

CCHE Agenda

March 2, 2000

Tivoli Student Union Room 320 A-B

Auraria Higher Education Center

Denver, Colorado

10:00 a.m.

- I. Approval of Minutes (February 3, 2000)
- II. Reports
  - A. Chair's Report -- Bracken
  - B. Commissioners' Reports
  - C. Advisory Committee Reports
- III. Consent Items
  - A. CCHE-Technology Advancement Group Program Plan -- Adkins/Hum
- IV. Action Items
  - A. Degree Programs Remanded to Governing Boards for Review and Action -- Samsom
  - B. Teacher Education Policy -- Samson/Lindner
- V. Items for Discussion and Possible Action
  - A. Grandview Terrace Waiver, CU-Boulder -- Adkins
  - B. Financial Aid Policy -- Samson/O'Connor
- VI. Written Reports for Possible Discussion
  - A. Technology Learning Grant and Revolving Loan Program Report -- Adkins/Richardson
  - B. Capital Construction Cash-Funded Programs -- Adkins
  - C. Report on Out-of-State Instruction -- Grieder

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE)  
March 2, 2000  
Agenda Item II, A

**TOPIC: CHAIR'S REPORT**

**PREPARED BY: ALEXANDER E. BRACKEN**

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

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE)  
March 2, 2000  
Agenda Item II, B

**TOPIC: COMMISSIONERS' REPORT**

**PREPARED BY: COMMISSIONERS**

This item provides an opportunity for Commissioners to report on their activities of the past month.

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE)  
March 2, 2000  
Agenda Item II, C

**TOPIC:                   ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORTS**

**PREPARED BY:   ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

This item provides an opportunity for Commission Advisory Committee members to report on items of interest to the Commission.

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE)  
March 2, 2000  
Agenda Item III, A

**TOPIC: CCHE-TECHNOLOGY ADVANCEMENT GROUP PROGRAM PLAN**

**PREPARED BY: JEANNE ADKINS AND RICK HUM**

### **I. SUMMARY**

The CCHE-Technology Advancement Group (TAG) staff has prepared the Proposed Program Plan for the Advanced Technology Program (included as Attachment 2). The Program Plan incorporated the guidance in the enabling legislation, recommendations from the state performance audit, direction from the administration and concerns expressed by the Joint Budget Committee and other members of the General Assembly.

In formulating an action plan for the TAG programs for the future, an advisory Committee, The Science and Technology Advisory Committee, has been formed under the chairmanship of Commissioner Dean Quamme. This committee reviewed the Program Plan and recommends CCHE approval.

### **II. BACKGROUND**

The Colorado Advanced Technology Institute (CATI) program was transferred to CCHE on July 1, 1999, as a result of passage of HB99-1359. This legislation provides general direction for the Advanced Technology Program. The CCHE-Technology Advancement Group (CCHE-TAG). A Performance Audit was underway of the CATI program at the time the legislature incorporated it into CCHE. The audit was completed in September 1999 of the Advanced Technology Program and included nine recommendations concerning the direction and administration of the program.

The Science and Technology Committee has been created to provide direction for the CCHE-TAG program and to make recommendations to CCHE concerning long-term funding and programmatic issues affecting TAG. The Science and Technology Committee (membership is included as Attachment 1) met twice and provided recommendations for the Proposed Program Plan.

The enabling legislation requires that the program be developed in conjunction with institutions of higher education and the Office of Innovation and Technology. The Proposed Program Plan has been provided to the CEOs of the institutions; the current CCHE-TAG Program Managers at the Universities and non-profits; the Secretary of Technology at the Governor's Office of Innovation and Technology, and the Director of the Economic Development Office. Comments or suggestions from these organizations will be provided at the March 3, 2000, Commission meeting.

The CCHE-TAG staff will be developing an Implementation Plan for the CCHE-TAG Program. The Implementation Plan includes a review of the currently funded programs and an evaluation of how those programs meet the new program selection criteria. Some of the currently funded programs may have to seek funding from other sources, if they do not match the approved Program Plan. The budget request for next fiscal year includes a continuation budget from the General Fund at a level similar to the current budget of \$2.9 million. The Science and Technology Committee expressed interest in considering new programs, but that may not be possible until additional funding is obtained. Legislation introduced by CCHE during this session, if adopted, could provide some additional resources for specific types of programs. The Science and Technology Committee will evaluate the submitted Program Plans, for next fiscal year, in May. The Commission will be presented the program funding recommendations for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2000, at the June 1, 2000, Commission meeting.

### **III. COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

**The Science and Technology Committee recommends approval of the Proposed Program Plan with inclusion of any suggestions from the Institutions, other State Agencies or the Commission that the Commission feels appropriate.**

Attachments:

[Attachment 1](#): Science and Technology Committee Membership

[Attachment 2](#): Proposed Program Plan

\*\*\*\*\*

Attachment A:

## DRAFT Economic Impact Survey

Company: \_\_\_\_\_ Survey Due By: \_\_\_\_\_

Please provide your company's SIC code \_\_\_\_\_ and NAICS code \_\_\_\_\_.

**Please**

**note:**

*Proprietary business information, provided to CCHE-TAG is not part of a public record. CCHE-TAG will publish summary results of the surveys. When filling out this survey, keep in mind that we are asking for your best estimate, not a detailed search of your records.*

1. How many additional jobs were created by this project in the last year and how many jobs do you estimate it will create in the next year?

	Manufact'g/ Production	Marketing/ Professional	Other Jobs	Average/ Annual Salary
Prior Year: 7-1-97 to 6-30-98	_____	_____	_____	\$ _____
Actual: 7-1-98 to 6-30-99	_____	_____	_____	\$ _____
Estimated: 7-1-99 to 6-30-00	_____	_____	_____	\$ _____

2. How many jobs were saved in the last year by this project and how many jobs do you estimate it will save in the next year? ("Saved" in the sense that employees would otherwise have been laid off. "Saved" should not be interpreted as referring to the continued employment of "Jobs Created" in a prior year).

	Manufact'g/ Production	Marketing/ Professional	Other Jobs	Average/ Annual Salary
Prior Year: 7-1-97 to 6-30-98	_____	_____	_____	\$ _____
Actual: 7-1-98 to 6-30-99	_____	_____	_____	\$ _____
Estimated: 7-1-99 to 6-30-2000	_____	_____	_____	\$ _____

3. What are your company's actual and projected annual sales resulting from this project? ("Colorado Exports" refers to all sales shipped outside of Colorado.)

	Colorado Sales	+	Colorado Exports	=	Total Sales
Prior Year: 7-1-97 to 6-30-98	\$ _____		\$ _____		\$ _____
Actual: 7-1-98 to 6-30-99	\$ _____		\$ _____		\$ _____
Estimated: 7-1-99 to 6-30-2000	\$ _____		\$ _____		\$ _____

4. What are your company's actual and projected annual cost savings resulting from this project?

Prior Year: 7-1-97 to 6-30-98	\$ _____
Actual: 7-1-98 to 6-30-99	\$ _____
Estimated: 7-1-99 to 6-30-2000	\$ _____

5. Have you had any capital infusion in the last 12 months related to this project?

5. Have you had any capital infusion in the last 12 months related to this project.

Stock \$ \_\_\_\_\_ Joint Venture \$ \_\_\_\_\_ Merger \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
State \$ \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \$ \_\_\_\_\_ Acquisition \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Other, please specify \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

6. How would you rate the CCHE-TAG Program's services on a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being very dissatisfied and 10 being very satisfied? (CCHE-TAG's Program services could include the Applied Research Product/Process Development, Commercialization or facilitation by Incubators or Venture Capital Center.)

Very dissatisfied 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very satisfied

Please explain your rating: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

7. Using a similar scale, what role did the CCHE-TAG Program services play in the results you have rep (CCHE-TAG's Program services could include the Applied Research Product/Process Development, Commercialization or facilitation by Incubators or Venture Capital Center.)

No role 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Crucial role

Employment: \_\_\_\_ Sales: \_\_\_\_ Cost Savings: \_\_\_\_ Capital: \_\_\_\_

8. What will be your company's greatest challenges in the next 12 months?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

9. Please estimate your firm's budgets for Research and Development.

This Year: \$ \_\_\_\_\_ Next Year: \$ \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature – CEO or Designee Date

Please return by mail or fax to:

CCHE-TAG  
1300 Broadway, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Denver, Colorado 80203  
Phone: 303-894-2936  
Fax: 303-894-2937

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION

\*\*\*\*\*

Attachment B:

The Corporation for Enterprise Development, a Washington, D.C.-based research institute, has compiled an annual "Report Card for the States" for the past 11 years. Colorado has performed extremely well once again in this survey, and especially well in the technology-related measures. The following table outlines how Colorado compares technology-related criteria:

--	--	--

<b>Measure</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Ph.D. Scientists and Engineers	<b>8</b>	Number of employed doctoral scientists and engineers per 1,000 workers
Science and Engineering Graduate Students	<b>4</b>	Number of science and engineering graduate students in doctorate-granting institutions, per million population
Patents Issued	<b>10</b>	Number of patents issued per 1 million population
University Research & Development	<b>8</b>	University research \$ granted per capita
Federal Research & Development	<b>9</b>	Federal research \$ granted per capita
Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) Grants	<b>3</b>	SBIR grants (\$) awarded per worker

Source: Corporation for Enterprise Development, "Report Card for the States," 1998.

Between 1995 and 1997, over 300 new high-tech firms have opened operations in Colorado. Over the course of 1995, Colorado ranked #3 in the nation for job-growth in the high-tech industry, adding over 22,000 new jobs. Most these jobs were in software and computer services, but telecommunications and high-tech manufacturing also saw substantial growth. In 1996, Colorado was ranked #4 in the nation for venture capital investment, with individuals and firms investing over \$400 million in the state's booming high-tech industry.

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE)

March 2, 2000

Agenda Item III, A

Attachment 1

### **CCHE – TAG Science and Technology Committee Membership**

<b>Dean Quamme</b>	MACTEC Environmental Restoration Services, LLC. Past member of CATI commission. Current member of Colorado Commission of Higher Education
<b>Merc Mecure</b>	Ph.D., CEO, CMD Optics. Founder of Ball Aerospace, very active in the Photonics industry in the state. Previous CATI Commissioner. Currently serves on the Colorado Advanced Photonics Technology Center Board.
<b>Jerry Donahue</b>	President, Boulder Technology Incubator. Jerry Donahue is on the OIT Science and Technology Committee.
<b>Lynn Taussig</b>	M.D., President or CEO of National Jewish Medical Research Center. A previous CATI Commissioner. Currently serves on the CVC Board. Is a member of the OIT Science and Technology Committee.
<b>Rick Ambrose</b>	V.P., Space Systems, Raytheon Systems and Director of Colorado Operations. A previous CATI Commissioner – on most recent commission. Rick has designated Mary Petryszyn as a participant in his absence
<b>Rep. Ron May</b>	Colorado Springs legislator who has headed several IT Committees and is interested in technology issues.
<b>Rep. Bill Swenson</b>	Longmont legislator who served on CATI Commission and has long-term interest in technology/technology transfer issues.



Colorado Commission on Higher Education  
Technology Advancement Group  
Proposed  
Program Plan

February 18, 2000

Mission

To establish Colorado as the acknowledged world leader in selected technologies so as to be the location of preferenc conduct of education, research, product development, and manufacturing in these technologies.

Statutory Direction

The Colorado Commission on Higher Education – Technology Advancement Group (CCHE-TAG) is authorized by Colorado Revised Statute § 23-1-106.5 and § 23-1-106.6 as follows:

**23-1-106.5 Duties and powers of the commission with regard to advanced technology.**

(1) The commission, in consultation with the governing boards of institutions of higher education and the office of innovation and technology created in the office of the governor, shall:

- (a) Establish priorities for the distribution of equipment and moneys available to the institutions of higher education according to its assessment of the long-range goals and capabilities of such institutions;
- (b) Integrate the needs of advanced technology industries in the state with the commission's overall master plan process and academic planning process;
- (c) Facilitate technology transfers and cooperation between academic research programs and advanced technology industries;
- (d) Distribute equipment and moneys among institutions of higher education based upon priorities established pursuant to paragraph (a) of this subsection (1);
- (e) Receive annual reports from the various institutions of higher education on the use of allocated equipment and moneys.

(2) The priorities established pursuant to paragraph (a) of subsection (1) of this section shall take into account the following objectives:

- (a) Avoiding unnecessary duplication of programs, particularly at the graduate level of instruction;

(b) Establishing centers of excellence in research and teaching for specialties at various campuses of the institutions of higher education, subject to available appropriations;

(c) Considering industry needs for technical training at the associate, baccalaureate, and graduate levels and for in-service and continuing education;

(d) Encouraging cooperation among institutions of higher education and local communities and other governmental entities;

(e) Developing the necessary infrastructure to support distance learning, telemedicine, economic development, and enhanced citizen access. The commission shall work cooperatively with the chief technology officer in the office of innovation and technology in the development of such necessary infrastructure.

(f) Increasing efficiency in funding through elimination of costly duplication and gaps in infrastructure that cause the misuse of state resources.

(3) In conjunction with institutions of higher education, the commission may promote and establish research center: connection with the administration and operation of any such centers established in cooperation with institutions of education, the commission may:

(a) Enter into any contract or agreement not inconsistent with this article for the benefit of the centers;

(b) Purchase, lease, trade, or otherwise hold real or personal property, whether tangible or intangible;

(c) In conjunction with institutions of higher education, appoint professional and support staff to work in and administer the centers or jointly administer such centers; and

(d) Procure insurance.

(4) (a) The commission is specifically empowered to receive and expend grants, gifts, and bequests, specifically including state and federal funds and other funds available, to the institute and to contract with the United States and any other 1 entities with respect thereto.

(b) Contributions of advanced technology equipment, grants, gifts, or bequests from private sources, including but not limited to advanced technology companies, individuals, and foundations, to the institute may be designated by the commission to a specific institution of higher education or may be nondesignated.

(c) Any nondesignated equipment, grants, gifts, or bequests received may be utilized for advanced technology research at institutions of higher education and for maintaining state-of-the-art laboratory equipment at such institutions.

(d) Contributions of advanced technology equipment, grants, gifts, or bequests from private sources, including but not limited to advanced technology companies, individuals, and foundations, may be designated by the commission to research centers in the fields of advanced technology research.

(5) The commission may appoint advisory committees or individuals to advise and assist the commission and suggest solutions for the problems and needs of advanced technology industries and institutions of higher education.

(6) The commission shall work cooperatively with the chief technology officer in the office of innovation and technology created in the office of the governor and with the state board for community colleges and occupational education to promote the development and use of the Colorado customized training program created in section 23-60-306 to provide the skilled labor force required by advanced technology businesses establishing or expanding facilities in Colorado. No special appropriation shall be made for the purposes of this subsection (7) subsection (6) which shall be funded only through general appropriations to the Colorado advanced technology institute commission for advanced technology programs.

(7) (a) On July 1, 1999, all items of property, real and personal, including office furniture and fixtures, books, documents and records of the Colorado advanced technology institute and the Colorado advanced technology commission are transferred to the Colorado commission on higher education

transferred to the Colorado Commission on Higher Education.

