

COLORADO COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

August 9, 2000
Teleconference Meeting
Denver, CO

MINUTES

Commissioners Present: Raymond T. Baker; Terrance L. Farina (on-line); Marion Gottesfeld (on-line); Robert Hes (on-line); Peggy Lamm (on-line), Ralph J. Nagel, Chair; James Stewart (on-line) and William Vollbracht.

Advisory Committee Present: Wayne Artis; Aaron Houston; and Sandy Hume (both on-line).

Commission Staff Present: Timothy E. Foster, Executive Director; Jeanne Adkins; JoAnn Evans; James Jacobs; and Sharon Samson.

I. Call to Order

The teleconference meeting of the Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) was called to order by Chair Nagel at 11:15 a.m. in the CCHE office located in the Colorado History Museum Building in Denver, Colorado.

The Chair, Commissioner Ralph Nagel, reported that Commissioners David Greenberg and Dean Quamme were excused.

Commissioner Stewart moved approval of the minutes of the June 1, 2000, regular meeting and the June 14, 2000 teleconference meeting of the Commission. Commissioner Baker seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

II. Reports

A. Chair's Report

Chair Nagel reported that on June 28, 2000, the Capital Assets Subcommittee developed the terms of the intellectual property for the CCHE Technology Advancement Group (TAG) program contract terms. The subcommittee recommended that the institutions and the TAG make contributions and determine any profits on TAG activity on how to allocate profit. The formula for the split is based on the proportionate contributions. This proposal gives the institution full recognition of their contribution of property and staff or any portion thereof. In addition, there is a commitment that any funds reverting to TAG will be used for new student and faculty development opportunities. The formula is based on proportional profits. The institutions responded and countered the proposal that the revenue returned to TAG would be capped at 10 percent, therefore, revenues in excess of the cap will be diverted to central administrative purposes of those institutions.

B. Commissioners' Reports

No reports

C. Advisory Committee Reports

Faculty representative Wayne Artis reported that he met with Executive Director Foster to explore ways that faculty can be more involved. In addition Dr. Artis will submit written comments from faculty on the Statewide Remedial Education Policy.

Student representative Aaron Houston congratulated Commissioner Nagel on his position as Chair of the Commission.

III. Consent Items

Action:

Commissioner Nagel moved that Action Items IV, A (Policy Revisions to the Policy and Procedures for the Discontinuance of Academic Degrees with Low program Demand) and B (Statewide Remedial Education Policy) be moved to Consent

Items. Commissioner Vollbracht seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

A. Capital Assets Subcommittee Delegation Request

In May 2000, the Commission approved the timetable for capital project review for the coming fiscal year and the guidelines for reviewing the pilot projects designated in the current Long Bill. To avoid unnecessary delays resulting from an abbreviated CCHE meeting schedule for the summer, staff requested the Commission delegate approval of the pilot projects to the four-member Capital Assets Subcommittee. Upon approval by the subcommittee the projects will be referred to the Capital Development Committee (CDC) and Joint Budget Committee (JBC). Several projects submitted for state capital funding in the past cycle were assessed as lacking sufficient, updated information to recommend allocation of capital resources. For several projects, changing needs dictated a review of the institution's direction on a project. In other cases, the scope of the project was an issue. As a result, the pilot program was created. The program provides for a complete conceptual drawing plan submission to the Commission on which a final funding determination would be based.

Pilot projects include the Business School renovation at Adams State College, the renovation and addition to the Old Collins High School at CSU, renovation of the Michener Library and a new academic building at UNC and a long-term planning project for the Colorado History Museum. The funding is restricted by footnote and may not be spent until the Commission has approved the revisions of the project plans and forwarded the revisions along with a recommendation to the CDC and JBC.

Only the unrestricted amounts to fund the conceptual design process may be spent by the institutions without further approval by the CCHE and the legislative committees. The Commission will not meet in September and staff reviews several projects are likely to be ready for subcommittee review prior to the October meeting.

