

CCHE Agenda
[Special Meeting](#)
December 1, 2000
Colorado Commission on Higher Education Office
1380 Lawrence Street, Suite 1200
Denver, Colorado
1:00 p.m.

I. Reports

II. Consent Items

A. Amendment to Colorado School of Mines Green Center Basement Renovation Program

Plan - Hoffman

B. Community College of Aurora Technology Program Plan, Revised - Hoffman

III. Items for Discussion and Possible Action

A. Higher Education Governance in Colorado NORED Report - Foster

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE)
December 1, 2000
Agenda Item I

TOPIC: REPORTS

PREPARED BY: RALPH NAGEL

This item will be a regular monthly discussion of items which the Chair feels will be of interest to the Commission.

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE)
December 1, 2000
Agenda Item II, A

**TOPIC: AMENDMENT TO COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES GREEN CENTER
BASEMENT RENOVATION PROGRAM PLAN**

PREPARED BY: GAIL HOFFMAN

I. SUMMARY

Commission staff recommends approval of the program plan amendment to the Colorado School of Mines Green Center Basement Renovation Program Plan. Colorado School of Mines submitted the program plan amendment on October 24, 2000, in response to CCHE concerns about the high square footage costs of the initial proposal and an Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) team's conclusion that inadequate physical facilities will lead to less than full accreditation for the baccalaureate degree the Department of Geophysics offers.

In the original program plan, the capital costs of a new 200-ton chiller, electrical equipment, and handicapped-accessible elevator were spread over only 11,000 square feet of assignable space. Colorado School of Mines wants Alternative 5 listed in the original program plan as the program plan amendment. Alternative 5 proposes to renovate 20,000 square feet of basement space.

Construction costs for the renovation of the entire 20,000 square feet will cost approximately \$1 million beyond the originally required amount. The total cost of the amended program plan will come to \$6,398,740. This reduces the square foot construction cost from approximately \$270/square foot to \$198/square foot.

The amended program plan will still renovate the research lab, machine shop, equipment storage, the rock preparation room, and the teaching lab. The amended program plan also will renovate:

- A dry teaching lab for hands-on demonstrations using actual core samples and rock specimens;
- A reconfigured wet teaching lab for more detailed laboratory analysis of material behavior and geochemistry and synthesis of fundamental material theories and mathematical models;
- General classroom/computer lab to serve as a lecture area for laboratories, computer lab for students to perform mathematical and computer modeling of geophysical behaviors, and a student project and group meeting area during unscheduled hours.

Also renovated will be space for the Institute for Resource and Environmental Geosciences (IREG), a laser lab, and reconfigured office space to promote more undergraduate involvement in research and more interaction with faculty. The additional square feet will create more integrated, multi-disciplinary, and hands-on undergraduate teaching and learning center. Colorado School of Mines anticipates the Department of Geophysics will not be the only user of the space. The Geology and Petroleum Engineering departments, as well as the Division of Engineering (Civil Engineering), also will occupy the renovated space.

The amended program plan also includes \$70,000 for temporary facilities to accommodate about 9,000 square feet of existing office storage, and laboratory areas during renovation.

II. BACKGROUND

Colorado School of Mines originally hoped to handle the renovation of the basement of Green Center through controlled maintenance funding. When the State Buildings Division concluded most of the renovations were program-driven, the school hurriedly put together a program plan to renovate the basement. The plan was written in the summer when many of the faculty and staff were away. In the meantime, however, faculty and staff had a chance to more seriously consider the pros and cons of each alternative. The conclusion was that Alternative 5 represented a better solution for both academic and financial reasons. Planners had initially discarded Alternative 5 because of the need to use temporary buildings to displace approximately 9,000 square feet of office, storage, and laboratory areas during renovation. Faculty and staff decided the inconvenience of locating temporarily in temporary buildings would be outweighed by the program plan benefits. Informed of the decision of Colorado School of Mines to submit a program plan amendment, CCHE staff recommended putting approval of the original program plan on hold until the amendment was received.

A revised project cost estimate for the program plan amendment is attached.

III. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Commission approve the program plan amendment to the Colorado School of Mines Green Center Basement Renovation, recognizing that the additional cost of about \$1 million will create a more flexible, multi-disciplinary space at a lower square footage cost than the previous program plan.

2	roof construction	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	(1c) Exterior Closure Total	\$10,584	--	\$10,584	--	--	--	--	--
1	exterior walls	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2	exterior windows	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
3	exterior doors	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	(1d) Roofing Total	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
1	roof coverings	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2	roof openings	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	(1e) Interior Construction Total	\$2,649,355	--	\$2,649,355	--	--	--	--	--
1	interior partitions	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2	interior doors	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
3	interior specialties	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	(1f) Interior Circulation Total	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
1	stair construction	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2	stair finishes	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	(1g) Interior Finishes Total	--	--	Incl. Above	--	--	--	--	--
1	wall finishes	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2	floor finishes	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
3	ceiling finishes	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	(1h) Conveying Systems Total	\$132,300	--	\$132,300	--	--	--	--	--
1	elevator and lifts	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2	escalators/other	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
3	other conveying systems	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	(1i) Mechanical Systems Total	\$980,538	--	\$980,538	--	--	--	--	--
1	plumbing	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2	HVAC	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
3	fire protection	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	(1j) Electrical Systems Total	\$182,050	--	\$182,050	--	--	--	--	--
1	service and distribution	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2	lighting and branch wiring	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
			--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Professional fees are estimated at 17% of construction due to the lack of and authenticity of existing documentation which will require more extensive investigation of entire building systems. We also anticipate additional professional fees due to difficult sequencing of the work.

