

# COLORADO COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

July 1, 1999  
Tivoli Student Center  
Auraria Higher Education Center  
Denver, Colorado

## MINUTES

Commissioners: Present: Raymond T. Baker; Alexander E. Bracken, Chair; Terrance Farina; Marion Gottesfeld; David Greenberg; Robert Hessler; Peggy G. Lamm; Ralph Nagel; William Vollbracht; and J. Timothy Waters.

Advisory Committee: Present: Senator John Andrews; Senator Kenneth Arnold; Senator James Dyer; Jane Duncan; Sandy Hume; and Representative Keith King.

Commission Staff: Present: Timothy E. Foster, Executive Director; Jeanne Adkins; JoAnn Evans; Rick Hum; Jeff Richardson; and Sharon Samson.

### I. Call to Order

The regular meeting of the Colorado Commission on Higher Education was called to order at 8:20 a.m. in the Tivoli Student Center at the Auraria Higher Education Center.

**Action:** Commissioner Hessler moved approval of the minutes of the May 6, 1999, regular meeting. Commissioner Greenberg seconded the motion, and the motion carried unanimously.

### II. Reports

#### A. Chair's Report

Chair Bracken introduced two newly appointed Commissioners, Ms. Peggy G. Lamm and Mr. Raymond T. Baker. The Chair announced that the official executive order of the appointments would be forthcoming. Ms. Lamm replaces Commissioner J. Timothy Waters whose appointment expired July 1, 1999, and Mr. Baker replaces Commissioner Lawrence Adler whose appointment expired June 30, 1999. Additional appointments of Mr. Dean Quamme and Mr. William Vollbracht will serve three-year terms as Colorado Advanced Technology Institute (CATI) Commissioner as a result of SB 99-1359. The four newly appointed Commissioners will go through the Senate confirmation process in the near future.

Chair Bracken recognized Commissioner Waters for his dedicated service to the Commission from 1993 to 1999 and Commissioner Adler for his service from 1995 to 1999. He also reported that Commissioner Lamar Allen was excused absent.

Commissioner Bracken reported that the third in the series of the Governor's community meetings to provide an opportunity for public input to the Consumer Guide was held June 17,

1999, in Loveland. Chair Bracken said it was a productive meeting with the northern Colorado community. In addition to publishing the Consumer Guide, CCHE staff member Shirley Garner Tipton will make the Guide accessible electronically.

Commissioner Greenberg reported that he attended the College Summit graduation ceremony. College Summit is a crash course for prospective students on how to go to college. Commissioner Greenberg found the ceremony to be very moving, and a successful program. The kids were very motivated by the program. Commissioner Greenberg invited the higher institutions to host a Summit on their campus.

## B. Advisory Committee Reports

Representative Keith King stated that the Commission has a good start on the Quality Indicator System, however, there are areas for building upon. He recommended the tightened percentages and expanding specificity.

## III. Action Items

### A. CCHE/CATI Grants for FY 1999-2000

Jeanne Adkins reported that with the transfer of the Colorado Advanced Technology Institute (CATI) grants programs to the Colorado Commission on Higher Education, the Commission is now responsible for the CATI budget. Ms. Adkins outlined the details of the CATI budget. She introduced Dr. Jeff Richardson and Dr. Charles "Chuck" Ferris, formerly CATI staff members and now members of the CCHE staff. Dr. Richardson and Dr. Ferris join Rick Hum to form the CCHE Technology Advancement Group. CATI has been completely integrated into CCHE.

Ms. Adkins provided the Commission with background on the transition of the CATI budget. Budget resources have been reallocated in the administrative line. She also reported that staff are in the process of working with the state auditor regarding the CATI audit. The state auditor will formally review the audit report on August 23, 1999. Staff has addressed the issues raised by the auditors and will address any other issues, which may arise.

Rick Hum briefed the Commission on the reduction in the administrative budget while the rest of the budget remains as proposed by the CATI Commission. Staff is uncertain about the total reduction in the administrative costs at this time. Staff recommended the grants programs be approved as presented in the agenda.

