

## **COLORADO COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION**

December 1, 2000  
Colorado Commission on Higher Education  
Denver, Colorado

### **MINUTES**

#### Commissioners

Present: Raymond T. Baker; Terrance L. Farina; Marion S. Gottesfeld; David E. Greenberg; Robert A. Hessler; Peggy Lamm; Ralph J. Nagel, Chair; Dean L. Quamme; James M. Stewart; and William B. Vollbracht.

#### Advisory Committee

Present: Senator Ken Arnold; Senator James Dyer; Representative Keith King; Wayne Artis; Calvin Frazier; and Sandy Hume.

#### Commission Staff

Present: Timothy E. Foster, Executive Director; JoAnn Evans; Sharon Samson; and Kathy Williams

- I. The meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m. in conference room B at the Colorado Commission on Higher Education Office in Denver, Colorado.

Chair Nagel outlined the meeting format by stating that the Commission will not address all of the recommendations contained in the NORED Governance Report. The Commission accepted public testimony only on items brought up as a motion at this meeting.

## II. Consent Items

### A. Amendment to 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 regarding 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 offered by the Department of Geophysics. Construction costs for the renovation of the entire 20,000 square feet will cost approximately \$1 million beyond the originally requested 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.

#### **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.

**Action:** Commissioner Nagel moved to approve the staff recommendation of Consent Item II A. Commissioner Farina seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

### B. Community College of Aurora Technology Program Plan Revised

Consent Item II B may be taken up at a later meeting.

## III. Higher Education Governance in Colorado NORED Report

On November 2, 2000, the Commission accepted the Higher Education Governance in Colorado at the Dawn of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, a report on higher education governance in Colorado conducted by Northwest Education Research Center (NORED) from Olympia, Washington. This agenda item provided an opportunity for the Commission to begin the process of responding to recommendations made in the NORED Report.

A. The first item the Commission discussed was recommendation 3.J. *"Reliable cost information is essential if policy makers are to accurately evaluate alternative arrangements and options. The CCHE has recommended implementation of a common system of data collection. This recommendation is reinforced here. It was impossible to determine the costs associated with the present governance arrangement with precision or dependable accuracy from the data collected as part of the present study. Until basic shortcomings in data and information systems are addressed and improved, neither policy makers nor the public will be able to count on the presence of accurate and accessible data to assist in policy*

*deliberations. As a prelude to the development of a common system of data collection, and to determine both the optimal level of reporting detail and the comparative costs of various higher education activities and functions, a comprehensive cost and expenditures study of Colorado higher education should be conducted."*

**Action:** Commissioner Vollbracht made a motion to establish a subcommittee of Commissioners and representatives of higher education community to develop standard data collection methods of measuring institutional cost information. Commissioner Hessler seconded the motion. Commissioner Gottesfield assured the institutions that the Commission is not trying to burden them with more information rather to replace what they are doing. The motion carried unanimously.

- B. The second issue the Commission addressed from the NORED report was recommendation 2. M. *"Through its RHEP initiative, the CCHE is exploring ways to use the existing community college network for the delivery of baccalaureate and some graduate programs by four-year institutions throughout Colorado. The CCHE also should consider the need for authority for certain regional community colleges to offer a limited number of upper-division programs suited to their institutional resources in cases of sustained need when other solutions are likely to prove impractical or unworkable. The emphasis should be on programs that combine lower division technical specializations with a liberal arts component drawn from the institution's academic transfer curriculum. Any authority for indigenous upper-division programs should not be allowed to diminish the institutions' comprehensive community college obligations, and all such programs should be approved by the State Board for Community and Occupational Education and the CCHE. These institutions should not be re-designated as baccalaureate institutions."*

Currently Colorado is initiating the REAP program. Community Colleges and CU, state colleges support the motion. Representatives of the Community College System, the University of Colorado system and the State Colleges support the motion.

**Action:** Commissioner Hessler moved that the Commission and the higher education community explore ways to use existing community college network for the deliver of baccalaureate programs by four-year programs (Recommendation 2M) utilizing the REAP Program. Commissioner Lamm seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously. The subcommittee will be made up of Commissioners as well as representatives of the higher education community.