Staff Recommendation:

That the Commission delegate to its Capital Assets Subcommittee the authority to approve the pilot projects and forward any approved projects to the CDC and JBC.

B. Technology Advancement Group Funding of Rural Technology Program

A concept proposed program to build the capacity of rural Colorado to participate in the opportunities of the new economy has been received and reviewed by staff. The Technical Advancement Group (TAG) staff and Advisory Board find potential merit in the proposal and have requested the proposing entities to prepare a more complete written proposal. Staff review by the Executive Director, however, raised several issues that project proponents have been asked to re-evaluate. Timing for submitting the proposal, staff review and the intervening meeting schedule for the Commission present several logistical issues to approve this project.

Staff recommends the Commission delegate authority to the Executive Director to allocate up to \$300,000 in TAG funds if the program should the final proposal meet program guidelines already approved by the Commission. Delegation would avoid the issue of uncommitted resources in this program and the potential inability to carry forward project funding.

Staff Recommendation:

That the Commission delegate to the Executive Director authority to obligate up to \$300,000 of TAG funds in support of the proposed rural program designed to build the work force capacity of rural communities to better participate in the digital economy should the final proposal conform to Commission objectives.

C. Policy Revisions to the Policy and Procedures for the Discontinuance of Academic Degrees with Low Program Demand

At the June 2000 meeting, the Commission tabled action on the proposed revisions to the Low Enrollment Program Policy until the August Commission meeting.

The Academic Council had insufficient time to process the policy revisions prior to the June meeting. Since June, the Council has consulted on the policy revisions at the July Academic Council meeting and through e-mail correspondence. The Council has reached a compromise position on the revision involving exemptions for large institutions and agreed to the other proposed revisions.

The proposed revisions to the *Policy and Procedures for the Discontinuance of Academic Degrees with Low Program Demand*

include five policy changes. In summary, the revisions (1) leave the exemption limit at five, but state the Commission preference regarding a maximum of three exemptions for large institutions, (2) strengthen the role of the governing board in assuming the primary responsibility for discontinuing programs, (3) explicitly clarify the criteria for exempting low demand degree programs (i.e., central to role and mission and student access), (4) define the appeals process to limit appeal short-term extensions for programs which the governing board is actively involved and intervention is occurring, and reaffirm that the Commission retains the ultimate responsibility if a governing board chooses not to make the final exemption selection. In addition, the policy language sets a three-year review date to ensure that the policy is achieving objectives.

Staff Recommendation:

That the Commission approve the revisions to the *Policy and Procedures for the Discontinuance of Academic Degrees with Low Program Demand*.

D. Statewide Remedial Education Policy

The *Statewide Remedial Education Policy* responds to the Commission's responsibilities stated in C.R.S. 23-1-113.3. The primary goal of the policy is to ensure that new freshmen have the academic competencies that allow them to succeed in college level courses. To accomplish this goal, the policy ensures that each first-time student is assessed in English and mathematics, receives timely and accurate information on the availability of remedial courses, is informed of the responsibility to enroll in remedial courses if necessary, and that CCHE informs each school district on the level of college preparation of its graduates. CCHE consulted with the governing boards in clarifying the statutory intent and developing the policy language.

The key characteristics of the proposed *Statewide Remedial Education Policy* include:

- All degree-seeking first-time students will be assessed.
- All students who are diagnosed as needing remedial assistance will be required to enroll in remedial courses early in their freshman year (i.e., first 30 credit hours).
- Colleges will provide students with full information regarding course availability and options to meet the college entry-level competencies, including the availability at other institutions and online courses.
- The Commission will inform Colorado public high schools about the level of college readiness of their recent high school graduate.
- The Commission, in cooperation with the public universities and colleges, will report annually to the Education Committees on who enrolls, how effective remedial education is, and how much it costs.