Senator Ken Arnold said that the ongoing grants are to continue the program plan at a reduced amount. Mr. Hum reported that the CATI program managers are not pleased with the 19 percent budget reduction, but have redone their budgets to fit within the 19 percent. Mr. Hum reported that CCHE received 2.8 FTE from CATI.

Representative Keith King inquired whether CATI program plans were tied to specific institutions or being reallocating. Ms. Adkins said that staff will conduct a program review of all

programs but was not altering any programs this year. The University of Colorado as an example is integrated into many of the programs.

Chair Bracken invited comments from governing boards, institutions and the public and there were none.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Approve the CATI program plans at the amounts recommended by the CATI Commission. Direct the CCHE staff to enter into revised contracts with all programs. The responsibility to approve these contracts and establish specific conditions for each program is delegated to the Executive Director. Expenditures beginning with July 1, 1999, are all eligible for grant reimbursement, as long as contracts are approved before December 31, 1999. The Executive Director is given the authority to redistribute any amounts that are not used in this cycle to other approved grants within the total \$2,518,140 for all grants.

**Action:** Commissioner Hessler moved approval of the staff recommendation. Commissioner Farina seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

IV. Items for Discussion and Possible Action

A. Mesa State College 1999 Facility Master Plan, Facility Components

Mesa State College submitted the 1999 Facilities Master Plan to replace the Commission approved 1992 Facilities Master Plan. In February 1999, the Commission discussed the academic/enrollment components of the 1998 Mesa State College Facility Master Plan.

Ms. Gail Hoffman outlined the facilities master plan stating that the total Facilities Master Plan identified capital and auxiliary projects totaling more than \$74 million to meet building space needs in:

- Humanities and Social Science laboratories
- Business Department faculty offices and classrooms
- Library space
- Office-related conference space
- Related student support space
- Physical Plant operational space
- Administrative space for Institutional Advancement

The facilities master plan is being updated because it appears the enrollment projections were understated in the 1992 facilities master plan. Phase I project funds to add approximately 55,000 gsf in the School of Humanities and Social Sciences were included in this year's Long Bill. However, by 2002 Mesa State College anticipates a space deficit of 52,000 asf as a result of enrollment increases.

The master plan update revises the facility plans. The Commission held off action on any facilities proposals until Mesa State College had an opportunity to complete the facilities master plan. The School of Applied Technology located at the Tilman M. Bishop Unified Technical Education Center is expected to generate 90 percent of the FTE growth.

Representative Keith King discussed his concern regarding the proposed purchase of a 200-bed apartment complex by Mesa State to be used for dormitories. He recommended that the institution rent the facility and allow the existing owner to maintain the facility. The institution should consider the condition of the building and the purchase cost to the state as opposed to leasing. Ms. Adkins responded that the master plan will discuss those concerns. She stated that Mesa State College has been very cooperative with CCHE in providing information, particularly with the number of changes in CCHE staff members working on this particular project. The master plan is valid and student-housing needs are validated. The Commission will have an opportunity to address the issue when the program plan is submitted.

Dr. John Fitzgibbon, Vice President of Finance at Mesa State College, said that the college is working very closely with the community and the telecommunication industry to develop courses to meet the community needs. He also said that there are no residential facilities in proximity of Mesa State campus and the institution needs to provide housing for students, either through auxiliary services or other avenues to meet the demand.

Commissioner Nagel suggested that private student housing could be provided at a lower cost. Dr. Fitzgibbon said Mesa State College would explore alternative options. Currently, students are renting private apartments. Dr. Fitzgibbon stated that the institution will provide additional information as stated in the staff recommendation. The information will be included in the master plan because the master plan is an overview of the overall needs. Mesa State College understands the direction the Commission recommended to help refine the facilities master plan.

Commissioner Waters recommended that if the old CCHE standards were used to review the Mesa State master plan, it would be helpful to include the standards used in the evaluation report.

Staff recommends the Commission approve the 1999 Facilities Master Plan for Mesa State College with the exception of the Development Center on the main campus and the Facilities Services Building.