(b) On and after July 1, 1999, whenever the Colorado advanced technology institute or the Colorado advanced technology commission is referred to or designated by any contract or other document, such reference or designation shall be deemed to apply to the Colorado commission on higher education. All contracts entered into by said institute or commission prior to July 1, 1999, are hereby validated, with the Colorado commission on higher education succeeding to all rights and obligations under such contracts. Any appropriation of funds to said institute from prior fiscal years open to satisfy obligations under such contracts shall be transferred and appropriated to the Colorado commission on higher education for the payment of such obligations.

### **23-1-106.6. Duties and powers of the commission with respect to technology transfers**

1) The commission, in consultation with the office of innovation and technology created in the office of the governor, shall:

(a) In all its program efforts, endeavor to facilitate the transfer of newly created technologies from the laboratory to the private sector for the start-up of new businesses, to add product lines to established firms, or to introduce technologies into mature industries in order to strengthen the state's existing economic base; and

(b) Assess the technology transfer potential of all academic programs targeted for investment and development.

(2) No special appropriation shall be made for the purposes of this section, which shall be funded only through appropriations to the advanced technology program costs.

#### Program Area Selection

The Colorado Commission on Higher Education – Technology Advancement Group (CCHE-TAG) supports programs that are intended to be technology transfer initiatives for specific advanced technology program areas. The current program areas are:

- Bioscience;
- Information Technology; and
- Advanced Materials Fabrication and Processing.

Over time, CCHE-TAG may select new program areas or discontinue old ones, after consultation with the Governor's Office of Innovation and Technology, the Office of Economic Development and the institutions of Higher Education determines a given program area has greater potential in a number of the following factors:

- Potential for economic development;
- High potential for success as measured by:
  - Near-term payback,
  - Technology has advanced to the point it is ready to go,
  - High visibility nationally and internationally, and
  - The technology is complementary to current advanced technology in the state.
- Colorado can be competitive in the marketplace;
- Technology transfer would serve the need of Colorado's private sector;
- There is demonstrated involvement by the private sector;
- There is federal involvement;
- There is multi-campus involvement on an on-going basis; and
- There is potential for the programs to become self-supporting.

Advancement of technology transfer has three definable stages. Although a program or projects within a program are likely to be aimed at aspects included in more than one phase, it is useful to compare programs that are primarily targeted at the same specific phase:

- Phase 1: Applied Research
- Phase 2: Product or Process Development
- Phase 3: Commercialization

## Criteria for Funding Specific Programs

The criteria for selection of funding priorities in these phases of technology transfer will be similar but the criteria will be weighted differently for the three phases.

The CCHE will determine the final approval of funding on Higher Education (CCHE) with recommendations from the Science and Technology Committee and the ranked recommended funding by CCHE-TAG staff. The staff recommendations will be based on the following criteria:

- \* Builds on the Institutions' strengths and previous successes  
(the criteria continue on the next page)
- \* Considers Colorado Industry needs for technical training at the: Associate
  - baccalaureate,
  - graduate levels,
  - in-service, and
  - continuing education
- \* Establishes centers of excellence in research and teaching subject to available appropriations
  - Provides opportunities for developing the necessary infrastructure to support:
    - distance learning
    - telemedicine
    - support economic development
    - enhanced citizen access
- \* Industry Involvement
- \* Federal Involvement
- \* Competitiveness – Colorado has the potential to be a leader
- \* Non-duplicative of other programs, particularly at the graduate level of instruction
- \* Has the potential for this program to take research in Colorado in a significant, new direction
- \* Increases efficiency in funding through elimination of costly duplication and gaps in infrastructure that cause the misuse of state resources
- \* Has potential for success
- \* Encourages cooperation among the institutions of higher education, local communities and other governmental entities
- \* Provides opportunity for rural areas of the state to economy benefit from development of technology
- \* Has the potential for becoming self-supporting
- \* Provides a balance of Applied Research, Product/Process Development and Commercialization within a program area and within a program

{The following pages include tables of weighted-scores for the criteria in the three phases. }

<b>Applied Research</b>	
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Possible Maximum Score</b>
Industry involvement	13
Federal involvement	11
Has the potential for success and/or becoming self-supporting	10
Establishes centers of excellence in research and teaching, subjects to annual	

appropriations	10
Has the potential for this program to take research in Colorado in a significant new direction	8
Builds on the institutions' strengths and previous successes	8
Encourages cooperation among the institutions of higher education, local communities and other governmental entities	7
Provides a balance of applied research, product/process development and commercialization within a program area and within a program	7
Considers Colorado Industry needs for technical training at the: associate, baccalaureate, graduate levels, in-service and continuing education	6
Competitiveness - Colorado has the potential to be a leader	6
Increases effectiveness in funding through elimination of costly duplication and gaps in infrastructure that cause the misuse of state resources	5
Non-duplicative of other programs, particularly at the graduate level of instruction	3
Provides opportunity for rural areas of the state to economically benefit from development of technology	3
Provides opportunities for developing the necessary infrastructure to support: distance learning, telemedicine, support economic development, enhanced citizen access	3
Total Maximum Scores	100

<b>Product or Process Development</b>	
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Possible Maximum Score</b>
Industry involvement	15
Competitiveness - Colorado has the potential to be a leader	12
Has the potential for success and/or becoming self-supporting	12
Builds on the institutions' strengths and previous successes	10
Increases effectiveness in funding through elimination of costly duplication and gaps in infrastructure that cause the misuse of state resources	9
Has the potential for this program to take research in Colorado in a significant new direction	8
Encourages cooperation among the institutions of higher education, local communities and other governmental entities	7
Provides a balance of applied research, product/process development and commercialization within a program area and within a program	6
Non-duplicative of other programs, particularly at the graduate level of instruction	4

Considers Colorado Industry needs for technical training at the: associate, baccalaureate, graduate levels, in-service and continuing education	4
Federal involvement	4
Establishes centers of excellence in research and teaching, subjects to annual appropriations	3
Provides opportunity for rural areas of the state to economically benefit from development of technology	3
Provides opportunities for developing the necessary infrastructure to support: distance learning, telemedicine, support economic development, enhanced citizen access	3
	-----
	100

<b>Commercialization</b>	
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Possible Maximum Score</b>
Industry involvement	16
Competitiveness - Colorado has the potential to be a leader	12
Has the potential for success and/or becoming self-supporting	12
Considers Colorado Industry needs for technical training at the: associate, baccalaureate, graduate levels, in-service and continuing education	10
Has the potential for this program to take research in Colorado in a significant new direction	10
Provides a balance of applied research, product/process development and commercialization within a program area and within a program	7
Provides opportunity for rural areas of the state to economically benefit from development of technology	7
Increases effectiveness in funding through elimination of costly duplication and gaps in infrastructure that cause the misuse of state resources	6
Encourages cooperation among the institutions of higher education, local communities and other governmental entities	5
Non-duplicative of other programs, particularly at the graduate level of instruction	3
Builds on the institutions' strengths and previous successes	3
Establishes centers of excellence in research and teaching, subjects to annual appropriations	3
Federal involvement	3
Provides opportunities for developing the necessary infrastructure to support: distance learning, telemedicine, support economic development, enhanced citizen access	3
	-----

## Program Goals

All programs will be evaluated based on their ability to complete the work plans submitted for the program and on the following program goals.

Goal 1:

**Enhance educational opportunities at Colorado Higher Education institutions by providing practical, industry-driven research opportunities.**

*How*

*measured:*

The initial measure (output) is the number of students at various educational levels and various institutions that have opportunities to participate in research sponsored by CCHE-TAG.

The longer-term measurement (outcome) would come from tracking the individual students after graduation. The information could be accumulated:

- Employed within Colorado or elsewhere?
- Employed in a technical position?
- Did the experience gained through the research project provide an important experience in the educational process?
- Highest Degree obtained?
- How many years since graduation?
- Current Salary Range?

Goal 2:

**Enhance the institutional research infrastructure by providing support for applied research, product/program development and commercialization.**

*How*

*measured:*

The initial measure (output) can be measured by the total budget for the research program and the number of students that participate in the research programs.

The longer-term measurement (outcome) would be an analysis of the trends in the research program.

- Are more private/industry dollars acquired to support additional research?
- Are federal research grants acquired?
- Do students involved in the research program obtain their current degree? Advance to a higher level degree? Actively work in the research field either in industry or in an academic position?

*{Program goals are continued on the next page}*

Goal 3: **Provide Colorado industries with useful products or processes from the research that has been performed.**

*How*

*measured:*

The initial measure (output) includes the number of patents applied for and granted. The number of useful processes developed, tested and transferred to industry.

The longer-term measurement (outcome) would be the degree to which those products or processes have impacts on companies that make use of them. This would have to be done by requesting information from companies on an annual basis. Kansas Technology Enterprise Corporation does an Economic Impact Survey mailed for 5 years after a company is involved in a project. The type of questions that might be asked include:

- Increases in sales as a result of the research project (total and in Colorado);
- Number of jobs created or maintained;
- Cost saving from the research project;
- Evaluation of the services received from the research project.

An example of an Economic Impact Survey adapted from the form used in Kansas is included as Attachment A. CCHE-TAG intends to develop a similar survey document that would be used with all corporations that participate in the CCHE-TAG program research.

Goal 4:

**Create a reputation and environment that attracts business to Colorado because of its research reputation capabilities and educated workforce.**

*How*

Measurement of this goal will be more difficult. There are some national surveys that will be useful in tracking Colorado's perceived business environment over time. One example is a "Report Card for the States" compiled annually by the Brookings Institution, a Washington, D.C.-based research institute. An extract from the latest report is included as Attachment B.

*measured:*

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE)  
March 2, 2000  
Agenda Item IV, A

**TOPIC: DEGREE PROGRAMS REMANDED TO THE GOVERNING  
BOARDS FOR REVIEW AND ACTION**

**PREPARED BY: SHARON M. SAMSON**

**I. SUMMARY**

The Commission remanded four degree programs to the governing board for review and action during the past year including Environmental Science and Engineering (Ph.D.) at Colorado School of Mines, Physics (M.A.) offered by the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs, and Ph.D. in Biological Education and Ph.D. in Chemical Education offered by the University of Northern Colorado. The Commission placed the Environmental Science and Engineering degree into review in 1997; the governing board review findings are now due. The Commission approved the Physics degree in 1988, placed it into review in 1993, accepted the University of Colorado Regents' request for a final two-year extension that expired in 1999. The Commission placed the Chemical Education and the Biological Education Ph.D. degrees into review in 1994, accepted the UNC Trustees report in 1996. UNC's Chemical Education doctoral degree has met its graduation and enrollment projections.

Based on the performance of these degree programs, the staff recommends that the Commission:

- Continue provisional status for the Ph.D. in Environmental Science and Engineering offered by CSM until the Visiting Committee recommendations are final.
- Discontinue the M.S. in Physics offered by UCCS.
- Continue provisional status for the Ph.D. in Biological Education offered by UNC until 2003.
- Grant full approval to the Ph.D. in Chemical Education offered by UNC.

**II. BACKGROUND**

The Commission monitors newly approved academic programs during the first five years of implementation. CC's statutory role is to ensure that new degree programs are within the role and mission, respond to bona fide need, and that the new program does not unnecessarily duplicate existing degree programs. Institutions provide enrollment and graduation projections to document bona fide need and lack of duplication. To measure program success, the Commission compares the projected enrollment and graduation numbers originally provided by the proposing institution with their actual enrollment and graduation data. If the data reveal solid demand, the Commission grants the degree program full approval status and delegates the responsibility to the governing board for continually assessing the program's quality. If the data indicate that the degree program is not fulfilling its original objectives, the Commission remands the degree program to the governing board for full review and action.

Under CCHE policy, the governing board transmits a letter to the Commission a letter indicating its action regarding the program, following the full program review. The actions are limited to one of the following:

1. Specific corrective actions taken by the governing board to address the factors that prevented the program from meeting its goals and objectives,
2. Notice of an intent to restructure the program in accordance with bona fide state needs, or
3. Notice of program termination.

If the governing board opts for corrective action, the governing board shall notify the Commission and outline the impact that these actions have had or are intended to have on the program enrollment and graduation numbers. The letter shall also include information on the type of support and oversight that the governing board shall provide until the program meets its goals and objectives.

If the governing board opts to restructure the program, this action implies that the program shall cease admitting

students to the program until the Commission approves the new program curriculum. The institution shall submit proposal for the restructured program following CCHE's degree approval policies and procedures.

If the governing board opts to terminate the program, the program shall cease admitting new students or readmitting former students effective immediately. Currently enrolled students may complete the program under the statutory guidelines of no more than four years for a baccalaureate or graduate level program.

The Commission will consider the governing board's action. Six affirmative votes are required for the program under review to continue with provisional approval or receive full approval status. If a governing board fails to take appropriate corrective action, the Commission, in keeping with its statutory authority, may discontinue the program.

### **III. STAFF ANALYSIS**

Four programs have been remanded to the governing boards, including three doctoral degrees and one masters' degree.

#### **Environmental Science and Engineering Ph.D. – Colorado School of Mines**

The Commission approved the Environmental Science and Engineering Ph.D. in 1992. In January 1998, the Commission examined the five-year performance of the doctoral degree and concluded that the low graduation number (i.e., one degree granted) justified a full governing board review. The CSM Board of Trustees subsequently approved plan for review and received a report from the Peer Review Committee (three faculty from Clemson, Univ. of Michigan, Univ. of Wyoming) at its June 1999 meeting. The final step in the original review plan is a visit by a Visiting Committee. The governing board requests time to complete the original review plan before making the final determination regarding the status of this degree program.

The materials documenting the progress of this degree note four facts:

1. The initial review findings indicated that the program lacked the resources needed to fully implement the program. The governing board intervened and authorized the hiring of five additional faculty members since CCHE's review.
2. CSM completed a student enrollment pattern analysis that parallels CCHE's analysis. With the additional senior faculty, the institution anticipates that six students will complete the doctoral degree requirements in 1999-2000. The number of new students entering the doctoral degree indicates that the trend will continue.
3. The governing board has declined to approve additional degree programs until the Environmental Science and Engineering program meets its initial goals.
4. The program has attracted an annual funding of \$1.5 million of sponsored research dollars.

The Visiting Committee will complete its work and submit its report to the CSM Board of Trustees in September 2000. The governing board action would determine the status of this degree program in the succeeding months, reporting CCHE by January 1, 2001.

#### **Biological Education (Ph.D.) – University of Northern Colorado Chemical Education (Ph.D.) – University of Northern Colorado**

The Commission approved three doctoral degrees -- Biological Education, Chemical Education, and Educational Mathematics -- in 1989. In January 1996, the Commission examined the five-year performance of the doctoral degree and concluded that Educational Mathematics had met its enrollment and graduation goals but that the two science degree programs justified a full governing board review. In 1997, the UNC Board of Trustees subsequently completed full program review and chose option #1 under CCHE's Five-Year Review Policy, specifically to take corrective action to address the factors that prevented the program from meeting its goals and objectives and to intervene in the administration of the degree programs. The governing board raised the enrollment and graduation numbers for each degree program, (i.e., combined enrollment of 13 full-time majors and average no less than two graduates per year from the Ph.D. program). The UNC governing board intervened by increasing funds for assistantships, requiring the departments to increase external support, and conducted an annual review. It also stipulated that failure to reach the program goals by 1998-99 would result in program closure. The institution approved the plan and requested the University to negotiate an MOU with the Chemistry Department and another with the Biology Department.