- C. The third item the Commission discussed was recommendation 2 A *"The CCHE should review institutional role and mission statements for their adequacy and relevance to changing conditions of Colorado. Particular attention should be directed to determining the continued efficacy of mission distinctions based on stratified admissions categories and their effects on the capabilities of regional higher education providers to meet a broad range of needs in different areas of Colorado. The Commission should involve the boards and institutions in this*

*mission review process. The goal should be a definition of distinctive roles and missions for each institution that can be used both to expand service and in the development of the Colorado Compacts."*

Commissioner Nagel stated that recommendation (2A) is a very large topic and the Commission does not know where it will end up because it will require much discussion. He recommended that the Commission's consideration focus on two or three issues of the recommendation. First, there must be eligibility requirements established before an institution can take the step to initiate a compact college because this is a serious change in accountability. Second, there should be clear guidelines/areas where the Commission can expect specific new agreements to be written so that citizens, students, and institutions know the issues in advance. Third, although the NORED report recommended starting with six compact colleges, it is the consensus that six is too a large step for the state to take at this time.

Chair Nagel suggested that Colorado start with at least one and no more than three institutions for the pilot of compact colleges and focus on governing boards with a single institution. Perhaps it may be easier for those governing boards with a single institution to respond. The Commission is willing to state to the court that this is a good opportunity for great dialogue with the legislature and institutions.

Ed Bowditch, Vice Chancellor of Administrative Affairs for the Colorado State University System asked for clarification of the advantages to the institutions that become compact colleges.

Elizabeth Hoffman, President of the University of Colorado, echoed Mr. Bowditch's statement. She also supports the framing of the motion.

Christine Johnson, Vice President of Educational Support Services at the Community Colleges of Colorado, supports the prudent approach especially since we don't know the cost impact.

George Walker suggested that the Commission address ethnic minority numeric goals in developing compact colleges.

Aaron Houston, representative of the Colorado Student Association (CSA), reported that CSA supports the Commission approaching the issue of compact colleges in a limited way.

Dale Mingleton, Trustee of the State Colleges, supports the Commission's recommendation and asked that the higher education governing board systems be included in the decision making.

Representative Keith King reported that a bill title on this issue has already been proposed and will be sponsored by Senator Anderson and himself. He invited the Commission to give input immediately on the bill.

The Commission agreed to initiate the compact college recommendation by starting on a smaller scale with two and not more than three institutions. Governing boards may suggest institutions for consideration to Executive Director Foster. Commissioner Gottesfeld volunteered to serve on the subcommittee study group that will draft a recommendation on charter/compact colleges.

**Action:** Commissioner Nagel made a motion that Colorado begin the compact college project with at least one but no more than three institutions and focus on governing boards with a single institution. Commissioner Gottesfeld seconded the motion and the motion carried.

- D. Recommendation 2E *"Metropolitan State College of Denver should be governed by an independent governing board and strive to meet those baccalaureate program needs of residents of the metropolitan area not otherwise covered by the graduate and professional programs unique to CU-Denver at Auraria. It should continue its open door tradition but it should be designated Metropolitan State University of Denver."*

Dale Mingleton, Trustee of the State Colleges, reported that all four presidents of the state colleges agreed that Metropolitan State College should remain part of the state college system. He responded to concerns raised in response to the NORED recommendation:

- Diversity: Metro State student population is diverse, however, Adams State College's population is just as diverse.
- Traditional/non-traditional students. 44 percent of students at Metro State are over 25 years old. Although at Western State that figure is only 12 percent, Adams and Mesa are at 33 and 34 percent respectively, which makes the similar to Metro. The argument that the schools are different is not strong enough to pull Metro out the State College System.
- The other institutions in the system have some advantages by having Metro State in the system and Metro benefits by being part of the system. Other schools offer graduate programs to which students from Metro can transfer.
- The blend of the four state college presidents offer different viewpoints as a system to cover what's best for citizens of Colorado.
- The four institutions are not research institutions, but rather are teaching institutions. Perhaps there are other teaching institutions that would fit within the State College System.
- Fund is a major issue for all the state colleges.