**Staff Recommendation:**

The Commission's conditional approval is contingent upon a recognition that the space deficits on which the plan is based would not exist in several areas under the proposed new benchmarks and that the State College Board of Trustees provide a strategic plan by November 1, 1999, to address the following issues:

1. Providing on-line student services in lieu of additional student services and administrative space at all four campuses for on-site student services and the potential for converting existing service-designated space to other uses.

2. Addressing on-line availability of reference services through its library to supplant the need for physical space outlined in the master plan, particularly for periodical volumes. The analysis that budgetary constraints are forcing cancellation of microfiche copies and a return to paper copies may not be the same if long-term costs of collection storage are factored. The plan does not provide this analysis.
3. Addressing the strategic decisions driving the technology addendum to the 1999 Facilities Master Plan and the factors within that plan that drive additional costs operationally, but which may save capital investment dollars.
4. Purchase of property for expansion of the Tilman M. Bishop Unified Technical Education Center should be re-examined in the following context: whether dual use of facilities at the Main Campus can accommodate a portion or all of future needs at the UTEC campus, and whether distance learning can decrease additional need for capital projects at this campus. A more detailed analysis of this land purchase and its justification should be conducted by the board before submission of a program plan.
5. Before proceeding with plans for additional conference space, an assessment of community participation in a joint-use agreement should be completed to maximize the use of any facility proposed to be constructed or renovated for this purpose.
6. The Facilities Services data indicate a general deficit in the office space category (1,433 assignable square feet). While many facility management functions involve computers, this does not lead to the conclusion that a separate facility should be constructed for this purpose. Some evidence that the institution has examined locating the additional offices within another planned renovation or addition would be appropriate. The ultimate conclusion of the Trustees may be that a separate facility is needed, but the information provided in the plan would not lead to that conclusion.

**Action:** Commissioner Gottesfeld moved approval of the staff recommendation with the amendment that Mesa State College explore the cost comparison of leasing a housing facility as opposed to purchasing the 200-bed facility. Commissioner Greenberg seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

#### B. Academic Master Plan for the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs

Dr. Sharon Samson reported that the academic planning discussion is new to the higher education system. In 1991 the academic master planning process changed from a voluminous process to reviewing academic initiatives. Academic Initiatives showed new initiatives but lacked the context and guiding principles and were less than useful to the Commission. In 1997 the Commission changed the academic planning process and put in place a process that is more sensitive to the changing needs of the institutions. As a result of multiple requests for engineering graduate program approvals in 1998, the Commission stated that they would review the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs (UCCS) Master Plan before considering additional new degree proposals. The Academic Master Plan for the UCCS is the first master

plan to be reviewed under the new planning process. At the next meeting the Commission will discuss all other academic master plans.

The Commission's role in the institutional master plan process is to:

1. Clarify state priorities,
2. ensure that decisions are made along the lines of state priorities in the future and are guided by the priorities,
3. Identify further steps that an institution or governing board need to take to meet statewide goals, and
4. initiate an on-going conversation with the governing boards on the statewide core values.

Under policy the Commission communicates how academic master plans align with state priorities.

Dr. Samson then provided an overview for the UCCS Academic Master Plan. The strength of the plan as presented is that it is an aggressive growth plan with a projection of 10,000-student enrollment. The challenge of the plan is the discrepancy between the funds needed for growth and the resources available at the institution. The opportunity identified in the plan is that the institution is located in a technology rich environment, both internally and externally. The conflict at the system level is that there are issues of duplication and competition. Those issues of duplication may need to be addressed in a broader context than at the institutional level.

UCCS is a comprehensive baccalaureate liberal arts institution with selective admission standards. Under statute it is entitled to offer selective professional and graduate programs for the Colorado Springs area, but it is primarily designed to serve undergraduate students. The institution offers programs available in the liberal arts area, 5 percent in business, 7 percent in education, 28 percent in engineering, 7 percent in health, and 2 percent in professional studies.

