

# COLORADO COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

November 4, 1999  
Metropolitan State College of Denver  
Denver, Colorado

## MINUTES

Commissioners Present: J. Lamar Allen; Raymond T. Baker; Alexander E. Bracken, Chair; Terrance Farina; David Greenberg; Robert Hessler; Peggy G. Lamm; Ralph Nagel, Vice Chair; Dean Quamme; and William Vollbracht.

Advisory Committee Present: Senator Kenneth Arnold; Penelope Bauer; Representative Nolbert Chavez; Senator James Dyer; Calvin Frazier; Jane Duncan; Sandy Hume; and Representative Keith King.

Commission Staff Present: Timothy E. Foster, Executive Director; Jeanne Adkins; JoAnn Evans; Lauren Farris; Gail Hoffman; and Raymond Kieft.

### I. Call to Order

The regular meeting of the Colorado Commission on Higher Education was called to order at 9:20 a.m. in the Tivoli Student Union at the Auraria Higher Education Center. Metropolitan State College of Denver hosted the meeting.

**Action:** Commissioner Greenberg moved approval of the minutes of the October 7, 1999, meeting. Commissioner Vollbracht seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

### II. Reports

#### A. Chair's Report

Chair Bracken reported that Commissioner Marion Gottesfeld was excused absent. He also reported that Governor Owens will host a higher education governing board conference on Monday, November 15, 1999, in Denver to discuss board responsibilities based on a student-centered approach. The Commission is looking forward to participating in the conference.

#### B. Commissioners' Reports

No reports.

#### C. Advisory Committee Reports

Faculty representative Dr. Penelope Bauer reported that the Colorado Faculty Advisory Committee (CFAC) met October 15, 1999, at Red Rocks Community College and she distributed the CFAC bylaws. She reported that CCHE staff members Jeanne Adkins and Ray Kieft updated CFAC on various studies and initiatives going on in higher education. CFAC wants to assure the Commission and the higher education community that it is committed to quality education and will work with the state toward that goal. CFAC invited the Commission to attend the next CFAC meeting in April.

Student representative Jane Duncan reported that the Colorado Student Association (CSA) held its representative assembly and solidified the platforms for the year. Those platforms are to work with the Commission on QIS, request the Joint Budget Committee (JBC) for a line item for graduate programs, student fee autonomy, diversity recruitment and retention. CSA will host a leadership conference February 18-20, 2000.

Senator Arnold reported there have been several good meetings in the past few weeks with the Governor's Education Summit, and the Business and Education Coalition on how education is affecting the business community.

### III. Consent Item

#### A. Mesa State College 1999 Facilities Master Plan Supplement

Jeanne Adkins stated that Mesa State College Facilities Master Plan Supplement responds to the six recommendation included as part of the CCHE analysis and the seventh recommendation made by the Commission at the July 1, 1999 meeting. Gail Hoffman prepared an analysis of the response by Mesa State College to the issues raised when the Facilities Master Plan was submitted.

Chair Bracken clarified that upon approval of this consent item, the Commission approves the supplemental information submitted to Mesa State. When facility program plans are submitted in the areas listed in the agenda, the plans need to address the supplemental information material in bold-faced type (as outlined in this month's agenda item). Approval of the master plan item does not mean approval of the plan.

Vice Chair Nagel recommended that item 6 regarding the planning for new apartment facilities on the main campus be deleted from the master plan because housing is not an essential part of the academic plan. He suggested Mesa State College pursue private funding or private ownership of the apartment facilities similar to the University of Northern Colorado's plan for a privately-owned apartment project. Higher education funding should go to academic needs and allow the private or community sector to respond to housing facility needs.

Commissioner Farina suggested the apartment facility remain in the facilities master plan because it allows the institution to explore private development as opposed to public development.

Ms. Adkins stated that the CCHE policy lists the process as guidelines rather than policy. They do not bind the commission. The facility program plan element is where the policy directs specific things to happen. The Commission may want to look at the current policy to see how it plays out with institutions. The current policy is not as clear on what a master plan should be. Approval of the facilities master plan is not approving a specific type of project. Mesa State is aware that the Commission is not interested in promoting housing projects on campus.

