

COLORADO COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

June 1, 2000
Colorado Mountain College
Glenwood Springs, Colorado

MINUTES

Commissioners Present: Raymond T. Baker; Terrance L. Farina; David E. Greenberg; Peggy Lamm; Ralph J. Nagel, Chair; Dean L. Quamme; James Stewart; and William B. Vollbracht.

Advisory Committee Present: Wayne Artis; Aaron Houston; Sandy Hume; and Representative Keith King.

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

I. Call to Order

The regular meeting of the Colorado Commission on Higher Education was called to order at 10 a.m. in the New Sp Center in the Calaway Building at Colorado Mountain College in Glenwood Springs, Colorado.

II. Reports

A. Chair's Report

The Chair, Commissioner Ralph Nagel, reported that Commissioners Marion Gottesfeld and Robert Hessler were excused absent. Minutes of the May 4, 2000, were not available for approval. Action on the May minutes will take place during a teleconference meeting to be held June (date to be determined). Commissioner Nagel reported that this was his first opportunity to serve as chair of the Commission, however, he had no report.

B. Commissioners' Reports

No reports.

C. Advisory Committee Reports

Representative Keith King reported that he sponsored House Bill 1355 regarding Colorado's need to graduate more students to meet the high demand for employees in the high technology industry, particularly electronic engineering worked with the American Electronics Corporation to establish a scholarship program for resident students at all levels in the student's plan. He said that the legislation received tremendous support from the electronics industry. CCHE administer allocation of the degree programs in technology. Commissioner Nagel thanked Representative King for his efforts in support of higher education issues.

III. Consent Items

None

IV. Action Items

A. Programs of Excellence

JoAnn Evans presented the 2000 Programs of Excellence. The *Program of Excellence* is Colorado's most prestigious academic honor. Each year the Commission seeks nominations of those academic programs that exemplify quality and high levels of academic performance. The designation of this honor recognizes programs that excel and demonstrate continuing commitment to outstanding performance. The award entitles each program to five years of enhancement.

funding.

The higher education governing boards nominated 35 degree programs for consideration in this year's selection process. An external review panel, composed of noted professionals in the arts, business, engineering, health, humanities, technology, evaluated the 35 degree programs and forwarded a list of ten semi-finalists to the Commission sub-committee. The Commission sub-committee made up of Commissioners Farina, Hessler, and Lamm review semi-finalist programs and selected six programs for Commission consideration for the 2000 Programs of Excellence. The six finalist programs are:

- Western State College Biology Program
- University of Northern Colorado Monfort School Of Business Program
- Adams State College Counselor Education Program
- Community College of Denver Graphic Design Program
- University of Colorado-Colorado Springs Geography/Environmental Studies Program
- Morgan Community College Physical Therapy Assistant Program

The funding recommendation for the 2000-01 fiscal year Programs of Excellence was distributed.

Staff Recommendation

(1)
That the Commission approve the recommendation of the sub-committee and designate the selected programs as the 2000 Programs of Excellence.

(2) That the Commission approve the funding recommendation for the 2000-01 fiscal year.

Action: Commissioner Greenberg moved approval of the staff recommendation. Commissioner Quamme seconded motion, and the motion carried unanimously.

Upon approval of the staff recommendation the awards were presented to the governing board representative of the recipient institutions.

B. Proposals for New Academic Degree Programs

Dr. Sharon Samson presented three proposals for Commission approval, noting that two degree program proposals submitted for consideration were postponed for action. CCHE staff needed additional time to resolve curriculum questions and duplication issues for the two programs, i.e., M.S. and Ph.D. in Environmental Studies submitted to the University of Colorado at Boulder.

She presented recommendations supporting the approval of three undergraduate degrees:

(1) Proposal to Offer a Bachelor of Arts in Astronomy at the University of Colorado at Boulder

Dr. Samson stated that issues raised at the concept paper stage have been adequately addressed in the full degree proposal and outlined the elements that supported approving the degree approval request, including: (1) the strength of the faculty in the Department of Astrophysical and Planetary Sciences (APS); (2) the experience in research and graduate offerings in the department; (3) the considerable participation of APS faculty in undergraduate general education; (4) a well-defined curriculum; (5) and the level of interest in an undergraduate degree in astronomy shown by prospective students. She noted for the record that the Astronomy program is not seeking authorization for teacher licensure.