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE)
 December 1, 2000
 Agenda Item II, B

TOPIC: COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF AURORA TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM PLAN, REVISED

PREPARED BY: GAIL HOFFMAN

I. SUMMARY

Commission staff recommends approval of two parts of the five-part Community College of Aurora Technology Program Plan: infrastructure improvements (\$276,520) and the three-year implementation of Windows 2000 (\$1,230,690).

In the original program plan, Community College of Aurora proposed these five initiatives in its technology plan:

- Infrastructure improvements (\$276,520)
- Advanced Delivery Systems and Student Kiosks (\$96,000)
- Student Wireless Network Access and Laptops for Faculty and Students (\$79,680)
- Three-Year Implementation of Windows 2000 (\$1,230,690)
- Video Streaming, Language/Music Lab, Student Email (\$133,600)

After consultation with the Governor's Office of Innovation and Technology, CCHE staff concludes that only the infrastructure improvements and three-year implementation of Windows 2000 should be funded this year.

The reasons for funding only two parts of the five-part plan are that insufficient information was provided in the program plan to explain the necessity for the advanced delivery systems (eight new "smart" classrooms) and kiosks; the student wireless network access and laptop for faculty and students; and video streaming, language/music lab, and student email. Approximately 35% of courses are delivered in distance format through cable-delivered AT&T cable. Video streaming via personal computers would allow the campus to offer live interactive communication from a classroom or office to students using personal computers and hooked up to the Internet, network, or intranet.

On the management issue, the college believes it has sufficient technical expertise on staff (many adjunct computer science instructors work in the information technology field) to handle the infrastructure and Windows 2000 implementation. It estimates having a consultant to guide implementation of those two parts of the plan would cost up to \$100,000.

II. BACKGROUND

The program plan that Community College of Aurora first submitted to CCHE consisted of the budget documents and a few brief explanatory paragraphs originally intended as an executive summary for the Board of Trustees. The program plan itself is more detailed, but still lacks context and data to back up the various requests. The college does not object to having only the infrastructure and Windows 2000 parts funded this year. It recognizes that it will have to submit more detailed information for the other parts of the program to be funded in the next funding cycle.

Community College of Aurora has submitted a revised project cost estimate showing funding for only those two parts of the program plan, as well as money to cover a 10% contingency fund. That revised project cost estimate is attached.

III. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Commission approve only these parts of the Community College of Aurora Technology Program Plan: Infrastructure improvements (\$276,520) and Three-Year Implementation of Windows 2000 (\$1,230,690).

CC-IT: CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION <u>TECHNOLOGY</u> PROJECT REQUEST FY <u>01</u> - <u>02</u>		
<i>Project Compliance</i>		
Project Title: Technology Plan	Purpose Code:	Name of Preparer: Bobby Williams
Department: HED	Strategic Plan Objective(s):	
Program: AUR	Dept. Approval by:	Date: __/__/__

Priority Number: 1 of 2

OSPB Approval:

Date: / /

	Total Project Costs	Prior- Year Appropriation	Current Request	Year 2 Request	Year 3 Request	Year 4 Request	Year 5 Request
A. Land Acquisition							
(1) Land Purchase Cost							
B. Professional Services							
(1) Consultants							
(2) Quality Assurance							
(3) Independent Verification & Validation							
(4) Leased Space							
(5) Other (_____)							
(6) Total Professional Services							
C. Assoc. Building Construction							
(1) New (_____ GSF)							
(2) Renovate (_____ GSF) Connection Costs							
(3) Site Work /Landscaping							
(4) Total Costs (Sum 1-3)							
D. System Construction							
(1) Cabling	\$ 50,000	\$ -	\$ 50,000	\$ -	\$ -		
(2) SW: COTS							
(3) SW: Built							
(4) Total Costs (1-3)	\$ 50,000	\$ -	\$ 50,000	\$ -	\$ -		
E. Equipment							
(1) Servers	\$ 104,000	\$ -	\$ 104,000				
(2) PCs, Laptops, Terminals, PDAs	\$ 1,230,690	\$ -	\$ 1,230,690	\$ -	\$ -		
(3) Printers, Scanners, Peripherals		\$ -					
(4) Network equip.	\$ 108,120	\$ -	\$ 108,120	\$ -	\$ -		
(5) UPS	\$ 14,400	\$ -	\$ 14,400				
(6) Other		\$ -		\$ -	\$ -		
(7) Total Equip. Cost	\$ 1,457,210	\$ -	\$ 1,457,210	\$ -	\$ -		
F. Miscellaneous							

F. Miscellaneous							
(1) Training Costs*							
(2) Project Contingency Costs*	\$ 150,721		\$ 150,721				
(3) Total Misc. Costs	\$ 150,721		\$ 1,540,721				
G. Total Project Costs							
[A(1)+B(7)+C(5)+D(5)+E(5)+F(3)]	\$ 1,657,931	\$ -	\$ 1,657,931	\$ -	\$ -		
G. Source of Funds							
CCFE	\$ 1,657,931	\$ -	\$ 1,657,931	\$ -	\$ -		
CF							
CFE							
FF							
* Provide Written Justification In Reference to the type and size of this project, it is standard practice to include a 10% contingency fee.							

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE)
December 1, 2000
Agenda Item III, A

TOPIC: HIGHER EDUCATION GOVERNANCE IN COLORADO NORED REPORT

PREPARED BY: TIMOTHY E. FOSTER

I. SUMMARY

Dr. William Chance of Olympia, Washington made a presentation to the Commission on the higher education governance study conducted by the Northwest Education Research Center (NORED) at the November 2, meeting. The Commission will discuss the report at this meeting.