Chair Bracken reiterated that by preserving in the master plan the element of planning for new apartment facilities on the main campus it emphasizes that housing a key component of how Mesa approaches the plan. He also pointed out that Mesa representatives were present at the meeting and had heard the commission discuss involvement of the private sector in potential projects.

**Action:** Commissioner Greenberg moved to accept the Mesa State College 1999 Facilities Master Plan Supplement upon consent. Commissioner Quamme seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

#### IV. Action Items

##### A. Capital Construction Program Priority of Funding for FY 2000-2001 Capital Construction Requests

Ms. Jeanne Adkins outlined the elements of the CCHE staff's preliminary recommendations for facility funding priorities for the state higher education system. The Commission is charged by the General Assembly with establishing "a unified five-year capital improvements program coordinated with education plans" and recommending the priority of funding capital construction projects for the system of public higher education.

The subcommittee on capital construction is comprised of Commissioners Raymond Baker, Ralph Nagel, Dean Quamme, and William Vollbracht. The subcommittee recommended a pilot project to propose to the Capital Development Committee outlined in Attachment A (of this agenda). The pilot would provide single-year design funding for concept drawings on a project. Allocation of the design resources would not bind the commission to approve the project. However, it would provide future commissioners with a more complete picture of a specific project, including architectural concept drawings that would actually reflect the project on a specific site. The pilot is proposed for a single year under the Capital Construction Consultant Services category of the commission's spending plan Policy L.

In the past program plans from campus have sometimes changed over the life of the plan. The CCHE revised policy covers the change. Proposing a more limited conceptual design phase allows the Commission to determine what it is investing in. If this is successful, the program plan will be eliminated and replaced with a conceptual paper request for funding. This process will save institutions both time and money. CCHE will need to monitor the pilot projects to determine whether Commission objectives are met and true savings are realized.

Ms. Adkins pointed out that the standards for prioritizing capital construction projects have not been updated since 1987. She recommended that upon completion of the HB99-1289 study that the categories be re-examined to relate to updated technology. Ms Adkins outlined the list of projects which will be presented to the Capital Development Committee on Monday, November 8, 1999.

Ms Adkins reported that the subcommittee has held meetings with the University of Colorado Health Sciences regarding Fitzsimmons and Community College and Occupational Education regarding Lowry. There are some outstanding issues at this time and the subcommittee does not recommend approving those program plans at this time. If the issues are worked out then the projects will move forward.

She also pointed out that approval of the list presented as the attachment to the agenda would deny the program plans submitted and not recommended for approval by the Commission subcommittee.

Upon approval of the list by the Commission it will be presented to the Capital Development Committee as the Commission's priority spending plan. In addition the Commission will approve the concept of the 8% pilot project and the program denials.

Lauren Ferris reported the new streamlined process would be developed based on the results of the pilot project. Once the evaluation and investment is made, the construction of the facility will stay with the original plan for the facility. Cooperative arrangements using the CMGC process (Construction Management/General Contractor) could be expanded with this approach.

Commissioner Nagel supported the pilot project goals to avoid micromanaging the institutions, but to bring integrity and comprehensive review to the program plan process. He recommended that institutions identify investment money in the community to bring the project to clarity before bringing projects to the commission.

Chair Bracken invited comments from institutions and there were none.

### **Staff Recommendation**

1. That the Commission staff recommend the approval of the attached draft prioritization list (Attachment 2) and referral of the prioritized list to the legislative Capital Development Committee, Joint Budget Committee and the Office of State Planning and Budgeting as required in C.R.S. 23-1-107 (7) (a).
2. That the Commission staff, in conjunction with the Capital Subcommittee, recommends the initiation of a one-year pilot program to allocate 8 percent of the anticipated project architectural and design fees toward the four projects so designated on Attachment 2. This pilot project shall be continuously evaluated by commission and governing board staff to determine whether the option can feasibly replace the existing program plan process. Staff shall report regularly to the subcommittee and to the full commission at the October 2000 meeting on the results of the pilot program with a recommendation on whether it should continue. Approval of these funding

allocations does not constitute final approval of the projects for purposes of consideration of the projects as continuation projects in FY01-02.