Staff Recommendation

That the Commission approve the request of the Board of Regents of the University of Colorado to offer a Bachelor of Arts in Astronomy at the University of Colorado at Boulder.

Action:

Commissioner Vollbracht moved approval of the staff recommendation. Commissioner Greenberg seconded the motion.

and the motion carried unanimously.

(2) Bachelor of Science in Environmental Science and Technology at Mesa State College

Dr. Samson reported that the Trustees of The State Colleges in Colorado and Mesa State College request Commission approval to offer a *B.S. in Environmental Science and Technology* and discontinue the current B.S. in Environmental Restoration and Waste Management. She summarized the staff analysis of the proposal, including the enrollment graduation goals and the Trustees of The State Colleges discussion of duplication and program differentiation environmental field.

Staff Recommendation

That the Commission approve the request to offer a B.S. in Environmental Science and Technology at Mesa State College and discontinue the Environment Restoration and Waste Management Program currently offered at Mesa College.

Action: Commissioner Vollbracht moved approval of the recommendation. Commissioner Greenberg seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

(3) Bachelor of Science in Environmental Studies at Western State College

Dr. Samson reported that the Trustees of The State Colleges in Colorado and Western State College request Commission approval to offer a *B.S. in Environmental Studies*. The aspects that support approving the degree approval request include: (1) the availability of public land in the Gunnison area to support the field experience; (2) the marketability of the baccalaureate degree documented by industry's growing reliance on consultant researchers; and (3) the level of interest in environmental studies shown by students currently enrolled in the minor. Staff expressed a concern regarding the sequencing of the curriculum, particularly the general education courses. Staff suggest that the institution reexamine the sequencing of the general education curriculum earlier in the curriculum, particularly basic skills courses.

Staff Recommendation

That the Commission approve the request to offer a B.S. in Environmental Studies at Western State College.

Action: Commissioner Vollbracht moved approval of the staff recommendation. Commissioner Greenberg seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

C. CCHE-Technology Advancement Group Program Funding for Fiscal Year 2000/2001

Ms. Adkins reported that the Colorado Advanced Technology Institute (CATI) program was transferred to CCHE on July 1, 1999, as a result of passage of HB 99-1359. This legislation folded CATI into the Colorado Commission on Higher Education and provided general direction for the Advanced Technology Program now called CCHE-Technology Advancement Group (CCHE-TAG). A Performance Audit of the Advanced Technology Program was completed in August 1999 which included recommendations concerning the direction and administration of the program.

A step-by-step process to accomplish these goals was undertaken by staff with the following objectives:

1. Create defined ways to review programs, assess their effectiveness and track program expenditures more clearly and more frequently.
2. Create additional program resources and/or redirect existing resources to continually update the TAG emphasis to focus on new technologies.
3. Create a better working relationship with industry and university partners to accomplish the legislative mission.
4. Ensure that the bulk of resources for the program were devoted to exploring and implementing new technologies with industry development that benefit Colorado residents long term.

The Commission approved the formal Program Plan in March 2000 that provides the framework for annual program review and funding. The Science and Technology Commission chaired by Commissioner Ouamme created an in

evaluation system that included weighted criteria for program evaluation. Programs that did not meet the objective outlined by the legislature and the Commission's guidelines were discontinued making \$513,000 available for new research opportunities in 2001 for the institutions. This is the first time that new dollars have been available for programs.

Another audit recommendation suggested that the Commission seek non-general funds from the private sector. HB redirects 25 cents of the Tire Recycling fee be allocated for technology for a total of \$600,000 next year. There will be a Request For Proposal (RFP) process and new guidelines for the program will be developed.

Commissioner Quamme reported that the TAG committee took seriously the auditor recommendation and addressed issues. The advisory committee understands the restrictions with the Tire Tap funds. The committee is excited and will come back with new proposals. The programs were aware of the issues raised by the audit and understood that the legislative demands were not met.

Ms. Adkins also outlined staff's response to the audit recommendations. Discontinued programs received funding to the end of the fiscal year and some were reconstituted as private non-profit entities. There are nine businesses which may have intellectual property return if the products succeed. If there is a return, those dollars will be reallocated to other programs.