Mr. Mingleton believes that now it is not in the best interest of students or citizens to dismantle the system. On the other hand, the Trustees of the State Colleges does not want to hold Metro State back. Right now Metro is thriving and is not hindered by being part of the system. The four schools create a synergy that is helpful to Colorado. The Trustees are willing to look at MSCD as a compact system.

Stephanie Vassilaros, President of Metropolitan State College of Denver Student Government, reported that Metro students emphatically support the recommendation for a separate governing board for MSCD. Metro is different because it is the only school in the state college system that doesn't provide student housing. Metro serves nontraditional students who not only do not live on campus, may have families and live in the metropolitan area. She stated that MSCD subsidizes other the state colleges since MSCD students pay higher tuition and that money could be better used on Metro campus. She believes that Metro State faculty is underpaid.

Lee Halgren, Interim President of The State Colleges, clarified the funding patterns for the state colleges. In 1986 funding allocations went directly to governing boards so they could begin to make allocation as they saw fit. In 1985, when legislature moved from direct funding to governing board funding, within the state system, Metro was below average by 4.6 percent. In 1995 their status had improved to 3.83 percent. At that time, the Trustees implemented a new budget allocation methodology to reduce disparity between the institutions. This current year Metro has improved to 3.81 percent below the system average. He added that all governing board systems experience disparity in funding.

Chair Nagel recommended that an adjustment be made to assure institutional funding is held harmless so that the Commission can focus on the governing part of the equation.

Commissioner Quamme is nervous about taking this item by itself, whether or not Metro should come out of the system, because of the impact it has on the other institutions within the system. Until there is a thorough understanding about how the other institutions will be operated, governed, etc. and what the financial impact will be, he is not convinced there needs to be changes in the system.

Commissioner Hessler also is uncomfortable with changing the system until there is further study into how the other institutions fit in the overall governance and it is determined what will best serve the students of Colorado. Commissioner Greenberg suggested there be a collaborative process to get legitimate alternatives. Commissioner Baker said that he is also opposed to the recommendation and supports additional study of the concept issues.

Representative King reported that he and Senator Anderson are drafting legislation regarding the compact college, however, could not discuss the details of the draft.

Senator Dyer also reported that he has entered a bill recommending that Ft. Lewis College have an independent board. The bigger picture would be concerning governance of higher education in Colorado which would be a huge bill.

Commissioner Farina, stated that although funding was separated from the recommendation discussion, it might be difficult to guarantee different levels of funding. The discussion will probably continue, and it may be a radical thing to

do without thinking of the implications on other three institutions. The number one recommendation emphasized in the NORED report was the compact colleges and he suggested the discussion focus on how to improve the higher education system.

Commissioner Lamm would like to know to what extent being associated with the state colleges is holding Metro back. Would the institution be able to grow further and have more tenured and better-paid faculty if it were under an independent governing board? Trustee Mingleton responded that none of the institutions are being held back and funds are going to all institutions. However, all faculty in Colorado are underpaid. Metro faculty salaries are higher than rural salaries. However, the college presidents are given the opportunity to reward some professors and instructors as they wish.

Commissioner Greenberg stated that MSCS after CSM is the most unique institution in the state. The trustees do an excellent job, but they have to balance the metropolitan with rural institutions. The rural schools are much more traditional than Metro and there are competing interests. A standard management consultant would suggest a spin-off of one and integrate the other three with other systems.

Commissioner Vollbracht did not want to vote on the recommendation at this time and would amend the recommendation to form a group to develop a suggestion to come back to the Commission next month. Commissioner Baker agrees that it does merit further dialogue along with the housing component which is an issue.

Executive Director Foster suggested that the Commission express general interest in Metropolitan State College having a separate board. A subcommittee should be established to develop a satisfactory solution to what happens to the other three institutions, and as part of that conversation, CCHE will adjust the funding formula so that the \$4.5 million remain as allocated by the Trustees of the State Colleges.

**Action:** Commissioner Greenberg made a motion to approve recommendation 2E, as stated above, with the exception that the name of the institution remains Metropolitan State College of Denver. Commissioner Lamm seconded the motion.