3. That the Commission staff and the Capital Subcommittee members recommend continued discussions with University of Colorado Health Sciences Center representatives and Community College and Occupational Education System representatives concerning the Fitzsimons and Lowry program plan requests in FY00-01. A report on the status of these discussions shall be presented at the December 1999 meeting.

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

#### V. Items for Discussion and Possible Action

##### A. Implementation of SB 99-229 and the Quality Indicator System

Dr. Ray Kieft reported that the concepts and components of a Quality Indicator System were introduced in 1996 with the passage of HB 96-1219. During 1996-97, the Commission implemented HB 1219 culminating with the submission of a report to the General Assembly in December of 1998. During 1999, the General Assembly passed SB 99-229 which amended HB 96-1219 by adding specificity and incorporating two directives: (1) benchmarks/standards were to be incorporated for each indicator/measure, and (2) comparisons among institutions would be expected and variances documented.

Governing board representatives, a representative of the Colorado Student Association, and recently, a representative of the Colorado Faculty Advisory Council constitute a Quality Indicator Advisory Committee which has been working with staff for six months toward the goal of implementing SB 99-229. Performance measures have been identified for the eight goals and many of the twenty-three required institutional actions outlined in SB 99-229. Benchmarks have not been identified for all measures at this time. A process for identifying the remaining benchmarks has been established. Relying on the data acquired from the implementation of the set of nine performance measures utilized this year, data acquired from the HB 99-1289 study, and data obtained from peer institutions and other states regarding their particular performance measurement system, the Committee will identify the remaining benchmarks.

Attachment 1 of the agenda includes thirty-one performance measures for measuring institutional performance related to the eight goals and twenty-three required institutional actions specified by SB 99-229. Dr. Kieft drew the Commission's attention to three matters which are important to keep in mind in reviewing Attachment 1:

1) Any Quality Indicator System must be a work in progress and the document is not complete. It will be refined as additional information is obtained and CCHE learns from our experience. The General Assembly understood this in that both HB 96-1219 and SB 99-229 include specific language acknowledging that revision and refinement was expected and would be allowed without returning to the General Assembly for its approval. Performance measures are a work in process and will be refined.

2) Benchmarking and comparisons among institutions must recognize the differences among institutions in terms of role and mission, size, admission standards, budget support, etc. One size does not fit all institutions. Different benchmarks apply to different institutions.

3) SB 99-229, as did HB 96-1219, focuses on undergraduate education. Consequently, the set of performance measures in Attachment 1 does not include measures for either graduation education or graduate research. This should not be interpreted that the Commission does not value graduate education or graduate research.

Dr. Kieft outlined some of the specific performance measures and benchmarks in Attachment 1. He noted the concern expressed by the Quality Indicator System Advisory Committee regarding the funding of costs associated with the various surveys that institutions would be administering. It is suggested that the governing board chief executive officers and Executive Director Foster resolve this concern.

Item XIB requires governing boards to submit a plan for each institution governed by the board outlining a program of graduation year assessment. If the program incorporates the use of a test, the governing board would determine if achieving a certain score would be a requirement of graduation. The Commission does not establish graduation requirements. This measure requires that a graduating student must participate in the assessment but does not require a certain level of performance by the student as a requirement for graduation.

Item XIC requires that institutions implement an assessment of student competency in foundational skills and basic literacy which comprise the curriculum of each institution's general education program (e.g., reading, writing, quantitative, critical thinking). Such an assessment would generally take place toward the end of the sophomore year. No instrument has yet been determined. The Quality Indicator Advisory Committee will be working over the next few months to possibly identify a nationally normed assessment instrument.

SB 99-154 directs that teacher preparation programs be completed in four years with the student majoring in an academic discipline area. SB 99-154 translates into the baccalaureate teacher education program being a 120-credit hour program. Item 19C parallels this requirement for all baccalaureate degree programs with the exception of degree programs that because of accreditation standards or professional association course and program standards, must include more than 120 credit hours. In like fashion, AA and AS degree programs would require no more than 60 credit hours. These measures apply to all institutions.