The TAG requested the Rural Technology group to create a broad-based proposal focused specifically on how technology can be used to enhance local business development, multiuse network.

Executive Director Foster summarized that the program has grown beyond reaching a limited audience. Commissioner Quamme said that there are several organizations on the state level working on technology.

The Colorado Manufacturing competitiveness ranked low because its direction was different and did not attract participation. The accountability was not visible. The advisory committee felt continuing the program was not productive. Commissioner Quamme said the program migrated toward strictly course development. However, the company will redraft and come back with a new proposal.

Ms. Adkins reported that two pieces of the audit have not been addressed. The first is the creation of legal authority CCHE to have the nonprofit authority. That was accomplished by recent legislation (SB 61). The second was administrative costs of some of the programs.

Administrative costs of some of the programs have been addressed. Colorado Advanced Materials Institute and the Colorado Advanced Photonics are heavily dependent on state resources. Both programs have been notified they must reduce administrative costs in the next year. There is currently a stronger current process for managing the funding. Year's contracts will not be signed until the language is included. The language cannot be retroactive. There would be a question how future funding would be allocated.

Commissioner Vollbracht inquired about the status of the Supernet funds. Ms. Adkins responded that the supernet funds could not be transferred to the non-profit funds because there was no controlling entity for the former CATI nonprofit. SB 61 allows CCHE to establish a nonprofit. Each institution transferred a one-time \$100,000 of the supernet resource into the nonprofit. The staff and the institutions have negotiated a draft intellectual property agreement. The Commission at a teleconference meeting later in June will review the agreement. The agreement will split the proceeds in excess of one million with the state in proportion to the investment.

Commissioner Lamm stated that since the state has not had additional dollars in the past, how will the institutions and industry be informed? Ms. Adkins outlined the process and stated that there is a backlog of proposals that have not been funded.

Commissioner Baker said that this looks like economic development. Reviewing the proposals is extremely time consuming. Ms. Adkins commented that the mission of TAG is research, not economic development. It ties research into the original research idea and not the economic development. It's the highest risk investment. It is complimentary for the legislature to take this risk. Commissioner Quamme said the funding is used for proven research rather than basic

research.

Advisory Committee member Keith King inquired about the 25 cent allocation from the tire tap fund. Ms. Adkin explained that the revolving loan fund allocations is set aside for TAG programs. Executive Foster said there are industries that are ready to work with the higher education institutions.

Staff Recommendation

(1) The Science and Technology Committee recommends approval of the funding totaling \$2,096,955 for 12 programs as specified in the Recommended Funding table. The funding for each individual program is conditional pending successful completion of the FY 1999/2000 programs.

(2) It recommended that the Commission delegate the authority to adjust any individual program amount within the total approved amount to the Executive Director, if any funds are unused.

Action: Commissioner Farina moved approval of the staff recommendation (1) to approve the funding of \$2,096,955 for 12 programs as specified in the Recommended Funding table. Commissioner Greenberg seconded the motion unanimously.

Commissioner Farina moved approval of staff recommendation (2) to delegate the authority to adjust any individual program amount within the total approved amount to the Executive Director, if any funds are unused. Commissioner Greenberg seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

D. Low Enrollment Program Policy and Action

Chairman Ralph Nagel invited the governing board representatives to comment on the proposed changes to the Policy and Procedures for the Discontinuance of Low Demand Degree Programs before the staff presentation.

Dr. David Clark, Associate Vice-President of the Colorado State University system, advocated that the Commission leave the policy in place for a year before considering any changes. He expressed concern about reducing the number exemptions from five to three for institutions with more than 5,000 students. He argued that larger schools have more flexibility than smaller institutions and are better able to support low enrollment programs, particularly when they have unique programs, such as agriculture. He pointed out that reducing the number of exemptions may imply that programs close to the margin may not be wanted in the state. He asked the Commission to postpone action on the policy for one year, or at least, until the next Commission meeting to provide sufficient time to discuss the proposed changes.

Dr. Lee Halgren, Vice-President of Academic Affairs for The State Colleges, concurred with the policy goals of time review and discontinuance of programs that no longer address market needs, but stated that he is very concerned about reducing the number of exemptions from five to three. He believes that changing the number of exemptions could stifle innovation. If the Commission decides to lower the number of exemptions for large institutions, it is critical to clarify the January 2001 effective date in the policy. He further suggested eliminating the appeals criteria listed in section 3.03 of the policy since the Commission is only accepting requests for one- and two-year extensions. He urged the Commission to allow further discussion of the policy.

