues to meet every other month.
- Long-Term Care and Caregiving Committee - this committee was formed in 2021 with plans to meet five times a year.
- Retirement Security Committee - this committee was formed in 2015 and met twice a month until it was dissolved in 2016.
- Technology and Innovation Committee - this committee was formed in 2017 and continues to meet monthly.
- Local and Regional Implications and Planning Committee - this committee was formed in 2017 and met monthly in that year only.
- COVID Committee - this committee was created in 2021 and plans to meet at least five times a year through the end of the year.
- Access to Healthcare/Healthcare Committee - this committee was formed in 2015 and met twice a month until it was dissolved in 2016.

⁴¹ § 24-32-3405(5)(b), C.R.S.

-
- Physical Environment Committee - this committee was formed in 2016 and met twice a month until it was dissolved later that same year.

Although the Planning Group was statutorily directed to create a committee to address housing issues, the Planning Group instead discussed such issues at its regular monthly meetings.

Finally, the Planning Group created a Disparities Task Force in 2021 to consider the impact of race, ethnicity, gender and geographic location on older adults in Colorado, to better engage with older adults of color and to assist the Planning Group in making more equity-focused recommendations.

Proposals and Their Status

Since its creation in 2015, the Planning Group has, among other things, made more than 50 recommendations. Below are a few highlights of those recommendations from fiscal years 19-20 and 20-21.

- The Planning Group recommended that the Governor create a permanent, high-level office or position in the executive branch to be accountable for and to lead the state's work on issues pertaining to aging. The Planning Group also recommended that the General Assembly consider establishing a similar position in the legislative branch.

In 2018, The NextFifty Initiative provided funding for a new position in the Governor's Office—Senior Policy Advisor on Aging, which was filled in 2019.

- In an effort to create age-friendly communities, the Planning Group played a key role in launching the Lifelong Colorado Initiative.

Launched in 2018, this initiative went statewide in 2021 with the Senior Advisor on Aging developing a statewide plan that was adopted by the Governor's Office that same year. The plan covers eight domains of aging, including transportation, housing, outdoor spaces and buildings, social participation, work and civic engagement, communication and information, respect and social inclusion.

- The Planning Group recommended the creation of a talent pipeline that includes older adults and that increases workforce opportunities for them through appropriate access to education and training.
 - *An older adult was placed on the Colorado Workforce Development Council in 2019;*

-
- *The Mature Worker Task Force was created and held meetings in 2019 and 2020;*
 - *The Colorado Workforce Development Council and the Governor’s Office supported the Colorado Above Fifties Employment Strategies Conference in February 2020; and*
 - *House Bill 21-1264 mentioned the work needs of older adults.*
- The Planning Group recommended increasing retirement savings for all Coloradans.

The Colorado Secure Savings Program, which will become operational by the end of 2021, was designed to increase access to retirement savings for nearly 1 million Coloradans who do not currently have a way to save for retirement through their jobs.

The Financial Security Coalition was created in 2019 to, among other things, address financial fraud and abuse of older adults.

- The Planning Group recommended measures to protect older adults from mistreatment, abuse, neglect and exploitation.

The Office of Public Guardianship was created in 2017 and funded in 2019, to provide guardianship services for indigent and incapacitated adults when other guardianship possibilities are exhausted.

- The Planning Group recommended the development of statewide family caregiver support policies.

Efforts have included securing paid family leave for family and related members to have financial support while they care for an aging loved one. While multiple legislative efforts were made prior to 2019, in 2020, Colorado voters approved a ballot initiative that will, among other things, provide most workers in Colorado with up to 12 weeks of partial pay and job security for various family- and medical-related absences from work.

- The Planning Group recommended the state improve accountability of health-care spending and support community-based providers.

Senate Bill 21-290 secured \$15 million in funding for the statewide network of community-based providers for services for older adults.

Among the Planning Group’s additional accomplishments are:

- Development and publication of the *Strategic Action Plan on Aging* in 2018 and 2020, with an update in 2019;

-
- Multiple written reports that included policy analysis to inform the action plan in 2016, 2018, 2019 and 2020, as well as several subject-specific reports on topics such as caregiving, housing, supportive communities, transportation, finance and long-term services and supports;
 - Establishment of the Legislative Caucus on Aging in 2018. This caucus, with bipartisan chairs, provides an opportunity for aging providers, advocates and other stakeholders to engage with legislators, legislative staff and relevant members of the executive branch;
 - The Planning Group's monthly newsletter provides a communications channel between the Planning Group and its various stakeholders. As of the writing of this report, the newsletter had a distribution of 1,355 individuals;
 - In 2018, the Planning Group, along with other organizations, sponsored the Special Forum on the Homestead Exemption. This four-hour event, attended by more than 250 individuals, resulted in the Colorado Legislative Council's Homestead Exemption Report, which compared Colorado's homestead exemption to similar programs in other states; and
 - In 2016 and 2021, the Planning Group participated in several social media campaigns to raise awareness of the challenges and opportunities facing older adults.

In short, the Planning Group has accomplished more than can be adequately covered in this sunset report.

Reasons to Sunset the Planning Group

The population of the U.S. is aging. According to at least one source,

The number of Americans ages 65 and older is projected to nearly double from 52 million in 2018 to 95 million by 2060, and the 65-and-older age group's share of the total population will rise from 16 percent to 23 percent.⁴²

In other words, the demographic shift that the Planning Group was created to address is not only imminent, but it has begun. The Planning Group has made recommendations regarding, or at least studied, the topics of the state's economy, workforce, business and market-based products and services to support older adults, state and local budgets and fiscal policies, Medicaid and other safety net programs, family caregiving and long-

⁴² Population Reference Bureau. *Fact Sheet: Aging in the United States*. Retrieved August 24, 2021, from www.prb.org/resources/fact-sheet-aging-in-the-united-states/

term care and support services, the impacts of potential federal entitlement reforms, transportation and infrastructure.

The Planning Group has at least addressed much that it was tasked with, but the issues surrounding the looming demographic shift will continue to evolve. This would seem to argue in favor of continuing the Planning Group.

However, many agree that while long-term, holistic planning must continue, the time has come to begin to operationalize the work that the Planning Group has already completed. It seems reasonable to expect such important work to be completed by a state body. As a body whose only real tie to state government is through its fiscal agent, the Department of Local Affairs, the Planning Group is ill suited to this new task.

Analysis and Recommendation

Although the Planning Group may be ill suited to the task of operationalizing the recommendations it has made and the ideas it has put forward, it is not the only organ of state government focused on ageing.

The Colorado Commission on Aging (CCOA), while tasked with a very different mission than the Planning Group and having a distinctly different structure, is one such body. Housed in the Department of Human Services, CCOA's focus has traditionally been on the more vulnerable, whereas the Planning Group has had a much broader focus, looking at the poor and wealthy, the ill and the healthy. Further, CCOA's membership is based on geographic diversity, whereas the Planning Group's membership reflects its mission, with representation from a wide variety of groups and sectors representing older adults, as well as the state institutions that serve them.

While the CCOA's current mission and composition do not necessarily align with those of the Planning Group, the General Assembly could make the necessary changes to build upon the foundation laid by the Planning Group.

Stakeholders have repeatedly insisted that regardless of which organization assumes the responsibilities of the Planning Group, that organization must have the freedom and independence to make recommendations and to address the complicated and intertwined issues that comprise any meaningful discussion on aging and how the state will address this enormous demographic shift.

In the end, however, the Planning Group has largely fulfilled its mission. Therefore, the General Assembly should sunset the Planning Group.