The materials documenting the progress of these degrees note several facts:

1. The degrees and enrollment in Chemical Education meet the original projections provided to CCHE. While the Chemical Education program has not met the governing board's graduation expectations negotiated in the MOU, it has exceeded the enrollment projections.
2. The Chemistry faculty has attracted the external funding required by the MOU.
3. This is the only Chemical Education Ph.D. degree program approved in Colorado.
4. Only 9 students are actively making progress toward the Biological Education Ph.D. graduation requirements.
5. The Biology faculty is seeking extramural funds to support the graduate research program and the department is seeking two tenure-track faculty.
6. The President of UNC approved an MOU agreement extending the time until 2001-2002. The Office of Academic Affairs is monitoring the progress of the Biological Education degree and believes that it will reach the MOU goals by June 30, 2002.
7. This is the only Biological Education Ph.D. degree program approved in Colorado.

Under CCHE policy, the level of oversight exercised by the UNC Board of Trustees and the significant achievement of the Chemical Education Ph.D. degree program in meeting its original projected enrollment and graduation numbers allows the Commission to grant full approval to Chemical Education degree program and delegate accountability for the degree program to the UNC Board of Trustees.

#### **Physics (M.A.) – University of Colorado at Colorado Springs**

The Commission approved the Physics M.A. degree program in 1988. In January 1994, the Commission examine five-year performance of the degree and concluded that the low enrollment and graduation numbers (i.e., one degree granted) justified a full governing board review. The Regents re-approved the degree program in 1995 and forwarded the approval request to the Commission. In March 1996, the Commission remanded the M.S. in Physics approval request back to the Board of Regents with four specific questions. The Regents replied with a request for a three-year extension. In September 1996, the Commission reduced the projections to half the original numbers and approved two-year extension with six conditions, including take immediate steps to raise student enrollment in the program. The university agreed to discontinue the program if it failed to reach the revised enrollment and graduation projections.

The materials documenting the progress of the Physics degree program note the following facts:

1. The Physics degree has not met the 1996 revised enrollment and graduation projections.
2. In the two years since the Commission action, the enrollment and number of degrees awarded has declined.
3. UCCS claims that significant demand for the Physics masters' degree program exists in the Colorado Springs community.
4. Colorado has four approved Physics masters' degree programs.

The University of Colorado Board of Regents' request continuation of the degree program and full approval status, citing that while Physics failed to meet the proposal's original or revised enrollment or graduation goals, it does not meet CCHE's low demand, low enrollment benchmark. Because the Physics degree has operated for twelve years with meeting its projections, it does not appear that demand exists to substantiate the need for a graduate program in Physics. The CCHE low enrollment benchmarks are not applicable to newly approved programs, i.e., those in provisional approval status.

ENVIRONMENTAL (Ph.D.)	SCIENCE CSM	AND				ENGINEERING
		1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	
	Projected Enrollment	35	38	38	38	149

	Actual Enrollment	19	22	20	21	82
	Projected Degrees	9	15	15	15	54
	Actual Degrees	0	1	2	2	5

**Biological Education  
(Ph.D.)**

**UNC**

		1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	TOTAL
	Projected Enrollment	10	10	10	10	40
	Actual Enrollment	7	3	4	8	22
	Projected Degrees	1	2	2	2	8
	Actual Degrees	2	4	0	1	7

**Chemical  
(Ph.D.)**

**Educational  
UNC**

		1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	
	Projected Enrollment	10	10	10	10	40
	Actual Enrollment	9	7	9	12	37
	Projected Degrees	1	1	1	1	4
	Actual Degrees	1	3	1	0	6

MASTERS

**PHYSICS (M.A.)**

		1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	TOTAL
	Projected Enrollment	35	35	18	18	106
	Actual Enrollment	12	16	10	10	48
	Projected Degrees	5	5	4	4	18
	Actual Degrees	1	4	3	2	10

#### **IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

**That the Commission:**

- **Continue provisional status for the Ph.D. in Environmental Science and Engineering offered by CSM until the Visiting Committee recommendations are final.**
- **Discontinue the M.S. in Physics offered by UCCS.**
- **Continue provisional status for the Ph.D. in Biological Education offered by UNC until 2003.**
- **Grant full approval to the Ph.D. in Chemical Education offered by UNC.**

#### **Appendix A**

##### **STATUTORY AUTHORITY**

23-1-107. Duties \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ powers of the commission with respect to program approval, review, reduction, and discontinuance. (1) The commission shall establish criteria or guidelines, which define programs and procedures for approval of new academic or vocational program offerings.

23-1-108. The Commission shall prescribe uniform academic reporting policies and procedures to which the governing boards shall adhere.

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE)  
March 2, 2000  
Agenda Item IV, B

**TOPIC: TEACHER EDUCATION POLICY**

**PREPARED BY: SHARON M. SAMSON/DIANE LINDNER**

## **I. SUMMARY**

At the February Commission meeting, CCHE introduced the proposed Teacher Education Policy ([Attachment 1](#)) that it has developed in consultation with the State Board of Education. The policy responds to C.R.S. 23-1-121, which mandated that the Commission adopt policies establishing the requirements for teacher preparation programs offered by institutions of higher education before July 1, 2000.

The key features of the policy include:

- Presents an equitable state policy that applies the same quality standards to all teacher education programs.
- Requires the integration of content knowledge with professional knowledge; i.e., the entire higher education institution is responsible for the quality of the teacher preparation programs.
- Establishes joint review and approval processes that ensure that teacher education program curricula align with P-12 content standards; i.e., CDE and CCHE reinforce the standards and focus on the mutual goal of quality.
- Increases the minimum number of hours that teacher education candidates spend in the field.
- Encourages collaboration among key constituents for professional development of prospective teachers.
- Creates opportunities for the continuous involvement of school districts personnel in the assessment of teacher quality.
- Develops a strong accountability system that measures the quality of approved teacher education program.

Colorado is well positioned to become the leading state in performance-based Teacher Education with the adoption of this policy. The national teacher education accrediting societies are interested in forming partnerships with Colorado because of the state's progressive position on teacher quality. Several degree programs that have been redesigned to address the proposed Teacher Education Policy and the new performance standards have notified CCHE that they are final contenders for national grants.

If the Commission approves the policy, it will be effective immediately. The Commission will evaluate any program proposal seeking teacher preparation approval using the program performance criteria specified in this policy.

## **II. ISSUES RAISED AT THE PREVIOUS COMMISSION MEETING**

At the February meeting, the Commission discussed the larger issues associated with the proposed Teacher Education Policy, and deferred to staff on the procedural questions. The presentation focused on the policy goals, approval process for new teacher preparation programs, the 2000-2001 review process, and the data collection procedures. Testimony from the floor introduced topics that ranged from the definition of entry-level licensure, the list of preferred degrees, and implementation time line, but the Commission discussion remained focused on quality and how to define and assess the quality of teacher preparation programs.

The goal of the new policy is to ensure the quality of teacher preparation programs. The policy responds directly to the statutory intent of SB 99-154 to raise the quality of teacher preparation. By implementing a performance-based model, the policy creates a system to answer the general public concerns regarding the lack of quality in teacher preparation. Each section of the policy supports the quality goal -- defining performance measures, processes for assessing the quality of teacher preparation programs, and data systems that support broad teacher education accountability to the legislature and the general public.

The Commission is charged in statute to review and approve all teacher education programs offered by public institutions of higher education. As a result of suggestions offered at the February Commission meeting and other communication, the language describing the approval process for new programs and the 2000-2001 Joint Review Process was simplified (Section 6.00). The simplification has made the processes more understandable to all persons involved in redesigning programs to meet the new standards.

At the conclusion of the discussion, the Commission requested staff to research the masters' degree question. Col discontinued all its Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) degree programs in 1986. Since 1980, the Colorado Department of Education has only recognized bachelors' degrees and post-baccalaureate programs as approved entry-level teacher preparation programs. With the statutory mandate to ensure that students are able to complete entry-level teacher preparation in a reasonable time (i.e., four academic years), the proposed definition for entry-level degrees appears valid.

### III. STAFF ANALYSIS

The staff analysis describes the two sections of the proposed policy that were developed between the February and Commission meetings, including definitional terms (Section 3.03) and Appendix A: Performance Indicators and Measures.

During the past month, the institutions assisted CCHE and CDE staff in refining the definitions that are specific to teacher education and relevant to a performance-based model. Definitions that are understandable, relevant, and succinct are critical to understanding a new policy. This collaborative process helped develop a consistent set of definitions. The most notable change to the definitions is the substitution of *Professional Development School* (more generic) for *Partner School* (a specific form of a professional development school). Carol Wilson, Director of the Colorado Partner School, recognized some schools may not qualify as a Partner School due to distance between the college and the K-12 school or number of K-12 teachers who meet the qualifying credentials. She suggested the substitution and wrote the definition that is now in the policy. The second change is the elimination of the definition for Masters' Degree. Since the policy pertains to entry-level teacher preparation programs, including this definition did not add value to the policy. The final definitional change is the use of P-12, rather than K-12. P-12 represents more accurately the full scope of teacher education in Colorado – Early Childhood, Elementary, Middle School, and Secondary.

Another policy section that evolved in the past month is the Preferred Degree List. Because it was part of the protocol and not the policy, the preferred degree list was intended to be an interim measure to assist Colorado in its transition to a performance-based teacher education system aligned with P-12 content areas. It was developed in consultation with the Colorado Department of Education and identified degree programs that were explicitly aligned with the curriculum taught in the K-12 schools. For example, an elementary teacher is expected to teach reading, mathematics, science, and history. However, elementary teachers do not typically teach engineering, psychology, or meteorology. The partial listing became comprehensive during the past month. During this period, CCCOES, CDE, and CCHE negotiated the degree requirements for vocational licensure areas (Agriculture, Business, Marketing, Home Economics, Technology, and Trades and Industry). The programs that aligned with the vocational licensure areas were also added to the preferred list. The review committee completed its work and added five degree programs to the list. Unfortunately, the Preferred Degree List added more confusion than clarity, and therefore, the revised Teacher Education Policy no longer includes the Preferred Degree List.

This revision affects the Joint Program Review protocol. The CCHE and CDE, together with the institutions, recognize that the proposed Teacher Education Policy will necessitate the redesign of every program that is currently approved for teacher preparation. CCHE also recognizes that performance data will not be available for the newly redesigned teacher preparation programs. Therefore, the 2000-2001 Joint Program Review will be examining the evidence of program change and supporting infrastructure to determine which teacher education programs meet the new performance and content standards. Under the revised policy, all teacher education programs will be assessed individually on the degree the content is aligned with the curriculum of the K-12 schools.

The central section of the policy is the program performance standards that will guide the approval process and the 2000-2001 joint program review. A working committee, the Program Standards and Measures Committee, formed to assist CCHE on valid measures and data sources. The members represented both public and private institutions. Because the working committee will present its final recommendations regarding the performance indicators and measures on February 28, Appendix A of the Teacher Education Policy contains the framework and preliminary draft measures. The final version of the program performance standards will be provided to the Commission in a separate mailing. It is important to recognize that the program performance standards are complemented by the professional content standards adopted January 2000 by the State Board of Education ([Attachment 2](#)). Because of the level of collaboration between CDE and CCHE, the two standards form a more rigorous set of teacher preparation criteria than either agency could provide alone.

### III. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

**That the Commission approve the proposed Teacher Education Policy.**

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE)  
March 2, 2000  
Agenda Item IV, B

Attachment 1

## **SECTION I**

### **PART P TEACHER EDUCATION POLICY**

#### **1.00 Introduction**

This policy describes the performance-based teacher preparation model adopted in Colorado. It outlines the criteria and procedures for approving teacher preparation programs in Colorado. It lists the statutory criteria and the corresponding performance measures that new programs must meet to qualify its graduates for state licensure and against which existing programs are evaluated. The policy describes the review processes and accountability measures that pertain to teacher education programs. All teacher preparation programs shall be discontinued as of July 1, 2001, unless re-approved prior to this date under the review process outlined in this policy.

The policy applies to all programs at public institutions of higher education operating in Colorado that prepare entry-level classroom teachers. It does not apply to programs that prepare school administrators or special service licensure areas (e.g., school nurse, occupational therapist).

#### **2.00 Statutory Authority**

By statute, the Colorado Commission on Higher Education has responsibility to define the criteria and guidelines for higher education academic degree programs. The statute (C.R.S. 23-1-107(1)) reads:

The commission shall review and approve, consistent with the institutional role and mission and statewide education needs, the proposal for any new program before its establishment in any institution. No institution shall establish a program without first receiving the approval of the commission. As used in this subsection (1), "new program" includes any new curriculum that would lead to a new vocational or academic degree. The commission shall further define what constitutes an academic or vocational program and shall establish criteria or guidelines that define programs and procedures for approval of new academic or vocational program offerings.

and C.R.S. 23-1-121 which states:

On or before July 1, 2000, the Commission shall adopt policies establishing the requirements for teacher preparation programs offered by institutions of higher education. At minimum the requirements shall ensure that each teacher preparation program may be completed within four academic years, is designed on a performance-based model, and addresses the statutory criteria.

#### **3.00 Goals, Principles, and Terminology**

##### **3.01 Policy Goals**

The primary goal of CCHE's *Teacher Education Policy* is to ensure the quality of teacher preparation. To address the policy goal, the policy does the following:

3.01.01 Establishes the requirements for teacher preparation programs, including entry-level teacher preparation programs [23-1-121 (2)].

3.01.02 Specifies the process and protocol for a statewide review of all programs with current teacher preparation approval, beginning July 1, 2000, and concluding June 30, 2001. All teacher preparation programs will be discontinued on July 1, 2001, unless reauthorized by CCHE under the proposed review process.

- 3.01.03 Requires annual monitoring of the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs [23-1-121 (3)].
- 3.01.04 Requires a periodic review of teacher education programs, at least once every five years.
- 3.01.05 Implements procedures for collecting and reviewing evaluative data of teacher education programs, performance on professional tests.
- 3.01.06 Proposes a process for developing a reward system for field-based activity of faculty and supervising teachers.
- 3.01.07 Specifies a process for collaborating with the governing boards to define the information to be included in annual report to the education committees of the General Assembly.
- 3.01.08 Requires an annual report on the performance and quality of teacher education programs to the legislative education committees, beginning January 2002 [22-60.5-116.5].

### 3.02 Principles

CCHE's *Teacher Education Policy* is based on the following principles:

3.02.01 Educator preparation is a shared enterprise among the Colorado Commission on Higher Education, the Colorado State Board of Education (SBE), institutions of higher education, and school districts. In this context the Colorado Commission on Higher Education has responsibility for the approval and review of entry-level programs designed to prepare teachers while the Colorado State Board of Education is authorized to develop the professional content standards and license the graduates of approved teacher preparation programs.

3.02.02 Teacher preparation programs are student-centered and performance-based. Consequently, they are evaluated by the students' performance and the criteria listed in Section 4 of this policy.

3.02.03 Programs designed to prepare teachers must be responsive to rapidly changing needs or requirements for school district positions, including:

- Technology and its role in instructional delivery.
- Ability to communicate with students, parents and guardians regarding educational progress and student behavior.
- Ability to assess student learning and modify curriculum based on assessment results.
- Classroom management techniques.
- Ability to apply knowledge to the P-12 classroom and adapt instruction in ways that enhance student learning.