Based on the discussion at this meeting Commissioner Greenberg withdrew his motion with the condition that the Commission substitute a date certain that the subcommittee will have a set of options to present to the Commission. Commissioner Lamm withdrew her second to the motion. Senator Arnold suggested a February due date for the subcommittee's recommendation to the Commission.

**Action:** Commissioner Greenberg moved that an exploratory advisory subcommittee be established made up of representatives (trustees) of the three governing boards (State Colleges of Colorado, University of Northern Colorado and Colorado State University),

their chief executive officers and representative of the CCHE staff be established to develop recommendations regarding the governance of Metropolitan State College of Denver and the impact on the governance of other institutions. The subcommittee will report to the Commission at its February meeting. Commissioner Farina seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

- E. Recommendation 3 H, *Colorado should consider a common course numbering system for use in its public institutions of higher learning. The independent institutions should be invited to participate on a voluntary basis. There are models in place in other states that may be emulated to reduce the level of effort involved in the creation of such a system. The presence of such a common nomenclature could contribute greatly to the elimination of many of the problems associated with credit transfer in Colorado.*

Elizabeth Hoffman, President of the University of Colorado, suggested Colorado use a system of numbers for campuses to articulate courses into, similar to the Illinois system, and use the already existing articulation agreements. The community colleges and CU are already working on it.

Lee Halgren stated that the State Colleges are supportive of the common numbering and would like to join in the work being done.

Aaron Houston, President of the Colorado Student Association (CSA), expressed support for common course numbering.

Wayne Artis, representing the faculty, said supports the clearinghouse system rather than the Florida model.

Sharon Samson, CCHE staff, supports the simplest approach and said this may uncover some general education questions. It may open up broader issues. If there is a committee that is already formed, CCHE be happy to work on it.

Representative Keith King said that he would introduce legislation on this issue. He said there are several state models and National Council of State Legislatures is conducting the research.

There was discussion about whether legislation was required to make all institutions participate and it was the consensus that legislation may move the process along quicker.

**Action:** Commissioner Lamm made a motion to approve a common course numbering system in order to ease transfer as recommended in NORED Report recommendation 3 H. Commissioner Stewart seconded. The motion carried with nine in favor and one (Commissioner Baker) opposed.

- F. Recommendation 2 F, *Ft. Lewis College should be governed by an independent governing board and assigned clarified mission responsibilities as a regional higher education provider. It should continue to emphasize services to Durango*

*and southwestern Colorado, its Native American program specialization, and its cooperation with Pueblo Community College in the provision of comprehensive higher education services in the Southwestern region of the state.*

Senator Jim Dyer asked the motion to approve the recommendation 2F be amended to end of the second sentence at Durango and drop the rest of the language. He reported that there is a great deal of local community discussion. There is not unanimous support in the community and the college. Ft. Lewis faculty are not totally in favor. Senator Dyer is planning to introduce legislation to help generate discussion. Commissioner Quamme supports getting community input.

Commissioner Vollbracht asked if the discussion of governance of Ft. Lewis College fit within the discussion on the state college subcommittee.

Ed Bowditch, representative of the State Board of Agriculture, said the critical issue is whether or not Ft. Lewis remains a statewide liberal arts college or a regional higher education provider. He appreciated Senator Dyer's recommendation for it to remain a regional higher education provider. The position of the State Board of Agriculture was outlined in the NORED response and would be happy to have further dialogue with the Commission.

**Action:** Commissioner Hessler moved to approve recommendation 2F regarding Fort Lewis College's independent governing board. Commissioner Lamm seconded the motion.

Commissioner Farina moved to amend the motion to approve recommendation 2F to include a period after the word "responsibilities" in the first sentence. In addition, it will be put on the same time line as the state colleges (report at the February Commission meeting). Commissioner Quamme seconded the amendment. The amendment passed unanimously.

Commissioner Nagel clarified that not all things will relate to items that the Commission should have a stake in and some may be better handled in other arenas, through institutions, and through the legislature. There are a few items that may be called back later.

**Action:** Commissioner Baker moved to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Greenberg seconded the motion and the meeting adjourned at 2:46 p.m.