Commissioner Lamm asked if indicator 11D regarding the graduation assessment program included a provision of an exit examination that if a student failed it, the institution would not allow the student to graduate. Dr. Kieft responded that the indicator did not include that provision since the Commission was not a governing board and did not have the authority to establish graduation requirements. Such a requirement would be determined by the institution and its governing board.

Commissioner Bracken commented on the process over the past three years. In 1996-97, the institutions added 102 institution-specific measures to the brief list of common indicators that

were used for all institutions. The indicators now number thirty-one. He wondered when we were going to stabilize the indicators. He commented that he hoped we would soon reach a point where we define what we measure and stay with it.

Commissioner Farina commented that this entire quality indicator system effort isn't the brain-child of the Commission. It is legislatively mandated and the Commission is carrying out the will of the General Assembly.

Advisory Committee member Penny Bauer commented on the indicators involving class size. She expressed concern that smaller class size expectations will result in hiring more faculty and requiring more classroom space. She also commented that the distance education wording needs clarification since it seems that the indicator is saying that 50% of courses need to be offered by distance education. She suggested it would be useful to hear from members of the QIS advisory committee to hear of concerns before the Commission possibly acts.

Christine Johnson, Vice President of CCCOES, commented that the work of the QIS Advisory Committee and staff has been exhaustive and exhausting. She asked that the Commission look at the cost of the proposed assessment of foundational skills and basic literacy. Who bears the cost? Some of the indicators will be used for the consumer guide and the differentiation of institutions must be tracked carefully in the Consumer Guide. CCCOES supports the Commission approving this set of measures and benchmarks acknowledging that some refinement will take place.

Dave Clark, Vice Chancellor of the CSU system, stated support for Christine Johnson's comments. He noted that each draft of the implementation of SB 99-229 has been an improvement. All elements of SB 99-229 are now incorporated. He requested that the Commission not take action but wait until the December meeting with a more refined document to provide more exact measurements. With regard to the measurement of class size, he anticipated there would be difficulties with competing requirements and desires.

Lee Halgren, Vice President of Academic Affairs and Student Affairs for the State Colleges, stated that there are two levels in discussing the quality indicator system. One area of concern is the number of indicators, not only because of the costs associated with some but the intangible costs associated with the human resource dimension. The impact of institutional staff is considerable. Stable indicators would help the institutions and systems deal with the resource issues. He also asked if quality equals efficiency? Another issue is what is done with the data and how it is presented. The state college institutions are each unique. For example, there are not many students at Metropolitan State College of Denver that will graduate in eight consecutive semesters.

Commissioner Greenberg asked if the Commission acts today, does this preclude refining? Dr. Kieft stated that it is staff's recommendation that the Commission acknowledge that the quality indicator system is a work in progress and will necessitate refinement. Thus, acting today does not preclude continuing to refine the system. Dr. Kieft suggested the Commission delegate to the Executive Director the authority to refine the system. The Commission would be kept informed of any substantive refinements.

Commissioner Bracken commented that a report on the implementation of SB 99-229 has to be to the legislature by early December.

Commissioner Vollbracht asked how long had the Quality Indicator Advisory Committee been meeting and could all the issues be resolved in two weeks? He thought that to come to a conclusion of what quality is cannot be concluded in two weeks.

Commissioner Allen stated that there are and there will be unintended consequences of any such system and the Quality Advisory Committee and staff would smooth out those unintended consequences.

Michel Dahlin, Assistant Vice President of the CU system, echoed comments of the other governing board representatives. She commented that there is limited national data and some benchmarks have been established without much outside validity. She stated that she is sympathetic to the timeframe. If the Commission allows refinement and addresses the cost issues, the CU system supports approval of the staff recommendation with refinements incorporated.

Commissioner Lamm asked how long it might take to work out the details. Vice President Dahlin responded at least two more meetings. The sophomore foundational skills and basic literacy competency assessment may take longer since there is a philosophical level of concern about the entire matter. Some basic skills continue to be addressed and learned at the upper division level. Another concern is with institutions which admit students that have better preparation than other institutions with different index score.

Robert Moore, Vice President for Business Affairs at the Colorado School of Mines (CSM), expressed concern about the rising junior exam. The Colorado School of Mines sees no value in establishing a sophomore exam system-wide. Institutions have varying admission criteria and CSM has a narrowly focused role and mission.