3.02.04 The degree that content knowledge, field experience, and professional knowledge are integrated into a performance-based model determines the strength of a teacher preparation program.

### 3.03 Terminology

Approved Teacher Preparation Program is a teacher education program that has been reviewed pursuant to the provisions of C.R.S. 23-1-121, the performance-based standards established by the Commission and the requirements of 23-1-108 and 23-1-116, and has been granted teacher preparation approval by the Commission.

Assessment is defined as the method used to collect evidence of what a student knows and is able to do.

Content Standards are the specific statements of what a K-12 student should know or be able to do in specified academic areas. The State Board of Education adopted model content standards that define what students enrolled in Colorado's K-12 public schools should know and be able to do at certain threshold points in their schooling—at fourth grade, at eighth grade, and as they approach graduation from high school—in order to be considered proficient in subject content areas. **All students in a teacher education program will be assessed on their knowledge and ability to teach the content that corresponds to the level they intend to teach** (e.g., English secondary).

Degree program, as defined in statute, means a CCHE-approved program of study with a defined curriculum that leads to a formal diploma. In the context of this policy, a teacher preparation degree program includes four curricular components:

a) General education curriculum

The curriculum that provides skills acquisition and broad knowledge across the arts and sciences. Students who complete the general education core curriculum will demonstrate proficiency in oral and written communication, mathematics, critical thinking, social sciences, humanities, and science.

b) Content Knowledge

The portion of the curriculum that provides the content knowledge that aligns with the State Board of Education endorsement standards, typically called the academic major. The academic majors or degree programs eligible for entry-level teacher preparation approval include:

- Degree programs in specific fields of study that are aligned with the curriculum of the public schools.
- Interdisciplinary degree programs that are structured to address the P-12 content standards that apply to a particular licensure level.

c) Professional knowledge

Courses and experience that develop knowledge and skills designed to apply the content knowledge in the classroom meet the State's professional knowledge standards, and link practice and theory.

d) Field-based experience

Experiences designed for students to apply content and professional knowledge in authentic school settings under supervision of teachers and faculty. Field-based training may include a variety of experiences associated with teaching in supervised settings, e.g., classroom observations, assisting licensed teachers in school settings, practica, student teaching and internships or integrate all experiences under a partner school model. Student teaching is a field-based experience in which teacher candidates demonstrate their competence to develop curriculum, teach and assess students, and diagnose learning difficulties in a specific classroom setting over an extended period of time under supervision of a lead or cooperating teacher.

Field experiences must account for a minimum of 800 clock hours in the teacher preparation program.

Endorsement

is the designation on a license that the holder is authorized to teach a specific grade or developmental level (e.g., elementary), subject area (e.g., language arts), or special service area (e.g., counselor).

Entry-level teacher preparation programs include baccalaureate degrees, post-baccalaureate programs, alternative teacher programs, and teacher-in-residence programs. Under C.R.S. 23-1-121, CCHE will specifically approve the baccalaureate and post-baccalaureate entry-level teacher preparation programs. SBE approves the alternative and teacher-in-residence programs.

Licensure

refers to the system and criteria that authorizes individuals to teach in Colorado public schools. The Colorado State Board of Education is the agency authorized to license teacher education candidates, including provisional license for entry-level educators, professional license for experienced educators, and master certification for highly accomplished educators. Provisional licenses are issued to persons who hold approved bachelors' degrees, have completed a degree program that is approved for teacher preparation, an alternative licensure program, or a teacher in residence program and have demonstrated professional competencies as specified by the Colorado State Board of Education.

The Colorado Commission of Higher Education is the agency authorized to approve teacher preparation programs offered in Colorado that qualify graduates for licensure.

entered in Colorado that qualify graduates for licensure.

Advanced Professional Development School (PDS) is a P-12 school at which a professional community of higher education faculty and teachers jointly prepare future teachers and improve schooling. Classes, practica, and activities may occur on-site at the P-12 school. In a PD relationship, the higher education faculty have significant presence in the school, and school faculty have a substantive voice in shaping the teacher education program. In a PDS, prospective teachers fully participate in the teaching environment over an extended period of time, so that clinical experiences have a sense of continuity and coherence. The same activities may be extended to an attendance area including elementary, middle, and high schools, or in some cases to a district.

Performance-based model refers to a system that evaluates each teacher preparation program against the performance standards as defined and adopted by the Commission, and the professional knowledge content standards adopted by the Colorado State Board of Education. Sections 4.01–4.07 of this policy specify the performance criteria that apply to the approval or review of an entry-level teacher preparation program. Teacher education programs that fail to meet the performance criteria will not be approved, will be placed on probation, or will be discontinued.

Performance-based standards refer to a set of prescribed standards that teacher candidates must know and be able to do.

Post-Baccalaureate Teacher Education Program is designed to supplement the academic background of students who have completed an undergraduate degree program i.e., Bachelor of Arts (BA) or Bachelor of Science (BS). This program is intended for people who decide upon a teaching career after college graduation or those interested in changing careers. In the context of this policy, a teaching post-baccalaureate program includes two curricular components: professional knowledge and field experience and admission standards that assess the applicant’s content knowledge to a curriculum. At institutions that offer approved masters’ degrees, post-baccalaureate credits may apply toward masters’ degree graduation requirements.

Quality Indicator System refers to CCHE’s policy that measures and rewards institutions for performance on specified indicators.

Teacher Candidate means a person who is participating in an approved teacher preparation program in order to enter the teaching profession (i.e., entry-level licensure).

Teacher Preparation Program is defined as a CCHE-approved program of study specifically designed to prepare teacher candidates to instruct K-12 students.

#### **4.00 Criteria for a Performance-Based Teacher Education Program**

Beginning July 1, 2000, the Commission shall use performance-based criteria specified in this section to review and approve entry-level teacher preparation programs, including proposals for new programs. Teacher preparation programs will be evaluated on the evidence supporting a performance-based model. Recommendation for approval by the Colorado Department of Education is a necessary but insufficient factor for Commission approval. In its review, the Commission will evaluate whether all programs requesting teacher education approval meet criteria 4.01 through 4.07.

4.01 Public institutions shall ensure that each teacher preparation program may be completed within four academic years and designed and implemented in accordance with the higher education Quality Assurance Act.

4.02 Each program will demonstrate that it has a comprehensive admissions system including screening and counseling for students interested in teaching.

4.03 Each program will demonstrate that it has an on-going screening and counseling of teacher candidates by practicing teachers or faculty members.

4.04 Each program will demonstrate that its course work and field-based training integrates theory and practice :

educates teacher candidates in methodologies, practices, and procedures of teaching standards-based education, specifically in teaching the content defined in the state model content standards.

4.05 The curriculum of each program will ensure that each teacher education candidate completes a minimum of 80 hours of supervised field based experience that relates to predetermined learning standards.

4.06 Each program will document the demonstrated skills required for licensure of each candidate prior to graduation.

4.07 Each program will provide ongoing, comprehensive assessment including evaluation of each teacher candidate's subject matter and professional knowledge and ability to demonstrate skill in applying the professional knowledge base.

#### **5.00 Approval Process for New Teacher Preparation Programs**

Any institution of higher education that chooses to offer a new teacher preparation program shall submit a proposal requesting Commission approval. The Commission, in conjunction with the State Board of Education, shall review teacher preparation proposals submitted by an institution of higher education. It will also review any requests submitted by a non-public institution.

5.01 CCHE will follow its existing program approval process for requests for teacher preparation approval.

5.01.01 These type of teacher preparation program approval requests require a concept paper and full proposal:

- New teacher preparation degree programs.
- New post-baccalaureate programs.

5.01.02 These type of teacher preparation program approval requests require a full proposal:

- CCHE-approved degree programs requesting teacher preparation approval.
- Modifications to existing degree programs.

5.01.04 Public institutions with approved teacher education programs do not require additional approval to offer programs as cash-funded programs.

5.02 The Commission will request the State Board of Education to review the professional content of each teacher preparation program prior to its consideration. The State Board of Education reviews the proposal to determine if the program content is designed and implemented in a manner that will enable a teacher candidate to meet the requirements specified by the State Board of Education.

5.02.01 If the State Board of Education confirms that the content portion of the program is aligned with the State Board of Education's performance standards adopted January 2000, CCHE shall review the proposal using the performance-based criteria specified in Section 4.00 of this policy.

5.02.02 If the State Board of Education does not recommend CCHE consideration because the program content does not meet the SBE standards, CCHE will disapprove the request.

5.03 CCHE will evaluate the proposal using the criteria specified in Section 4.00 of this policy and present a recommendation for Commission action. Proposals submitted prior to April 1 will be considered in June. Proposals submitted prior to November 1 will be considered in January.

#### **6.00 Review Processes for Approved Teacher Preparation Programs**

This section describes the three review processes that apply to teacher education programs, including the 2000-2001 Statewide Review, the Five-Year Review, and review process for an institution reward system.

6.01 2000-2001 Review Process

The process for existing programs with current teacher preparation approval will be conducted by CCHE in collaboration with the Colorado State Board of Education and occurs between July 1, 2000, and concludes June 30, 2001. The process

with the Colorado State Board of Education and occur between July 1, 2000, and conclude June 30, 2001. The review process consists of seven steps, including (1) scheduling the site visit, (2) institutional submission of evidence supporting the performance measures, (3) review of submitted evidence prior to the site visit, (4) a site visit by the review team, (5) CCHE written notification of approval recommendations to the institutions, (6) an appeals process, and (7) formal action by the Commission.

6.01.01 The institution will formally request a site visit indicating the programs that are designed to meet the criteria specified in this policy. CCHE will confirm the dates and provide a description of the materials the institution needs to submit to CCHE 30 days prior to the site visit.

6.01.02 The institutions will submit materials documenting how the degree programs meet the program criteria specified in Section 4.00.

6.01.03 The review team will review the submitted evidence prior to the site visit to identify program strengths, weaknesses, or missing information needed to support the performance criteria defined in this policy. Appendix A provides a detailed list of performance indicators and measures.

6.01.04 The review team will conduct an on-site review focusing on the results of the preliminary review and performance criteria that are best evaluated by demonstration. The site visit will consist of an entrance interview, program review, and an exit interview.

6.01.05 CCHE will notify the institution of its initial recommendation within ten days of the completed site visit.

6.01.05.01 The review team will forward its findings in writing to CCHE within five days of a completed site visit.

6.01.05.02 CCHE will notify each institution of its preliminary recommendation for each program reviewed within ten days of a completed site visit.

6.01.05.03 An institution may submit a rejoinder to address the findings or, if necessary, request a second visit to address the findings of the review panel. The second site visit must occur prior to March 31 and is subject to the availability of the review team.

6.01.05.04 CCHE will prepare a recommendation using the findings of the joint review team and formally share a written recommendation with the governing board at least 30 days prior to the June 1, 2001, Commission meeting. The staff may recommend that the Commission approve, discontinue, or place a teacher education program on probation.

The staff will recommend full approval of a teacher preparation program that meets the performance criteria adopted by the Commission and the professional content standards adopted by the State Board of Education.

The staff will recommend a one-year probation for programs that meet the professional content standards but fail to meet one or more of the performance-based criteria defined by the Commission. As defined in statute, a probationary program may not admit students into the program until it receives Commission approval. Probationary approval is not renewable; the program must reapply for approval and comply with the procedures specified in Section 5.00.

The staff will discontinue a program that does not meet the State Board of Education adopted teacher preparation standards.

6.01.06 Under CCHE's appeals process, a governing board may appeal a recommendation that places a program on probation or discontinues a teacher education program.

6.01.06.01 To initiate an appeal, the governing board shall submit a written request identifying the program and the reasons why it is contesting the recommendation. This material will be included in the agenda materials.

6.01.06.02 The representative of the governing board filing an appeal shall have an opportunity to testify at the Commission meeting.

6.01.07 The Commission will act on the teacher preparation approval recommendations, including any programs

appealed the staff recommendation. Program approval requires six affirmative Commission votes. The Commission action is binding.

6.01.07.01 If the Commission votes to discontinue a teacher preparation program, the decision is effective immediately. The institution may not admit, re-admit, or enroll new students effective July 1, 2001.

6.01.07.02 Students enrolled in a discontinued program at the time of the Commission action may complete their degree program under the original graduation requirements. Under State statute these students have a maximum of five years to complete the graduation and licensure requirements, i.e., under June 30, 2005. The institution shall advise students who do not appear able to complete the requirements into a degree program approved for teacher preparation.

6.01.02 Protocol for the 2000-2001 Review of Teacher Education Programs.

6.01.02.01 Prior to June 30, 2000, CCHE, in consultation with the State Board of Education, will refine the protocol for the site review, incorporate the recommendations of the Measurement and Assessment Committee, and specify the materials required for the review.

6.01.02.02 To schedule the review, each institution shall notify CCHE of the preferred dates for its site visit prior to July 15, 2000. The site visit must occur between July 1, 2000 and March 31, 2001. Institutions are encouraged to schedule a review as early as possible.

6.01.02.03 CCHE will coordinate the review schedule and confirm the site visit dates by July 31, 2000, including scheduling any institutions that have not identified the preferred review dates.

6.01.02.04 CCHE will solicit nominations from each teacher preparation constituency and select the site visit team. At a minimum, the review team will consist of the designated CCHE and CDE representatives and three other members who represent the key teacher education constituents.

6.01.02.05 Each review team member will participate in an orientation session prior to participating in the on-site review.

6.01.02.06 Each institution will confirm the final review dates 60 days prior to the scheduled review, including licensure areas and associated teacher preparation programs that the institution is requesting reauthorization.

6.01.02.07 Each institution will submit materials required for the site visit 30 days prior to the scheduled site visit. If the material is not provided, the site visit will be rescheduled at the convenience of the review team.

6.02 Five-Year Review Cycle

6.02.01 To address the policy goal of continuous improvement of teacher preparation programs, CCHE policy requires that each approved program undergo a periodic review.

6.02.02 The statute specifies that an institution reviews each degree program at least once every seven years and review approved teacher preparation programs at least once every five years.

6.03 Institutional reward system for field based activity

Following the adoption of this policy, CCHE will convene a working group to develop a system that recognizes and rewards the level of involvement of faculty in field-based activity. CCHE will present recommendations for a reward system to the Commission at the first Commission meeting scheduled during the 2001-2002 academic year. The Commission's recommendations will incorporate the findings from the 2000-2001 joint program review.

## **7.00 Data Reporting and Accountability**

7.01 CCHE in consultation with the governing boards will define the necessary data elements to monitor and evaluate the performance standards defined in statute and CCHE policy. To meet state and federal reporting dates, the mandatory date for collecting evaluative data pertaining to teacher education programs, including performance on professional tests, is July 1, 2000. Institutions are required to provide data for 1999-2000 if possible and for 2000-2001 if not possible.

is July 1, 2000. Institutions are encouraged to provide data for 1999–2000 if possible on student enrollment.

7.02 CCHE will collaborate with the governing boards to specify the information and the approach for conduct evaluation of teacher education programs that will be provided in the annual report to the education committees of General Assembly.

7.03 Beginning January 2002, CCHE will submit an annual report on the performance, quality, and effectiveness teacher education programs to the house and senate education committees.