Dr. Michel Dahlin, representing the University of Colorado, concurred with the need for additional time to discuss substantive issues associated with changing discontinuance procedures. She stated that CU is particularly concerned with the proposed reduction in the number of exemptions, explaining that large institutions benefit from having large and small degree programs. She encouraged allowing the institutions to be efficient by using both large and small programs and not to adopt the proposed three-exemption limit.

Responding to Commissioner Nagel's request for a brief overview of the salient points at issue, Dr. Samson highlighted the three policy changes – change in maximum exemptions for large institutions, clarification of the governing board responsibilities as the primary decision makers, and the consequences if a governing board chooses not to act. She noted that the discontinuance policy does not stifle innovation, but allows institutions to direct resources to high priority programs by discontinuing the degree programs that are no longer market responsive. She illustrated this effect by citing several examples of new programs that have attracted enrollment from existing, low-demand programs. She explained

that the dissonance in the system regarding this policy is partially due to the differences in roles between the Commission coordinating and planning mission – long term – and the governing boards’ managerial mission – immediate action impacts.

Responding to Commissioner Lamm’s question, the governing boards affirmed that they would have sufficient time to meet the 2001 effective date if the Commission acted in October. Commissioner Farina asked what are the implications if the Commission waited until October to reconsider the policy. Dr. Samson stated that not only is the Commission’s October agenda quite heavy but the Academic Council has a heavy policy and project load in the next three months. Scheduling the policy for Commission action before October would provide the Commission time to debate the substantive changes.

Executive Director Foster suggested that the Commission may wish to discuss the Low Demand Discontinuance Policy at its August retreat.

Commissioner Baker would like to hear recommendations directly from the members of the governing boards. She emphasized the complexity the Commission faces in making this decision and would appreciate honest recommendations from the governing boards. Seconding Commissioner Baker’s position, Commissioner Lamm stated that she is interested in seeing policy language that strengthens the governing boards’ responsibility to make the politically hard decisions on low enrollment programs. She wishes to deal with the policy revisions expediently, but she observed that the retreat is not conducive to the type of dialogue needed.

Staff Recommendation

That the Commission discontinue any degree programs that the governing boards have not discontinued or exempted under their five program limit.

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

Action: Commissioner Greenberg moved that the Commission continue the discussion of the Low Enrollment Policy until August 2000. Commissioner Baker seconded the motion, with the understanding that the Commission will hold a public meeting to act on this policy in August. Motion carried unanimously.

V. Items for Discussion and Possible Action

None

VI. Written Reports for Possible Discussion

A. Report on Out-of-State Instruction

The Commission accepted the report on Out-of-State Instruction. The Executive Director has approved the following out-of-state instruction.

The Trustees of The State Colleges has submitted a request for approval of a course to be delivered by Adams State College:

SPT 559: The Dramatic Landscape of England to be delivered in Bath, England from July 15 through August 12, 2000.

The Board of Regents of the University of Colorado has submitted a request for approval of a course to be delivered by the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center, School of Medicine:

New Approaches to the Management of Peripheral Arterial Disease and Intermittent Claudication to be delivered in Rosemont, Illinois on June 18, 2000.

The Board of Regents of the University of Colorado has submitted a request for approval of courses to be delivered by the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center, School of Medicine:

the University of Colorado at Boulder:

TMUS 4433 Special Studies: Study Tour in Choral Music and

TMUS 5534 Special Studies: Study Tour in Choral Music in Italy to be offered in Italy from May 22-June 4, 2000.

B. CCHE - Capital Assets Quarterly Report

The Commission accepted the Capital Assets Quarterly Report as presented.

C. Concept Paper:

(1) Bachelor of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies at Adams State College

The Commission accepted the concept paper submitted by the Trustees of The State Colleges for a Bachelor Interdisciplinary Studies at Adams State College.

Action: Commissioner Greenberg moved adjournment of the meeting. Commissioner Nagel seconded the motion, and the motion carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

There will be a teleconference meeting held in June to discuss the Technology Advancement Group Program Inte Property. Date to be announced.