Senator Arnold asked why the institutions don't know what quality is. He said that the institutions have been involved with quality for many years and should know everything there is to know about it. He asked whether the institutions have been using individual quality indicators and assessments. Even though some performance measures are not easily translated into numbers, the institutions should be able to measure performance and quality.

Representative King commented that he believes that quality exists in faculty contact hours and class size. An earlier version of the plan recommended a 40-hour workweek, and it seems to no longer be included. The way to achieve success is to have smaller classes and increased faculty contact.

Dr. Kieft noted that teaching hours as a percentage of a 40-hour workweek is included as indicator IVA. Benchmarks have not yet been established for this measure as national benchmark data has not yet been verified.

Commissioner Bracken suggested that the motion to accept the staff recommendation be approved with the understanding that authority would be delegated to the Executive Director working with the Quality Indicator System Advisory Committee to address the issues raised during this meeting to incorporate refinements.

### **Staff Recommendation**

That the Commission adopt Attachment 1 (of the agenda) as its response to implementing SB 99-229 and as its Quality Indicator System.

**Action:** Commissioner Lamm made a motion to accept the staff recommendation with the caveat to delegate to the Executive Director the authority to incorporate refinements as discussed at this meeting. Commissioner Hessler seconded the motion. The sentiment of the motion is that the Quality Indicator System report is a work in process. The motion carried unanimously.

### B. Master Plan

Executive Director Tim Foster stated that the second draft of the higher education master plan has been revised slightly from the first draft presented at the October 7, 1999, Commission meeting. The purpose of the master plan is to provide a framework and an outline of the goals and objectives of the Commission. The master plan was brought to the Commission to receive input from the Commission as well as from the higher education community. In addition, during the month of December, Mr. Foster will discuss the draft master plan with all higher education governing boards to obtain their input into the plan as well as schedule meetings with various chambers of commerce. The master plan will come back to the Commission in more final form for approval.

## VI. Written Reports for Possible Discussion

### A. Fall Enrollment Report

The Commission accepted the 1999 *Fall Enrollment Report*. The report includes historical headcount and FTE data for Colorado public postsecondary institutions, and provides an enrollment outlook for the current year.

### B. Five-Year Capital Improvements Program, FY 2000-01 Through FY 2004-05.

The Commission accepted the *Five-Year Capital Improvements Program, FY 2000-01 through FY 2004-05* report.

### C. Report on Out-of-State Instruction

The Commission accepted the report on out-of-state instruction.

To be delivered by the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center:

*Management of Urinary Tract Infections* to be delivered as teleconferences in cities throughout the United States after September 1, 1999. The University will report actual sites and delivery dates in its FY 2000 annual report on out-of-state instruction.

*Combined Modality Therapy for Early Stage Lung Cancer* to be delivered in Florida September 18, 1999, and at eight additional sites in the continental United States (to be identified later) in October and November 1999.

*New Concepts and Directions in Thyroidology* to be delivered in Florida September 29, 1999.

To be delivered by Western State College:

RECR 397, Special Topics, to be delivered in Canada February 20-26, September 24-October 7, 2000 and in Mexico March 4-10, March 12-18, and March 26-April 1, 2000.

To be delivered by Adams State College:

ED 589, *Eye Exercises to Make Learning Easy* to be delivered November 27-December 12, 1999, in Hawaii; and

PSYC 589, *Reaching Kids Through Whole Brain/Body Learning* to be delivered December 27, 1999-January 9, 2000.

D. Concept Paper

1. Bachelor of Science (B.S.) in Computer Engineering at Colorado State University.

The Commission accepted the concept paper for the Bachelor of Science in Computer Engineering at Colorado State University.

**Action:** Commissioner Greenberg moved to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Baker seconded the motion and the meeting adjourned at 11:48 a.m.

Upon adjournment Dr. Sheila Kaplan, President of Metropolitan State College of Denver, gave an overview of the history of Metropolitan State College of Denver, and the Auraria Higher Education Center. Metro State has open enrollment admission standards and is the third largest college in Colorado with 12,200 FTE. She thanked the Commission for their support of the institution.