7.04 CCHE and CDE will develop a memorandum of understanding that facilitates data sharing among the agencies regarding the key performance indicators, to follow-up on the placement, classroom performance, and licensure of students prepared in approved teacher education programs. The sharing of data among state agencies for educational purposes is supported in federal and state law. Any agreement will conform to state and federal privacy laws.

**Appendix A: SB154 Program Requirements Assessment Matrix.**

*draft*

<b>SB154 Requirements</b>	<b>Performance Indicators</b>	<b>Program Criteria</b>	<b>Supporting Data Collection And Analysis</b>
<p><i>a. * Admission System (Comprehensive admission system which includes screening and counseling for students who are considering becoming teacher candidates)</i></p>	<p>Screening and Counseling Process</p>		
	<p>The program has a written admissions policy that specifies minimum qualifications for admission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Cumulative undergraduate GPA of at least 2.5</li> <li>● Demonstrated proficiency in writing</li> <li>● Experience working with children</li> <li>● Evidence of mastery of general studies curriculum as evidenced by passing score on rising junior exam or equivalent measure</li> <li>● The program consistently follows the policy in admissions decisions; all exceptions are documented with written rationale that shows an equivalent level of academic and professional accomplishments</li> <li>● The admissions criteria are reviewed at least every three years in</li> </ul>	<p>Summary of students admitted into teacher education programs</p>

		<p>conjunction with data on teacher supply and demand in districts served by the program and success of graduates in teaching positions</p>	
	<p>Articulation Agreement with Community Colleges</p>	<p>Specifying general education courses that are required for teacher education</p> <p>At least one agreement with feeder community colleges (Teacher Ed MOU)</p>	
<p><b><i>b. Ongoing screening and counseling of teacher candidates by practicing teachers or faculty members</i></b></p>	<p>A written policy exists that describes the academic, personal and professional expectations of teacher candidates.</p>	<p>A process exists for referral, counseling, and redirection of teacher candidates that do not meet these expectations.</p> <p>Records exist that demonstrate implementation of this process and that provide a summary of the number and percent of teacher candidates who leave the program</p> <p>A data driven advising system is in place and functioning that ensures that academic and professional progress of candidates are monitored regularly.</p>	<p>Profile of students admitted into teacher education programs</p> <p>Retention rates of students admitted into teacher education preparation programs</p>
<p><b><i>c. Course work and field based training that integrates theory and practice (i.e., early field experience) and educates teacher candidates in the methodologies, practices and procedures of teaching standard-based education</i></b></p>	<p>A written conceptual framework exists for the program, identifying the knowledge, skills, or dispositions to be developed in each course and field experiences</p>	<p>Student assessments and performance products reflect the conceptual framework</p> <p>Required course sequences reflect the alignment of student learning goals to field experience (theory to practice)</p>	
<p><b><i>d. Each candidate completes a minimum of 800 hours of field experience that relates to predetermined learning standards</i></b></p>	<p>Written requirements exist in institution's catalog or student handbook establishing field experience requirements of 800 hours</p>	<p>The institution has a support system for both university and school-based supervisors of field experiences that is sufficient to ensure the integration of theory and practice required in Criterion 3</p> <p>Criteria for selecting cooperating teachers who will be assigned to teacher education candidates and a list</p>	

		<p>education candidates and a list of cooperating teachers that meet criteria</p> <p>Institution documentation of field experience hours demonstrates that the requirement is satisfied by all teacher candidates</p>	
<p><i>e. ** Demonstrate the skills required for licensure as specified by the State Board</i></p>	<p>The program has written policies that require teacher candidates to provide products that demonstrate skills specified by the State Board</p>	<p>The program utilizes a process for evaluating these products, so that they are scored in a consistent way across all students in the institution.</p> <p>The program has a process for identifying teacher candidates who are not meeting State Board standards and ensuring that they do meet those standards prior to licensure, or that they are removed from the program.</p> <p>Program records indicate how each student has performed on each required assessment.</p> <p>The program has a systematic process for using assessment data related to State Board standards to improve performance assessments, curriculum, and program support for the development of Teacher candidate skills.</p>	<p>Quality of performance based assessments developed by and/or implemented by the IHE.</p> <p>Overall data resulting from the analysis of performance-based assessments and/or sample of teacher candidate work with related assessments/portfolios.</p> <p>Results of process that identifies teacher candidates who do not meet standards.</p> <p>Develop a system to use feedback from student test scores that link back to the teacher preparation institution.</p> <p>Feedback from the first and third year teacher/administrator survey providing data on the quality of the teacher's preparation</p>
<p><i>f. Comprehensive assessment of candidate's knowledge of subject matter</i></p>	<p>The institution maintains complete records of all students taking the PLACE and/or other identified subject matter examinations</p>	<p>The institution uses this information to evaluate admissions policies and program requirements.</p> <p>Institutions periodically review how students are doing on these assessments and provide feedback to content area majors.</p>	

**Appendix B. Role and Mission of Public Four-Year Colleges and Universities.**

Masters' programs are restricted to certain institutions, including **Adams State College, Colorado State University, the University of Colorado at Boulder, University of Colorado at Colorado Springs, University of Colorado at Denver, and the University of Northern Colorado**

~~Spring, University of Colorado at Denver and the University of Northern Colorado.~~

Doctoral programs in teacher education are restricted to certain institutions, including **Colorado State University**, the **University of Colorado at Boulder**, **University of Colorado at Denver** and the **University of Northern Colorado**.

The **University of Northern Colorado** has a statutory role as the primary institution for teacher education, with responsibility for statewide delivery of instruction.

Attachment 2

## **Performance-Based Standards for Colorado Teachers**

The following shall serve as standards for the licensing of all teacher education candidates in Colorado and reflect the knowledge and skills required of beginning teachers.

**Standard One: Knowledge of Literacy.** The teacher shall be knowledgeable about student literacy development in reading, writing, speaking, viewing, and listening.

**The teacher has demonstrated the ability to:**

- 1.1 Plan and organize reading instruction based on ongoing assessment.
- 1.2 Develop phonological and linguistic skills related to reading including:
  - Phonemic awareness.
  - Concepts about print.
  - Systematic, explicit phonics.
  - Other word identification strategies
  - Spelling instruction.
- 1.3 Develop reading comprehension and promotion of independent reading including:
  - Comprehension strategies for a variety of genre.
  - Literary response and analysis.
  - Content area literacy.
  - Student independent reading.
- 1.4 Support reading through oral and written language development including:
  - Development of oral English proficiency in students.
  - Development of sound writing practices in students including language usage, punctuation, capitalization, sentence structure, and spelling.
  - The relationships among reading, writing, and oral language.
  - Vocabulary development.
  - The structure of standard English.
- 1.5 Utilize Colorado Model Content Standards in Reading and Writing for the improvement

- 1.5 Utilize Colorado Model Content Standards in Reading and Writing for the improvement of instruction.

**Standard Two: Knowledge of Mathematics:**

The teacher shall be knowledgeable about mathematics and mathematics instruction.

**The teacher has demonstrated the ability to:**

- 2.1 Develop in students an understanding and use of:
  - Number systems and number sense
  - Geometry
  - Measurement
  - Statistics and probability
  - Functions and use of variables
- 2.2 Utilize Colorado Model Content Standards in Mathematics for the improvement of instruction.

**Standard Three: Knowledge of Standards and Assessment:** The teacher shall be knowledgeable about strategies, planning practices, assessment techniques, and appropriate accommodations to ensure student learning in a standards-based curriculum.

**The teacher has demonstrated the ability to:**

- 3.1 Design short and long range standards-based instructional plans.
- 3.2 Develop valid and reliable assessment tools for the classroom.
- 3.3 Develop and utilize a variety of informal and formal assessments, including rubrics.
- 3.4 Assess, compare and contrast the effects of various teaching strategies on individual student performance relative to content standards.
- 3.5 Use assessment data as a basis for standards-based instruction.
- 3.6 Provide effective verbal and written feedback that shape improvement in student performance on content standards.
- 3.7 Prepare students for the Colorado Student Assessment Program (CSAP), Third Grade Literacy Assessment, and other assessments of educational achievement.
- 3.8 Ensure that instruction is consistent with school district priorities and goals, the Colorado Model Content Standards, and the 1999 Colorado Accreditation Program.

**Standard Four: Knowledge of Content:** The elementary teacher is knowledgeable, in addition to literacy and mathematics in the following content areas: civics, economics, geography, history, science, music, visual arts, and physical education.

Middle school and secondary content teachers shall be knowledgeable in literacy and mathematics and expert in their content endorsement area(s).

**The teacher has demonstrated the ability to:**

- 4.1 Utilize content knowledge to ensure student learning.
- 4.2 Enhance content instruction through a thorough understanding of all Colorado model content standards.
- 4.3 Apply expert content knowledge to enrich and extend student learning.
- 4.4 Integrate literacy and mathematics into content area instruction.

**Standard Five: Knowledge of Classroom and Instructional Management:** The teacher is knowledgeable about classroom practice in order to successfully manage time, communications, and record keeping procedures that will support and enhance student learning.

**The teacher has demonstrated the ability to:**

- 5.1 Create a learning environment characterized by acceptable student behavior, efficient use of time, and disciplined acquisition of knowledge, skills, and understanding.
- 5.2 Apply sound disciplinary practices in the classroom.
- 5.3 Apply appropriate intervention strategies and practices to ensure a successful learning environment.
- 5.4 Raise the academic performance level of a group of students, over time, to a higher level.
- 5.5 Understand the cognitive processes associated with various kinds of learning (e.g. critical and creative thinking, problem structuring and problem solving, invention, memorization and recall) and ensure attention to these learning processes so that students can master content standards.
- 5.6 Work in cooperation with library media and other resource specialists in providing student instruction on how to access, retrieve, analyze, synthesize and evaluate information, and integrate these information literacy skills into the curriculum to accomplish standards-based learning activities.
- 5.7 Accurately document and report ongoing student achievement.
- 5.8 Communicate with parents and guardians effectively in order to involve them as participants and partners in student learning.
- 5.9 Communicate a variety of assessment results, and their implications to students, parents, guardians, professionals, administrators, and the community.

**Standard Six: Knowledge of Individualization of Instruction:** The teacher is responsive to the needs and experiences children bring to the classroom, including those based on culture, community, ethnicity, economics, linguistics, and innate learning abilities. The teacher is knowledgeable about learning exceptionalities and conditions that affect the rate and extent of student learning, and is able to adapt instruction for all learners.

**The teacher has demonstrated the ability to:**

- 6.1 Employ a wide range of teaching techniques to match the intellectual, emotional, and social level of each student, and choose alternative teaching strategies and materials to achieve different curricular purposes.
- 6.2 Design and/or modify standards-based instruction in response to diagnosed student needs.

- 6.1 Design and modify student case instruction in response to engaged student needs, including the needs of exceptional learners and English language learners.
- 6.3 Utilize his/her understanding of educational disabilities and giftedness and their effects on student learning in order to individualize instruction for these students.
- 6.4 Teach students within the scope of a teacher's legal responsibilities and students' educational rights, and follow procedures as specified in state, federal and local statutes.
- 6.5 Develop and apply individualized education plans.
- 6.6 Collect data on individual student achievement and be accountable for each child's learning.
- 6.7 Use specific knowledge of student medical conditions and medications and their possible effects on student learning and behavior.

**Standard Seven: Knowledge of Technology:**

The teacher is skilled in technology and is knowledgeable about using technology to support instruction and enhance student learning.

**The teacher has demonstrated the ability to:**

- 7.1 Apply technology to the delivery of standards-based instruction.
- 7.2 Use technology to increase student achievement.
- 7.3 Utilize technology to manage and communicate information.
- 7.4 Apply technology to data-driven assessments of learning.
- 7.5 Instruct students in basic technology skills.

**Standard Eight: Democracy, Educational Governance and Careers in Teaching:** The teacher recognizes the school's role in teaching and perpetuating our democratic system. The teacher knows the relationships among the various governmental entities that create laws, rules, regulations, and policies that determine educational practices.

**The teacher has demonstrated the ability to:**

- 8.1 Model and articulate the democratic ideal to students, including:
  - The school's role in developing productive citizens.
  - The school's role in teaching and perpetuating the principles of a democratic republic.
- 8.2 Develop, on the part of the students, positive the behavior and respect for the rights of others, and those moral standards necessary for personal, family and community well-being.
- 8.3 Understand and respond to influences on educational practice including:
  - Federal and state constitutional provisions.
  - Federal executive, legislative and legal influences.
  - State roles of the governor, legislature and State Board of Education.
  - Local school districts, boards of education and boards of cooperative educational services.

- Non-traditional and non-public schools, including: charter schools, religious schools and home schooling.
  - Public sector input from business, advocacy groups, and the public.
- 8.4 Promote teaching as a worthy career and describe various career paths in education, including local, state, national, and international options, higher education, public and private education.
- 8.5 Evaluate his/her own performance and access the professional development options necessary to improve that performance.

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE)  
March 2, 2000  
Agenda Item V, A

**TOPIC: GRANDVIEW TERRACE WAIVER, CU-BOULDER**

**PREPARED BY: JEANNE M. ADKINS**

## **I. SUMMARY**

The Commission is directed by statute to review and approve program plans for institutional cash-funded projects. Projects that are under \$500,000 may be submitted for consideration of waivers of program plans. Commission policy allows discretionary waiver authority between \$500,000 and \$1.5 million for non-capital projects. If a waiver request is not granted by CCHE, a program plan by policy and statute must be submitted on the project for review and approval.

The University of Colorado-Boulder submitted a waiver request in August 1999 for either relocation or demolition by the Board of Regents of 26 properties in Grandview Terrace all currently owned by the institution. CCHE granted request on September 10, 1999.

However, Betty Chronic, (Attachment B) a representative of Historic Boulder, filed an objection to the CCHE waiver of program planning and is requesting the Commission overturn that action and require program plans for remodel/demolition projects. Mrs. Chronic also asks that the Commission deny the institution's master plan section for the Grandview Terrace neighborhood.

CCHE has not received the UCB Master Plan for review at this time and no Commission action on the document pending. Staff has not begun the master plan review. The Commission, however, could act to rescind the waiver granted for the relocation/demolition projects and require program plans be submitted. Staff action was based on information provided at the time the waiver was requested. Had the document referencing one project designated in 1998 as eligible for the national register been available, the decision to grant a waiver on that project would likely have been different. With regard to the properties adjacent to parcels still under private ownership, a more complete explanation of the impact of potential plans on those properties would have been requested from the institution. For the other properties however, the outcome likely would not have changed from staff's perspective.

## **II. BACKGROUND**

Beginning in 1961, the Board of Regents began purchasing single-family residential sites in the neighborhood of Grandview Terrace. The neighborhood abuts the University of Colorado-Boulder main campus to the north and consists of bungalows and apartments built between the 1900s and 1930s. Used to provide housing for faculty and historic fraternity and sorority houses near the campus, the neighborhood contains six large buildings on University Avenue at the north edge of the campus, five of which were fraternity/sorority houses. The building at 1506 Broadway was originally a sorority and now houses the Native American Rights Fund building.

Historic architectural features, according to Historic Boulder, range from Mission, Tudor and Vernacular styles. Bungalows in the interior area are generally Craftsman style, providing "a cohesive and important collection of Craftsman style houses and bungalows." This style is defined as part of an Arts and Crafts Movement at the turn of the century focusing on design simplicity and use of natural materials. The buildings typically are cut and rubble foundations, with stucco and brick features, low-hanging eaves, visible rafters and knee bracing, tapered windows and door surrounds with tapered porch supports and prominent front porches.