Dr. Samson reported that enrollment has increased in headcount and FTE. Headcount growth has increased from 5,940 to 6,540 in the past ten years, all at the undergraduate level. This represents a one percent annual growth rate. Dr. Samson noted that recent growth at UCCS can be attributed to three factors: (1) merger of Beth-El School of Nursing, (2) growth of undergraduate enrollment, and (3) improved sophomore retention rates. The student profile distribution reflects the role and mission of the institution. The program mix appears to be slightly disconnected with the comprehensive liberal arts role and mission because it favors engineering. A review of similar institutions in other states was unable to find another comprehensive liberal arts institution with the number of engineering programs as offered at UCCS.

UCCS depends on state support for 36 percent of its revenue, 35 percent from tuition and fees, and one percent comes from research grants. Dr. Bunnell Shade said that the legislature's current practice of tuition rates impacts the funding issue statewide. The institution is looking at its resources to support the plan.

The board goals of the plan deal with (1) access and choice, (2) the degree the Commission interested in investing in technology, (3) how to promote institutional productivity and quality which are part of the statewide goals, and (4) strategies to fund growth.

Dr. Samson summarized that the issues with the UCCS master plan for the Commission are:

- The cross-impacts on the system pertaining to enrollment.
- The governing board has an issue with funding to sustain the projected growth given UCCS's limited resources.
- The disconnect between the institution's plan and their actions to move forward aggressively with engineering programs.

Chair Bracken summarized that the anticipated outcome of the Commission's discussion of the Academic Master Plan. There is no staff recommendation. The agenda item outlined the major issues for Commission discussion. The focus of the discussion identified the points where UCCSS master plan did not align to the statewide Commission goals.

Dr. Linda Bunnell Shade, Chancellor of UCCS; Regents Jerry Rutledge; Peter Steinhauer; and Norwood Robb; were present to respond to Commission questions. Dr. Bunnell Shade stated that enrollment growth at UCCS has been a function of the role and mission, the growth of the Colorado Springs area in the past 25 years, and demand from the business community for advanced degrees. The number of high school graduates of El Paso County has increased by 21 percent. The addition of campus residence halls has contributed to the enrollment growth and at least 30 percent of students in residence hall are El Paso County residents and the merger with Beth El College of Nursing and Health Sciences. The engineering programs have been approved within the past few years and have five years to reach the enrollment projections. The projected 1,000 foreign student enrollment projection is based on the College of Engineering student exchange program with Finland and the College of Business provides courses internationally.

Regent Peter Steinhauer said that the political climate in Boulder is such that UCB will not grow and the Colorado Springs campus will grow in the future. The Regents' goal is to provide graduate programs at UCCS that will meet the needs of the community.

Regent Jerry Rutledge said the Commission has granted a number of engineering programs at UCCS that reflects the growth of the high technology in the community. However, industries in Colorado Springs are frustrated because their employees cannot get the education they need.

Regent Robb commented that UCCS has deficit resources. The Regents will decide if they will identify needs and make tough decisions to reallocate resources. They may decide to discontinue teacher education programs and freeze enrollment at the Boulder campus. UCCS could become the model distance education campus.

The Commission requested additional information from the CU System to address the disconnect between need for graduate programs in engineering and enrollment decline. Other concerns raised by the Commission include: student financial assistance, the projected enrollment growth

of 1,000 foreign students, availability of resources, the addition of Ph.D. degrees, and other new degree programs.

Rocky Scott, of the Greater Colorado Springs Economic Development Corporation, distributed details about population and employment growth in El Paso County and spoke in support of the academic master plan. He pointed out that there is a demand for degrees by Colorado Springs workers.

Mr. Foster questioned the need for degree programs. At a May meeting with Colorado Springs business leaders, industry representatives expressed interest in courses for employees rather than degree programs. John Riggin, of Hewlett Packard, concurred.

Ms. Heidi Van Heusen, representative of the Colorado Student Association, said that access and affordability are important to students, and inquired about the university's plan to address technology and course fees to students. Dr. Bunnell Shade responded that the institution does not plan to increase student fees but anticipates research activity will bring in revenues and in a fund-raising plan will attract additional dollars.

Dr. David Clark, Vice President of Academic Affairs at the Colorado State University System, explained that the CSU governing board is concerned about the engineering school expansion implied in the UCCS master plan. He suggested the Commission engage a consultant to examine Colorado's ability to support another major engineering college.