The policies and procedures are to be in place by April 1, 2001, and fully implement the assessment testing in the 2nd academic year.

Staff Recommendation:

That the Commission approve the *Statewide Remedial Education Policy*.

Action: Commissioner Stewart moved approval of the four consent items as presented in the agenda. Commissioner Vollbracht seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

IV. Action Items

A. Fiscal Year 2001-2002 CCHE Budget Request and Governing Board Recommendations

Mr. Jim Jacobs explained the Fiscal Year 2001-2002 budget proposal process. The budget process begins when the Commission submits a budget recommendation to the Governor's Office of State Planning and Budgeting (OSPB). CSPB reviews the budget, the Governor revises the recommendation and the Governor's budget request for higher education is then submitted to the Colorado General Assembly. Historically CCHE is a unique state agency because it has two budgets

-- one submitted by the Commission and one from OSPB. Executive Director Foster explained that as part of the executive branch, CCHE submits a budget recommendation to OSPB, and OSPB includes that recommendation in the statewide budget requests.

By November 1, 2000, the budget recommendation will be submitted to the Joint Budget Committee (JBC). The JBC discusses the higher education request with the higher education community. In March the JBC conducts similar meeting with all state agencies which results in the creation of the Long Bill. The General Assembly makes the final decision on the Long Bill appropriation. H.B. 00-1451 directs the Commission to "submit a unified budget request representing all functions performed by the Governing Boards and Local District Junior Colleges."

The fiscal year 2001-2002 budget recommendation (Table 1 as shown in the agenda) requests a 6 percent increase over year's budget. The priorities of the budget are:

- Enrollment based on fall FTE enrollment
- Inflation
- CPI for UCHSC and CSU Agencies
- Governing Board performance funding
- Decision items:
 - Programs of Excellence
 - Rural/Urban Tuition Buydown
 - Increase access through financial aid, both merit and need-based, and the Governor's Opportunity Scholarship (GOS)
 - Graduate Student Support
 - Teacher Encouragement Fund
 - CCHE web-based consumer guide
 - Division of Occupation Education Area Vocational Schools
 - PharmD UCHSU
 - CSU Veterinarian Medicine Program
 - CSU Agencies Increases

Commissioner Gottesfeld complimented the staff on the budget presentation. Commissioner Hessler asked if the Teacher Encouragement Fund would continue to grow on a yearly basis. Dr. Samson responded that it is a 3-year phase plan to reduce the loan burden for students.

Don Williamson, representative of the Community College system, reported that the SBCCOE passed a resolution to support CCHE's initiative to lower community college tuition in the context of addressing broader enrollment policies at all public higher education institutions. The resolution supports the Commission's recommendation to buydown tuition. Commissioner Nagel stated that lowering tuition is an important issue to the Commission.

Ed Bowditch, representative of the Colorado State University system, commented on the proposed FY 2001-2002 budget. He stated that the highest budget priority for the CSU system is to increase faculty salaries. His concern is that the proposed overall budget package will not help increase salaries. He pointed out that last year's decision items were funded first and the balance went into performance funding. He recommended performance funding receive a higher priority on this year's budget request in order to provide additional funding for faculty salaries. He agreed that tuition buydown proposal to provide access is important. However, he is concerned about the drastic tuition reduction impact on other institutions in the vicinity. Reduction of tuition at community colleges most likely will result in enrollment shifts at surrounding four-year institutions. For example, Fort Lewis College and University of Southern Colorado will suffer declining enrollment as students shift to the lower tuition at nearby community colleges. He recommended a phase-in process over a two-year period or 15 percent for four years. He applauded the Commission on the emphasis on graduate education. He proposed that the Commission review the recent financial aid policy to provide more financial aid to graduate students. He recommended not going forward with tuition buydown and graduate education increase but instead put that money in the performance-funding plan. He encouraged the Commission to work with governing boards to encourage boards to provide more emphasis on graduate education and tuition differentiation.