CCHE Policy Section III, Part Q, 3.01(a), states that neither governing boards nor institutions may "authorize, or acquire sites or initiate any program or activity requiring capital construction for the use of state-supported institutions, regardless of the source of funding, unless it has obtained the prior approval of CCHE. This includes acquisition, utilization of real property for the use of a state-supported institution of higher education by lease, lease-purchase, purchase, gift or otherwise." Statutory definitions incorporate demolition of property for eventual re-use within this category.

Thus, a waiver of program planning was needed for UCB to proceed to either relocate or demolish any of the structures within the Grandview Terrace neighborhood. The Board of Regents acted on the referral of the waiver request at its August 5, 1999, meeting and subsequently asked for a waiver from CCHE.

That waiver was granted by staff for 26 properties in the neighborhood in a letter to Chancellor Richard L. Byyny, M.D., on September 10, 1999, and a copy of the letter is Attachment A of this agenda item.

Acting on the CCHE approval of the program plan waiver, the institution subsequently issued letters to individuals who had expressed interest in moving bungalows asking for formal proposals and began drafting a request for proposed relocation bungalows and/or demolition of the properties included in the waiver request (Attachment C). The institution's new master plan, approved by the Board of Regents in February 2000, is expected to be reviewed over the next several months by CCHE staff. It directs much of the new parking and research space toward this area of the campus over the next ten years.

Although the interpretation of the events is slightly different, both Historic Boulder and UCB agree on the following basic facts concerning the issue:

- The institution has been purchasing property since the 1960s in the neighborhood with the full knowledge of the community that expansion for the campus in the future would occur on the property. It was a contentious issue in the institution's master plan process a decade ago and the debate ended with removal of the major construction plans from that plan and a return to the status quo. Historic Boulder representatives believe there was a tacit understanding that the institution would occupy the facilities, but preserve the exteriors of historic buildings and as much of the neighborhood character as possible in future development plans. The institution believes it was up front with the preservation group and the Boulder officials about preserving some areas and demolishing or moving the remainder of the bungalows.
- A 1992 memo (Attachment D) from the city of Boulder planning department set in motion a request for an historical survey of the property that outlined the intent to use grant funds to conduct the survey. Memos supplied by Historic Boulder confirm results of the survey indicating and the resulting recommendations for development of the area.
- UCB's Chancellor outlined goals of a Task Force on Interfacing the Campus and Community in August 1997. That task force completed its report January 21, 1998, a copy of which was submitted to CCHE by Historic Boulder. Recommendations in the report included encouraging development of the area as a transition area to reflect surrounding residential and downtown areas progressively. "The University should accommodate the historic character of the neighborhood so long as the University's program requirements can also be met." The report also encouraged UCB to consult with historic preservation experts to identify where use of existing buildings for its needs could be accommodated by preserving the buildings and meet long-term growth needs.
- Discussion among the community, historic group and institution continued over the next 18 months, with the institution concluding it had upheld its commitment to the goals of the task force by choosing to preserve some buildings on the southern perimeter of the neighborhood while allowing preservation groups to relocate bungalows in the central portion of the neighborhood prior to demolition. The institution's decision also reflected the alternative to relocation – demolition of the bungalows if relocation bids were not received to allow for parking uses initially and ultimately construction of research and academic facilities on the property.
- Meanwhile, the Colorado Historical Society at the request of the City of Boulder officially determined (Attachment E) that three properties in the neighborhood – 1301 Grandview Avenue (the Evans residence), 1305 University Avenue, (Sigma Chi Fraternity House), 1511 University Avenue (Armory Building) – were individually eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. The society also informed the city and the institution in subsequent letters that the Grandview Terrace Historic District was eligible under the guidelines for the National Register.
- In February 1999 Colorado Preservation Inc. placed the neighborhood on its Most Endangered List. Between that date and August 1999, the institution and various groups continued to meet. Historic Boulder representatives believe the institution ceased to act in good faith. They believe various changes in subsequent master plan maps indicate the initial plan to reserve some historic areas and allow development in others was supplanted by a plan that destroyed the concept preservationists believed they had accepted.
- Historic Boulder in June 1999 filed an application for local landmarking as an historic district. The institution requested the board to re-open negotiations. In the intervening meetings listed above Historic Boulder claims the

requested the board to re-open negotiations. In the intervening meetings listed above Historic Boulder claims the institution refused to consider other options and offered only to allow four or five bungalows to be moved off site. If that could not be accomplished, it informed the board the bungalows would be demolished.

- Preservationists say that compromise is unacceptable considering the length of the discussions focusing on other options.
- The institution, however, submitted that plan to the Board of Regents and requested CCHE waive program planning on that basis. Historic Boulder believes the change of heart resulted because the landmarking decision was progressing both at the local, state and national levels. The group contends the institution was concerned it might face review on specific demolition projects that, if the designation occurred, could jeopardize other unrelated federal funding if National Historic Register conditions could not be met.
- Subsequently, Historic Boulder notified Colorado Historical Society officials that it concurred with the Boulder Landmarks Advisory Board on October 6, 1999, to seek national registry designation. It also proceeded to overturn its original agreement to a compromise development on January 24, 2000. The Boulder council unanimously approved the local historic designation February 1, 2000, opposed by two individual bungalow owners, who stated they did not wish to have rules imposed on the use of their property that could not be imposed on the institution.
- After receiving Regent approval and the CCHE waiver, UCB issued letters agreeing to pay up to the demolition costs for relocation of the buildings and ultimate demolition. The Colorado Historic Preservation Board acted officially in November 1999 recommending the neighborhood be included on the National Register of Historic Places. Formal notice was sent to the institution in December 1999 and requested to be included as part of the master plan review process. The actual letter seeking national designation of the neighborhood was submitted officially December 10, 1999.

### III. STAFF ANALYSIS

Staff has essentially made a recommendation in this case by granting the waiver request from the institution. Admittedly, that decision might have been altered with respect to several of the properties had information subsequently provided been submitted with the waiver request. However, staff does not believe the additional information would have changed the decision to grant the waiver for the majority of the properties involved in the request.

As noted in Attachment A, the waiver granted was not a blanket waiver and withheld any approval for potential use of the property. It waived program plan submission for the institution only for the potential demolition and relocation of the property, not its ultimate re-use. Staff believes that letter clearly puts the institution on notice that any use of the vacant property must be submitted to CCHE for review.

While staff does not pre-judge development plans projected by the institution in its forthcoming master plan, the ability of the institution to expand in other areas of the campus is limited. The debate then centers on the relative historic value of the neighborhood, whether the entire neighborhood's character should be preserved and/or whether some compromise meets the needs of preservationists and the institution.

### IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

**As stated earlier, staff has by virtue of granting the waiver entered a decision on this issue for the record.**

**Commission options, however, include:**

- **Overturn staff's decision to grant the program plan waiver and require program plan submission by the institution before any demolition/relocation could occur.**
- **Rescind the waiver and ask both parties to re-enter negotiations to reach a compromise that can be addressed by the Commission when it considers the UCB master plan. The section of the master plan concerning development of this property is controversial in the community.**
- **Allow staff's decision to stand and request the parties provide a consensus resolution to this issue to staff for Commission review when the UCB master plan is reviewed by the Commission this summer.**
- **Take no action, allowing waiver to stand and consider the issues raised when the master plan is reviewed this summer.**

Attachments:

[Attachment A](#) – CCHE Waiver Letter Reference Grandview Properties

[Attachment B](#) – Betty Chronic Letter requesting Commission review waiver action

Attachment C – UCB Letter requesting CCHE Waiver

Attachment D – City of Boulder Planning Dept. 1992 Letter

Attachment E – Historical Society notice December 1998

[Attachment F](#) – Historical synopsis of property purchases by UCB

[Attachment G](#) – UCB summary cost analysis on various options

[Attachment H](#) – Executive Summary of Grandview plans

Attachment I – Map of the Grandview Terrace area

**NOTE: Not all attachments are linked. Please e-mail us at the below address or call our office at 303-866-2723 to request a copy of those.**

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE)  
March 2, 2000  
Agenda Item V, A

Attachment A

September 10, 1999

Chancellor Richard L. Byyny, M.D  
Office of the Chancellor  
University of Colorado at Boulder  
Campus Box 17  
Boulder, CO 80309-0017

Dear Chancellor Byyny:

This letter is in response to the University of Colorado-Boulder request for a program plan waiver for the relocation and/or demolition of the Grandview Terrace properties owned by the University and approved for either relocation or demolition by the Board of Regents at its August 5, 1999, meeting.

The waiver is granted for the following properties:

1425 Broadway  
1215 Grandview Avenue  
1220 Grandview Avenue  
1225 Grandview Avenue  
1230 Grandview Avenue  
1232 Grandview Avenue  
1243 Grandview Avenue  
1244 Grandview Avenue  
1301 Grandview Avenue  
1320 Grandview Avenue  
1330/1332 Grandview Avenue  
1333/1335 Grandview Avenue  
1338 Grandview Avenue  
1344 Grandview Avenue  
1429 Grandview Avenue  
1433/1435 13<sup>th</sup> Street  
1510 13<sup>th</sup> Street  
1513 13<sup>th</sup> Street  
1514 13<sup>th</sup> Street  
1424 15<sup>th</sup> Street  
1434 15<sup>th</sup> Street  
1444 15<sup>th</sup> Street  
1450 15<sup>th</sup> Street  
1425 15<sup>th</sup> Street  
Armory Annex

Recognizing that a long-term acquisition plan has been in place by the university to provide for the future

educational needs, the demolition and/or relocation of those buildings will come exclusively from university ca funds, including the Research Building Fund and the Parking and Transit Services fund and that the estimated cost per facility is not expected to exceed \$50,000.

A waiver of the program plan requirements to demolish or relocate the above listed facilities, however, does constitute a blanket waiver for any future properties purchased in the area. Nor does granting this waiver bind Colorado Commission on Higher Education to support proposed future uses for these sites to be outlined in a Facility Master Plan expected to be submitted next month by the university.

Should you have further questions, please contact me at (303) 866-2723.

Sincerely,  
Signed -9/10/99-  
Jeanne M. Adkins  
Director of Policy and Planning

cc: Paul Tabolt  
James R. Topping  
John Bliss  
Kenneth Conahan, Eric Kurtz  
Teresa Wilson, Kelly Fox  
Amy Zook  
Larry Friedberg

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE)  
March 2, 2000  
Agenda Item V, A

Attachment B

Feb. 6, 2000

Jeanne M. Adkins  
Director of Policy and Planning  
Colorado Commission on Higher Education

Dear Ms. Adkins,

This letter is my request that the Commission discuss the decision made by you on September 10, 1999, to allow Boulder to demolish or relocate bungalows in the Grandview Terrace neighborhood in Boulder.

I appreciate your willingness to consider this request and your courtesy in speaking with me. It is my hope that at hearing this request that the Commission will decide to withdraw permission for relocation and demolition.

My reasons for seeking this action are outlined below and are backed by the included addenda or time lines, documents and clippings:

Grandview Terrace is a historic neighborhood in the city of Boulder, located to the north of the main campus. Adjacent to this neighborhood to the north and east is hillside neighborhood. The city owns the infrastructure in the neighborhood. There are nine private property owners remaining in the neighborhood. CU proposed plans assume owners of bungalows do not exist or don't count since buildings are projected for their properties. The plans assume that the city will hand over the streets and alleys to the university, but did not discuss this with the city, and no permission has been given. CU's announcement at a city council meeting last fall was that Grandview would be scraped off and used as a parking lot until authorization and funds for building are approved.

There is no demonstrated need to remove or demolish the bungalows. The University has owned properties in the neighborhood since the 1960s. When the first bungalows were purchased, Boulder citizens raised no outcry. We are accustomed to small bungalow on campus being used for special clinics (Broadway near Wardenburg). That was their usage, together with offices and small programs.

The master plan of 1989-1990 proposed massive buildings for the neighborhood including a new museum. Public opposition caused the plan to be shelved. Instead, the University and Boulder co-funded a historic resources survey to determine eligibility for listing on the National register. The survey showed that the neighborhood was eligible to be a National Register Historic District. That survey was ignored by CU in its current proposed plan. Because there was no opportunity for public input or open Regents meetings, this history has not surfaced.

The "compromise" plan between CU and Historic Boulder was no compromise. On June 2, 1999, Historic Boulder filed an application for local landmarking as a historic district. On June 28, 1999, CU appeared at a Historic Boulder Board meeting, requesting negotiations on Grandview. Several meetings were held. The vice chancellor insisted that, at most 4-5 bungalows could be kept in a "reserve", if Historic Boulder didn't agree to that and stopping the landmarking designation, that all the bungalows would be moved or demolished. HB was given a deadline of August 2 or the Regents would be requested on August 5 to allow demolition or moving. It was never explained that CCHE had not given permission and perhaps had never been asked at that time. It also was never explained that the 5-bungalow plan "reserve" had been drawn on June 14, not during negotiations. The same map, dated July 14, was the "compromise" plan. CCHE did not give the waiver until September 10. By then CU had already given HB a September deadline for choosing which bungalows to save.

Historic Boulder was not given all the facts or the full story that funding of Grandview redevelopment had not been

funded or that CU wanted to get rid of the bungalows and set up a parking lot with private owners left isolated in that lot. No one understood until a recent news story quoted a Regent saying they needed the bungalows gone to avoid problems with federal funding.

Historic Boulder, learning that they had been misled, overturned the agreement by majority vote on January 24, 2000. The Board voted to enthusiastically endorse the landmarking of Grandview Terrace as a local historic district. The Board had previously voted to support the application for listing on the National Register submitted by the Colorado Arts and Crafts Society. The National Register Colorado Review Board found that it met the criteria for listing and recommended forwarding to the Keeper of the Register for listing. The State Historic Preservation Officer forwarded for eligibility certification because of property owner objections, none of which were based on merits, but were generated by CU.

The Arts and Crafts Society then applied for Boulder landmarking, reactivating the earlier application by Historic Boulder. Several hearings were held. The Boulder City Council unanimously approved the district on February 1, 2000. Again no one opposed the district on its merits. Two bungalow owners spoke in opposition and stated they didn't want restrictions on them that CU would ignore.

Why am I appealing to you? It's simple. There is no public process at CU. The Regents meet in executive session for two to three hours before the public meeting. All business is transacted in executive session, then at the public meeting motions are made with little or no discussion and reports are given which honor individuals, programs or departments. All the information given them is from administrators and that is screened. A good example on Grandview is a letter from the Historical Society which was not presented to the Regents. One Regent learned of the letter just before the August 5 meeting, brought it up for discussion and was dismissed by administrators as "of course we are cooperative." Regents would not have known of the information otherwise.

During the past two years we have heard much about CU having power of eminent domain; that CU Regents may move the campus to another community; bypass Boulder and Boulder County on issues of land use and water. These comments have been made in public. Is CU accountable to no one? Why can't the community of Boulder work with the University of Colorado to plan for land use, housing and transportation? Is a community's only participation to be furnish housing for 73% of students not housed by the University? Why should we lose faculty and staff to other communities because CU fails to deal with housing for them. CU and the City of Boulder are interdependent. What do we have to do to establish cooperative planning?