Dr. Lee Halgren, Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs at the State Colleges, stated that the concern of the state colleges surrounds the increased undergraduate enrollment. Growth at UCCS at the undergraduate level will receive unnecessary resource investment when other state institutions may be operating under capacity.

Advisory Committee members Representative Keith King and Sandy Hume supported the UCCS academic master plan. Advisory Committee member Senator Arnold stated that he is concerned about program proliferation.

Chair Bracken summarized the Commission position. The Commission supported UCCS's growth plan to become an institution of approximately 10,000 students, confirmed that baccalaureate degrees fit within the role and mission of the campus, doctoral degrees did not, and the master's degree proposals needed to provide bona fide evidence of market demand. It endorsed the University of Colorado's Total Learning Environment goals of student-centered learning and technology-enhanced instruction. It voiced concern about the resource implications of the program plans and encouraged the use of distance learning to meet the needs of the community. The Commission will consider individual degree proposals following these priorities.

### C. Revisions and Updates to the Capital Assets Policies

Ms. Jeanne Adkins outlined the revisions and updates to the Capital Assets Policies. The revised policies provide an opportunity for governing boards to resubmit and reprioritize unfunded

capital construction projects on a regular basis. Under past policy every project would eventually make its way to the top of the priority list. With the revised policy that may still happen but the institution may also reevaluate the priorities.

Ms. Adkins thoroughly outlined all the revisions in the policy which have reduced the policy by ten pages and will improve efficiency for facility planning.

An institution's facility plan should be tied to the academic plan. CCHE staff will evaluate the use of the existing buildings. The data from the HB 99-1289 study will provide the benchmarks. One of the issues of setting a higher benchmark is to define what counts for space needs. Ms. Adkins advised the Commission that to move toward a higher utilization standard there needs to be a greater benchmark in place.

Dr. Jim Topping, of the University of Colorado, said the goal of the revised policy is to gain greater utilization of facilities and reduce capital asset expenditure. Facility operating costs are a great cost to institutions. The 60-hour-per-week goal is something institutions will pursue. The institutions may run into some problems in collecting the space utilization data because collection processes may not be in place at all campuses. Institutions are moving to self-paced, self-programmed instruction and those hours should be included in the equation. The threshold of \$250,000 for cash-funded projects and \$500,000 for state-funded projects should be brought into alignment.

Commissioner Nagel would like an opportunity to discuss a 24-hour day, seven-day-a-week facility utilization plan. Commissioner Bracken recommended there be a specific time trial period prior to re-evaluation of the guidelines to assure the process is working before it becomes policy. There was Commission consensus to move into the 24-hour day and set a specific time for reviewing the guidelines after completion of the HB 99-1289 study.

### **Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends that the Commission approve the revisions to Sections 1.00-18.00 of Section III, Part F – Space Utilization Planning Criteria, with the understanding that information gained in the capital assets portion of the Higher Education study required in HB99-1289 will be used to validate assumptions on which the goals are established.

Staff recommends that the Commission approve Section III, Part Q – Policies for Self-Funded Capital Construction to reflect changes in statute since the policy was first adopted and revised.

Staff recommends that the Commission approve Section III, Part E, sections 1.06 A and B, to reflect a new policy asking governing boards to reprioritize unfunded capital projects if they are being resubmitted in a later funding cycle.

**Action:** Commissioner Nagel moved approval of the staff recommendation with the amendment to apply a 24-hour day, seven-day-a-week facility utilization timeframe. Commissioner Bracken recommended there be a specific time trial period prior to re-evaluation of the guidelines to

assure the process is working before it becomes policy. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hessler and carried unanimously.

V. Written Reports for Possible Discussion

A. Legislative Report, Bill Summary, Budget Summary and Capital Construction Budget

The Commission accepted the Legislative Summary, 1999 Session of the General Assembly, the Bill Summary, Budget Summary and the Capital Construction Budget.

B. Implementation of SB 99-229 – Quality Indicator System

The Commission accepted the preliminary draft set of proposed standards for each major goal area and specific institutional action for the Quality Indicator System.

**Action:** Commissioner Greenberg moved to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Hessler seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 12:00 pm.