Executive Director Foster emphasized that the FY2001-2002 budget request is a 6 percent increase. The Commission went to the campuses to discuss tuition buydown. At that time the State Board of Agriculture did not express any enrollment problem. CCHE has been working at length with the Community College and the State College boards regarding the

program. CCHE has been working at length with the Community College and the State College boards regarding an expressed interest in tuition buydown. The Commission welcomes USC's participation in the tuition buydown. The Commission is committed to providing access.

Commissioner Baker said it is a critical point and the budget may merit some tweaking as we move forward. The budget proposal is the right thing to do and he fully supports the proposed budget. Commissioner Hessler strongly supports the tuition buydown although it may involve some risk for some institutions.

Staff Recommendation:

That the Commission adopt the budget recommendation for the governing boards and the request for the CCHE budget.

Action: Commissioner Hessler made a motion to approve the staff recommendation. Commissioner Farina seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

Executive Director Foster clarified that the capital assets subcommittee will meet via teleconference immediately following this Commission meeting. The agenda for the subcommittee meeting is to discuss the requests for the University of Colorado law school and the Colorado State University business school. He confirmed that the subcommittee was granted the authority to make the decision on behalf of the commission.

Jeanne Adkins pointed out that the delegation on the consent item was only for the pilot project and did not incorporate the law school. A motion would be required to include the law school. Commissioner Baker stated that all Commissioners received the information on the capital projects and emphasized that these are exceptions in light of the timing. Commissioner Hessler stated that the subcommittee, the CU and CCHE staff should be commended providing the information on the project.

Action: Commissioner Hessler made the motion to delegate authority to the capital assets subcommittee to move forward with the CU law school request. Commissioner Farina seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously. Commissioners Hessler and Farina moved to withdraw their motion.

Due to the timing issue Executive Director Foster invited the full Commissioners to participate in the Capital Assets Subcommittee meeting.

V. Items for Discussion and Possible Future Action

None.

VI. Items for Information and Possible Discussion

A. Concept Papers

(1) Master of Science (M.S.) in Engineering and Technology Management at the Colorado School of Mines

The Commission accepted the concept paper for a Master of Science (M.S.) in Engineering and Technology Management at the Colorado School of Mines.

(2) Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) in Special Education at Metropolitan State College of Denver

The Commission accepted the concept paper for a Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) in Special Education at Metropolitan State College of Denver.

(3) Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) in Liberal Arts and Sciences at Metropolitan State College of Denver

The Commission accepted the concept paper for a Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) in Liberal Arts and Sciences at Metropolitan State College of Denver.

B. Degree Program Name Change

The Commission accepted the report on Program Name Changes under delegated authority approved by the

The Commission accepted the report on Program Name Changes under delegated authority approved by the Executive Director in January 2000.

The two changes approved by the Executive Director include:

1. Institution: Colorado State University
Current Program Name: Physical Science (B.S.)
New Program Name: Natural Sciences (B.S.)
Approved by: The State Board of Agriculture (June 14, 2000)

Rationale:

To align the degree program with an integrated science curriculum that supports teacher preparation in the sciences and aligns with CDE content standards.

Scope of Proposed Change:

No substantive curriculum changes. The required number of credits for graduation is 120 – a four-year science degree.

Proposed Action by Executive Director:

Approve the name change as requested.

2. Institution: University of Southern Colorado
Current Program Name: Industrial Science and Technology (B.S.)
New Program Name: Facilities Management and Technology Studies (B.S.)
Approved by: The State Board of Agriculture (May 3, 2000)

Rationale:

To reflect the curriculum of the degree program more precisely.

Scope of Proposed Change:

No substantive curriculum changes.

Action:

Commissioner Baker made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Vollbracht seconded the motion and the meeting adjourned at 12:05 p.m.



August 9, 2000 Capital Assets Subcommittee Minutes (Acrobat Reader Required)