I've written this letter as an individual, representing only myself. However, I am a part of the preservation community at the local, state and national level. I speak on behalf of this community as well as many on the faculty, in city government and other groups and individuals.

We request an agenda item that allows for several speakers. We also ask that in the interim it be made clear that removal or demolition takes place. Allowing any change until after the Commission decides on your September 10 letter will destroy the neighborhood. Please understand that I am not suggesting no change, just change and that the University recognizes and retains the local historic district and realizes that the University should not be planning in secret and with arrogance.

Sincerely,

--signed 2-6-00--

Betty M. Chronic

4705 Shawnee Place

Boulder, Colorado 80303

Attachment F

University of Colorado at Boulder

**Chronology of Regental and Commission on Higher Education  
Actions Pertaining to the Grandview Terrace Area**

June 28, 1961

– \$211,000 in State Capital Construction funds were approved to fund, in part, the Preliminary Campus Development plan which would "focus attention upon the issues that will determine the direction of future development" and "get something down in black and white" as to preliminary campus design.

June, 1961 – approved purchase of 1416 Broadway for \$40,000 and the Armory, transferred by statute.

September 18, 1962 – approved purchase of 1220 Grandview for \$23,553.

December 15, 1962 – approved purchase of 1546 Broadway for \$33,000.

April 24, 1964 – approved purchase of 1424 Broadway for \$70,200.

June 24, 1966 – approved purchase of 1424 15<sup>th</sup> Street for \$18,500.

May 20, 1968 – approved purchase of 1330-32 Grandview for \$32,000.

May 26, 1970 – approved purchase of 1433-35 13<sup>th</sup>

Street for \$31,500. Regent Gilbert noted that CCHE approval had been granted, in keeping with all purchases.

October 28, 1971

– approved purchase of 1243 Grandview for \$38,000. When Regent Johnson seconded the above motion, he said...that even though the...action taken was to meet an immediate need for space in the area on the northwest corner of the campus he would recommend that the Business Affairs Office watch for other tracts...in the area...and complete the blocking-in of that area as part of the University land plan.

January 23, 1974 – approved purchase of 1305 University Avenue of \$32,000.

March 27, 1974 – approved purchase of 1221 and 1229 University Avenue for \$139,000.

February 22, 1979

– approved the Long Range Facilities Master Plan for 1979. Exhibit 10-B of the same plan shows proposed vehicular circulation including a potential parking structure site at the Grandview Terrace property. In addition, pg. 9.11 (g) describes Transition Areas and includes the following:

"The Research/Transition area north of University Avenue between Broadway and 17<sup>th</sup> Street should house humanities or social science research...This area will be considered for a major parking facility to support the heavy traffic generators (Mackay Auditorium, the Recreation Center, Norlin Library) in the northwestern area of the Main Campus which have considerably less parking than other areas of the campus."

October 5, 1979 – Commission on Higher Education approval of 1979 Master Plan with details of Grandview development plan.

February 21, 1980 – approved the Program Plan for Land Acquisition for Grandview. The request continued:

"As opportunities arise for property acquisition, it is proposed that permission be granted through acceptance of this plan to enter into negotiations from time to time toward purchases that would assemble useful blocks of land or buildings for University uses. The property acquisition schedule is considered to be continuing and long term. Final purchase decisions would be based on...approval by the appropriate University administrative officers and the Board of Regents."

The 1980 Program Plan for Land Acquisition notes that "An area of land beyond the northwest corner of the Boulder Campus along the top of the hill between Broadway and 17<sup>th</sup> Streets has significant University holdings....The area has been in transition from housing to University-related activities for some time....The additional properties would provide for expansion of research activities in the fields of social sciences and humanities, and it would possibly provide sites for additional campus parking....The area...is a checkerboard of University and privately owned parcels of land now used for housing, research offices, and various University departments....The area now includes 13 University-owned properties acquired since 1961 totaling 3.682 acres."

May 2, 1980 – CCHE approved the 1980 Program Plan for Land Acquisition.

*Summary:* "This short program plan is a proposal to obtain formal approval by the...Colorado Commission on Higher Education for land acquisition in this area as advocated in the 1979 Boulder Campus Master Plan. The additional properties would provide for expansion of research activities in the fields of social sciences and humanities, and it would possibly provide sites for additional campus parking....It is proposed that acceptance of this program plan be regarded as authority to purchase real property in the areas described as opportunities arise with the purpose of eventual assemblage of blocks of property useful to the University.

*Objectives:* "Its further purpose is to secure approval from the Colorado Commission on Higher Education to acquire property in this area based upon the contents of this program plan...It is the intent of this program plan to secure blanket approval to negotiate for purchase as properties become available."

*Acquisition Criteria:* "This property acquisition program must be considered long term."

*Alternatives:* "This program plan merely establishes authority to implement this acquisition for a small area at the University periphery."

June 19, 1980 – approved purchase of 1230 Grandview Avenue for \$115,700.

June 19, 1980 – approved purchase of 1244 Grandview for \$79,869.09.

August 20, 1981 – approved purchase of 1338 Grandview for \$146,000.

March 18, 1982 – approved purchase of 1444 15<sup>th</sup> Street for \$140,000.

March 18, 1982 – approved purchase of 1514 13<sup>th</sup> Street for \$75,000.

June 17, 1982 – approved purchase of 1425 15<sup>th</sup> Street for \$70,000.

August 19, 1982 – approved purchase of 1450 15<sup>th</sup> Street for \$140,000.

May 19, 1983 – approved purchase of 1344 Grandview for \$140,000.

In a January 31, 1984 memorandum to Arnold R. Weber, President, Board of Regents "Via H.H. Arnold, Secretary," and Harrison Shull, Chancellor, Boulder Campus, Ted Tedesco, the Vice Chancellor for Administration, addressed the proposed research building at 1165 Broadway. The memo indicated that he had met with the Advisory Committee of the University Hill Parking District and "I discussed with them... (the option to)...construct parking facilities off site in the general area east of Broadway and north of University Avenue."

August 18, 1985  
– approved purchase of 1225 Grandview Avenue for \$61,000. This property was described in the Request for Action as "a part of the Grandview Transitional System...(and)...of strategic importance to the University and the Boulder Campus, both in physical planning of the campus and promotion of the Research Building System."

June 19, 1986 – approved the refinancing of Grandview properties within the Transitional System.

September 18, 1986 – approved purchase of 1232 Grandview for \$120,000, of which \$15,000 was gifted back to the University by the owners.

May 19, 1988 – approved purchase of 1301 Grandview Avenue \$150,000.

May 19, 1990 – approved purchase of 1320 Grandview for \$170,000.

May 25, 1990  
- The 1990 Long-Range Facilities Master Plan was approved by the CU Board of Regents. Referring to Grandview Terrace and the Marine Street areas, page III-5 notes that general areas for acquisition include the "North periphery of the Boulder campus.... Land acquisitions are already underway for the *Grandview Terrace* area and Marine Street areas. These areas are needed for long-term expansion of instruction, research, services, parking, housing, conferences, cultural uses, student recreation, and athletics."

The Land and Facilities Inventory – Volume II – page I-5 of the plan reads:

"The Main Campus has grown rapidly from the original 44 acres of donated land to the current 321 acres. Land acquisition has been made through gifts, purchases, and the vacating of on-campus railroad and public rights of way. The 321 acres include 6 acres north of University Avenue in the *Grandview Terrace* area."

The 1990 Long-Range Facilities Master Plan listed projects that were planned for the area for services and administration, and structural parking. Also listed, as Exhibit III-12, "Demolitions Within 15 Years," page III-43, was the demolition schedule, in the "second 5 years / 1994-1998," for the following buildings:

Continuing Education 1221-1229 University

Continuing Education, 1221-1229 University  
Institute of Behavioral Science, No. 1  
1433-1435 13<sup>th</sup> Dwelling  
Institute of Behavioral Science, No. 3  
Armory Annex, 1424 15<sup>th</sup> Street  
1425 15<sup>th</sup> Street  
1444 15<sup>th</sup> Street  
Institute of Behavioral Science, No. 5  
1450 15<sup>th</sup> Street (Affirmative Action)  
Armory Trailer  
Institute of Behavioral Science, No. 4  
1225 Grandview  
1230 Grandview  
1232 Grandview  
Institute of Behavioral Science, No. 6  
1244 Grandview Dwelling  
1301 Grandview  
1514 13<sup>th</sup> Street  
International English 1333/35 Grandview  
1330-32 Grandview & Garage  
1338 Grandview Dwelling & Garage  
1344 Grandview, Apts. A, B, & C

May 2, 1991 - The 1990 Long-Range Facilities Master Plan was approved by the CCHE.

June 18, 1992 – approved purchase of 1513 13<sup>th</sup> Street and 1429 Grandview Avenue for \$127,500 and \$125,500, respectively.

January 21, 1993 – approved purchase of 1434 15<sup>th</sup> Street for the amount of \$210,000.

June 22, 1995 – approved purchase of 1333-35 Grandview for \$320,000 plus closing costs.

March 21, 1996 – approved purchase of 1510 13<sup>th</sup> Street for \$235,000.

December 12, 1996 – approved purchase of 1505 University Avenue for \$1,900,000.

December 10, 1998 – approved purchase of 1215 Grandview Avenue for \$410,000.

All of these actions were "consistent with the Grandview area land acquisition program approved by the Board of Regents on February 21, 1980, and the CCHE on February 4, 1980."

Note: Amount given as approved purchase price is actual dollar value in the year the property was approved for acquisition. Total cost of Grandview Terrace purchases, in historic dollars, is over \$5 million. In today's dollars, cost is reflected as nearly \$8 million. The University's current holdings stand at 29 buildings.

September 10, 1999

- letter from CCHE to Chancellor Richard L. Byyny approves the program plan waiver for the relocation or demolition of the Grandview Terrace properties owned by the University.

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE)  
March 2, 2000  
Agenda Item V, A

Attachment G

**University of Colorado at Boulder**  
**The Cost of Preserving the Grandview Bungalows**

The cost of maintaining any existing house in the Grandview Terrace area is determined by its eventual use. Assuming that the houses will have similar uses to those on the 9th Street Auraria campus can provide some measure of cost.

The 14 Ninth Street houses at the Auraria campus were renovated in a superficial manner in 1978. Most were internally to renovate interior space, but many upgrades were deferred, including heating, ventilating and conditioning. These improvements and many others required by codes were implemented in the ensuing years.

Total dollars spent in 1978 were from a \$1 million private fund-raising effort. The original street remained landscaping was not included. No ADA work took place at that time, but was added later -- usually in a temporary condition that in some cases remains to this day. About 10 houses have minimal ADA access today. Since 1978, at least an additional \$1 million dollars has been spent on upgrades. Most houses average 1,200 sq. ft.

The "Golda Meier" house was moved onto the site in about 1988. The cost of moving, site preparation, and renovation was approximately \$280,000 at that time.

These houses now are used for a cafe, an alumni house, a program director's headquarters, and faculty offices.

This information points out that to adequately restore the Grandview bungalows to a condition of use to meet today's codes and needs of the University will be costly. It is estimated that an average cost of \$200 per sq. ft. should be spent to completely restore these houses to year 2000 requirements. At an average size of 2,500 sq. ft. 22 houses would cost \$11 million. The four houses that the University has agreed to keep would approximate \$2 million.

Such a proposal to keep the neighborhood intact is a quantitative cost that prohibits the University from a qualitative use of the land that meets the needs contained in the Campus Master Plan.

Attachment H

## **University of Colorado at Boulder Planned Uses of Grandview**

### ***Context***

In the last 39 years, CU has spent \$8 million dollars (in 1999 dollars) to purchase Grandview properties with the intent of expanding the main campus. This intent has been documented in campus master plans since the 1960's and in discussions by the Board of Regents since 1961. Enough of the properties have been purchased to actually implement those plans.

### ***Why does the University need to develop Grandview:***

1. To accommodate the needs of the state for research and academic pursuits - the campus' space deficit now totals 1.7 million square feet, with over 500,000 square feet needed for research alone. \$204 million in research was secured by the campus in 1998-99 providing jobs, a strong economy and ensuring quality faculty and educational experience for Colorado citizens.
2. To expand the physically-landlocked main campus – few building sites remain on the main campus.
3. To accommodate growing student enrollment  
– now at an all time high, expected to increase another 7% in 10 years.
4. The property is within the ten minute class-change zone – required for scheduling.
5. To ensure that, as a state institution, CU-Boulder meets its obligation to use limited resources wisely - Additional investment in small houses that cannot effectively serve campus needs would be less than prudent.

### ***Grandview Plans***

The historic buildings along Broadway and University Avenues will remain, as well as the historic street grid of the area. Several new buildings housing expansion of academic and research uses are planned. Academic needs (including research) will be accommodated through adaptive reuse of several existing structures, about 105,000 gross square feet, and in new buildings, up to 450,000 additional interior gross square feet. Development may also include service supporting academic and research uses, such as day care, incidental retail (e.g. food services), and transportation facilities (e.g. transit shelters and parking garages). Some existing uses, such as the sorority house and the Native American Rights Fund, may remain for quite a while. Redevelopment of the corner of Broadway and University Avenue will create an appropriate corner and entrance to the campus.

The basic street layout of the area is to be retained. Most buildings (10) located along Broadway and University are planned to be refurbished because of their scale, condition, and significance. Some will be expanded to the rear in an architecturally compatible way so as to provide needed space and accommodate current accessibility requirements. The area will maintain a transitional edge between Grandview and the rest of the city. The landscaped setbacks along University and Broadway should be preserved and enhanced to provide attractive buffers and to provide an elegant setting for the expanded campus at Grandview.

A Historic reserve on the north side of Grandview Avenue is proposed to contain four to five Grandview bungalow style houses as a reminder of the history of this area. The reserve will also contain the only existing house considered of individual historic importance, 1301 Grandview.

New buildings are proposed to be located on the larger development sites in the center of the area. The height of the development is not expected to exceed five stories. The mass and scale of proposed development along the bluff should be somewhat less in order to provide an appropriate scale when seen from below the bluff.

The pattern of development along the existing streets is to be retained, with new buildings in Grandview relating to the existing streets.

streets they will front. Large street trees should be maintained along Grandview streets to enhance the pedestrian environments, retaining a traditional streetscape. Many of the new buildings will also border a new outdoor area pedestrian spine, to be developed where there is now an unsightly alley between Grandview and University Avenues.

The Tuscan vernacular style of the Main Campus is important to CU-Boulder's image. However, the diverse architecture of the Grandview neighborhood also creates its own identity, and relates well with the city. New development in Grandview area will be part of the Main Campus, and needs to continue the architectural style that defines it. At the same time, the Grandview area should be a transition between the city and the campus. New buildings should be created combine the Tuscan vernacular style and some of the qualities of the original buildings of the Grandview neighborhood.

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE)  
March 2, 2000  
Agenda Item V, B

**TOPIC: FINANCIAL AID POLICY**

**PREPARED BY: SHARON M. SAMSON/PATTY O'CONNOR**

## **I. SUMMARY**

This agenda item introduces a new policy -- *State-funded Student Financial Aid Policy* (attached). Representing a significant paradigm shift, the proposed policy departs from CCHE's former financial aid policy on three key points:

- Identifies statewide goals, rather than specifies procedures.
- Defines a few, explicit state parameters for merit-based programs. Institutions may incorporate additional parameters into the programs that best match the needs of their student population.
- Presents a framework for directing state-supported need-based dollars to the students with the least ability to pay.

The strengths of the proposed policy include its reliance on the professionalism of the financial aid community to meet the policy goals, increased emphasis on student responsibility, and a policy implementation plan that is structured to protect the interests of currently enrolled students. As each policy change was developed, CCHE tested the policy for its impact on students.

Two positive consequences of the proposed financial aid policy are: (1) institutions will no longer be required to submit packaging, philosophy, and program plans each year, and (2) the Commission will no longer conduct program reviews to determine if an institution is in compliance with institutional policies. Because most financial aid packaging is automated, the proposed policy changes will require each institution to invest in computer application programs that incorporate the changed student eligibility criteria. Substantive policy changes typically require changes to data systems.

If the Commission approves the policy, it will be effective July 1, 2000.

## **II. BACKGROUND**

This section describes the approach CCHE used and the activities that supported the development of the proposed policy.

In October 1999, CCHE convened a working committee that represented the different financial aid perspectives of eligible institutions: public two-year colleges, public four-year colleges and universities, public four-year universities that predominately serve graduate students, non-public colleges and universities, and proprietary schools. The members were invited to participate based on their expertise, critical thinking skills, and lack of bias. The committee met sometimes weekly to accomplish its charge. The committee played a critical role in developing the policy – challenging the operating assumptions and requesting data analysis to substantiate or refute perceptions about the use of financial aid. Consequently, as CCHE proposed different alternatives, the committee tested the policy alternatives for robustness and relevance.

Because the committee members did not represent or speak on behalf of their individual institution or governing body, CCHE requested feedback directly from all institutions to the proposed policy language and changes in student eligibility parameters for merit-based aid, work-study, and need-based financial aid programs. Using e-mail, CCHE shared drafts with the financial aid directors, student organizations, the Academic Council, and the Chief Financial Officers. The working committee advised CCHE on the merits of the different perspectives.

## **III. STAFF ANALYSIS**

The roles that the Commission and the institutions play exemplify the new policy direction and attitude. The state's role

is to provide leadership - - by defining the operating values, specifying the statewide goals, and allocating state financial aid funds to the institutions. In contrast, the institutions are responsible for creating policies and programs that meet the statewide policy goals -- by developing the procedures, administering the programs, and making the appropriate decisions to assist individual students in achieving their educational goals.

The most obvious difference between the current and the proposed financial aid policy is that it is value-driven procedural. With approximately 300 pages of requirements, operational directives, and forms, the current policy evolved from changes in the financial aid environment, including changes in federal regulations, related state policies, new financial aid programs, federal audit findings, and state program reviews findings. The cumulative effect of detailed recording of operational directions and allowable exemptions is that policy conflicts exist between one section of the policy and another. In contrast, the proposed policy is ten pages of goal statements and student eligibility criteria. The policy delegates the authority for handling exceptions to the institutions and affirms that the judicious exercise of professional discretion by financial aid directors is the best way to serve individual students.

Designed around students and student needs, the proposed policy is guided by four policy principles:

- Maximize the amount of financial aid funds available for Colorado residents by using federal dollars as the initial funding base and inform students of tuition tax credits and other resources available.
- Recognize the importance of student responsibility in paying for higher education costs. In the context of financial aid, student responsibility may be demonstrated through work-study, outside employment, or earning merit-based scholarships.
- Direct state financial aid **need-based** dollars toward the students with the least ability to pay the cost of higher education.
- Acknowledge the shared responsibility between the Commission and the institutions for improving access to higher education.

There are no changes to institutional eligibility. There are changes to the application procedures. The proposed eliminates two pre-designed forms. Instead, the applicant is required to provide documentation that the institution adequately administered federal financial aid programs for two years. In effect, the federal eligibility application process pre-screens the applicants for state financial aid, collecting the same information that was formerly included in the state application forms.

The most significant policy changes appear in the student eligibility sections. A chart that compares the current policy to the proposed policy highlights the differences in eligibility criteria (Attachment A). The proposed policy does not change that basic eligibility criteria for all students receiving state-funded financial aid. These criteria include:

- a U.S. citizen, permanent resident, or eligible non-citizen based on federal Title IV eligibility requirements for federal student aid;
- registered for selective service, if required;
- good academic standing and academic progress.

The proposed policy explicitly states that undergraduate students who are enrolled in their first baccalaureate degree program are eligible for federal and state financial aid. Students who are pursuing a second degree are not eligible for federal grants or state student assistance, although they may be eligible for institutional aid or federal loans.

#### A. Merit Based Aid

Under the proposed policy, student recipients of state-funded merit awards must demonstrate academic excellence by achieving and maintaining at least a 3.0 cumulative college GPA at the institution at which they are enrolled. Institutions may define more rigorous criteria, but all merit programs will require the minimum 3.0 college GPA qualifying criterion.

Incoming freshmen may be eligible for undergraduate merit awards if they provide evidence of academic achievement, in one or more of the following areas:

- high school GPA or high school rank from an accredited high school;

- standardized test scores;
- competitive audition or portfolio review.

Renewal of the merit award is contingent upon the student achieving and maintaining a cumulative college GPA of 3.0 or better. This change is an example of the proposed policy's increased emphasis on student responsibility and academic merit.

The policy impact was tested by identifying the number of students at each institution that qualified for merit award using the new criteria. The data shows significant numbers of students who meet the qualifying GPA for a merit award. In addition, CCHE contacted music directors and chairmen of art departments. The contacted individuals confirmed that talented music and art majors are as likely to maintain a 3.0 or better college GPA as students majoring in other programs.

#### B. Need Based Aid

The second major change applies to need-based aid. To ensure that state need-based dollars are directed to Colorado resident students in the lowest income categories, CCHE policy defines an index with three funding levels – Student with the Least Ability to Pay, Students with Documented Need and Modest Ability to Pay, and Students with Documented Need and Average Ability to Pay. The index specifies a tiered system of minimum and maximum need-based awards with Students with the Least Ability to Pay qualified for \$1,500 to \$5,000 state-support but capped by the actual unmet need. The ability to serve students will depend on the availability of state appropriations.

Student need patterns served as the test for this proposed policy change. To develop the index, CCHE calculated the unmet need of students enrolled in public two-year colleges and students enrolled in public four-year colleges subtracting the average federal awards, the average work-study package (\$2000) from the budget of tuition, fees, books, and living expenses. The goal of the index is to ensure that state dollars are targeted to equalize the debt burden of students in each income category.

#### C. Work-Study

The proposed policy does not change the student eligibility criteria for work-study.

#### D. Implementation Timeline

One important aspect of the proposed policy is the implementation timeframe. The financial aid award process is already in progress for students that plan to enroll during the 2000-2001 award year. To ensure that the proposed policy will not negatively impact a currently enrolled student, the policy outlines an implementation plan that the final committee believes is workable.

The financial aid working committee recommended that CCHE sponsor special sessions to help the financial aid community understand the new policy in advance of the implementation schedule. Responding to this suggestion, CCHE will provide several training sessions this April, develop a financial aid handbook with the assistance of the financial aid community, and publish financial aid policy fact sheets on CCHE's web pages.

In summary, the proposed changes to CCHE's financial aid policy define the leadership role of the Commission to create a strong financial aid system. It builds upon the operating values and principles of the Colorado financial aid community. It delegates the authority to the institutions for creating programs and procedures that best meet the needs of Colorado residents and aggressively promote access to the students with the least ability to pay.

## **Appendix A**

### **STATUTORY AUTHORITY**

Statutory authority for the Colorado Student Grant, Colorado Graduate Grant, Colorado Undergraduate Merit, and Colorado Graduate Fellowship programs is contained in 23-3.3-501, C.R.S.

**Scholarship and grant program – funding.** The commission shall use a portion of any moneys remaining after meeting the requirements of parts 2 and 3 of this article to provide other programs of financial assistance based upon financial need, merit, talent, or other criteria established by the commission for students enrolled at institutions.

Statutory authority for the Colorado Work-Study Program is contained in 23-3.3-401, C.R.S.

**Work-study program established – requirements.** (1) The commission shall use a portion of any moneys remaining after meeting the requirements of parts 2 and 3 of this article to provide a work-study program of employment of qualifying students in good standing with the institution in which they are enrolled in positions that are directly under the control of the institution in which the student is enrolled or in positions with non-profit organizations, governmental agencies, or for-profit organizations with which the institution may execute student employment contracts.

(2) Any in-state student who is enrolled or accepted for enrollment at an institution as an undergraduate may qualify for participation in the work-study program established pursuant to this section.

(3) Funds appropriated to the commission may also be used by the commission in conjunction with and to supplement funds for current job opportunities or to supplement or match funds made available through any other public or private program for financial assistance. A sum not to exceed thirty percent of the funds allocated by the commission for the work-study program may be used to provide funding on a basis other than financial need. A sum of not less than seventy percent of such money shall be used for students demonstrating financial need.

Go to [Proposed Policy](#)

Attachment 1

## SECTION VI

### PART F STATE-FUNDED STUDENT FINANCIAL AID POLICY

#### 1.00 Introduction

This policy describes the goals, programs, student eligibility criteria for each program, and eligibility standards for institutions participating in Colorado's three primary state-funded student assistance programs:

- **Need-based**  
aid assists students who cannot otherwise afford to attend college. Colorado Student Grant and Colorado Graduate Grant programs are designed for students with demonstrated need.
- **Merit-based**  
aid recognizes and recruits outstanding students. Colorado Undergraduate Merit and Colorado Graduate Fellowship programs are provided to recognize outstanding academic achievement of students.
- **Work-based** aid allows students to earn funds to assist in attending eligible educational institutions. It is considered a form of "self-help" assistance, since the student is earning money to help meet educational costs. Employment may be in jobs at eligible Colorado educational institutions, non-profit organizations, governmental agencies, or for-profit organizations. While the majority of funds are reserved for undergraduate students with documented financial need (minimum of 70 percent), a limited number of students who wish to work their way through college may benefit from the work-study program without documenting need.

The state-funded entitlement programs (Native American Tuition Assistance Program, Dependents Tuition Assistance Program) and the federal matching requirement programs (Federal Loan Matching, Leveraging Educational Assistance Partnership Program) are statutorily mandated and are referenced in Part G.

#### 2.00 Statutory Authority

Statutory authority for the Colorado Student Grant, Colorado Graduate Grant, Colorado Undergraduate Merit, and Colorado Graduate Fellowship programs is contained in 23-3.3-501, C.R.S.

**Scholarship and grant program – funding.** The commission shall use a portion of any moneys remaining after meeting the requirements of parts 2 and 3 of this article to provide other programs of financial assistance based upon financial need, merit, talent, or other criteria established by the commission for students enrolled at institutions.

Statutory authority for the Colorado Work-Study Program is contained in 23-3.3-401, C.R.S.

**Work-study program established – requirements.** (1) The commission shall use a portion of any money remaining after meeting the requirements of parts 2 and 3 of this article to provide a work-study program of employment of qualifying students in good standing with the institution in which they are enrolled in positions that are directly under the control of the institution in which the student is enrolled or in positions with non-profit organizations, governmental agencies, or for-profit organizations with which the institution may execute student employment contracts.

(2) Any in-state student who is enrolled or accepted for enrollment at an institution as an undergraduate may qualify for participation in the work-study program established pursuant to this section.

(3) Funds appropriated to the commission may also be used by the commission in conjunction with and to supplement funds for current job opportunities or to supplement or match funds made available through any other public or private program for financial assistance. A sum not to exceed thirty percent of the

**funds allocated by the commission for the work-study program may be used to provide funding on a basis other than financial need. A sum of not less than seventy percent of such money shall be used for students demonstrating financial need.**

### 3.00 Goals, Principles and Terminology

#### 3.01 Policy Goals for State-Supported Financial Aid

CCHE's Financial Aid Policy is designed to facilitate access for Colorado residents and provide academic incentives to promote academic achievement in college.

##### 3.01.01 Need-Based Aid

The goal of need-based student financial aid is to provide financial resources to Colorado residents who otherwise would be unable to pursue postsecondary education.

##### 3.01.02 Merit-Based Aid

The goal of Colorado's Undergraduate Merit Award Program is to recruit and retain undergraduate Colorado resident students who demonstrate high levels of academic achievement.

The goal of Colorado's Graduate Fellowship Program is to recruit and retain highly qualified graduate students by providing support as teaching or research fellows.

##### 3.01.03 Work-Study Aid

The goal of Colorado's Work-Study Program is to allow Colorado undergraduate resident students to earn funds while enrolled in a Colorado institution of higher education.

#### 3.02 Principles

The Financial Aid Policy is based on the following principles:

3.02.01 Financial aid policies and practices should maximize the amount of financial aid funds available for Colorado residents by using federal dollars as the initial funding base, and by taking into consideration federal tax credits.

3.02.02 Students have a responsibility to contribute toward their cost of education. Student responsibility may be demonstrated in several forms, such as a work-study job, outside employment, or earning merit-based scholarships.

3.02.03 State financial aid need-based dollars should be directed toward the students with the least ability to pay the cost of higher education.

3.02.04 The state and the institutions are co-responsible for ensuring student access to higher education. The state's role is to provide leadership – by defining the operating values, specifying the statewide goals, and allocating the funds. The institutions are responsible for creating policies and programs that meet the statewide policy goals by developing the procedures, administering the programs, and making the appropriate decisions to assist individual students in achieving their educational goals.

#### 3.03 Terminology

Award Year  
begins July 1 and ends June 30. All funds appropriated for a particular fiscal year are awarded to students enrolled during the award year.

Colorado Resident Student  
is a student who is eligible for in-state tuition classification as defined in Title 23, Article 7, C.R.S. For financial aid purposes, the definition applies to public and non-public institutions.

Cost of Attendance  
is the cost of attending the institution, including tuition and fees, books and supplies, room and board, personal expenses and

is the cost of attending the institution, including tuition and fees, books and supplies, room and board, personal expenses and transportation costs. Each year, CCHE establishes parameters for living expenses that are used to establish each institution's cost of attendance.

Dependent Student is one who does not qualify as a self-supporting or independent student.

Eligible Institution is an educational institution operating in Colorado which meets requirements specified in 23-3.3-101 C.R.S., and can document that it has a governance structure and institutional capability to administer a student aid program. A change in ownership or control of an eligible proprietary institution terminates eligibility. A new application must be submitted by the owners.

Eligible Program is a program of education or training which:

- admits, as regular students, only persons having a certificate of graduation from a secondary school (high school graduates), the recognized equivalent of that certificate (GED), or persons beyond the age of compulsory school attendance in the State of Colorado who have been shown to have the ability to benefit from the education or training offered;
- leads to an associate, bachelor, professional, or higher degree, or;
- is at least a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward a bachelors degree, or;
- is at least a one-year program leading to a certificate or a degree that prepares a student for gainful employment in a recognized occupation, or;
- is, for a proprietary institution or a postsecondary vocational institution, a program that provides at least 600 clock hours, 16 semester or trimester hours, or 24 quarter hours of undergraduate instruction offered during a minimum of 15 weeks of instruction, leading to a certificate or degree which prepares students for gainful employment in a recognized occupation.

Eligible Student is one who is enrolled in an eligible program as a "regular student." A "regular student" is defined as a student who is enrolled or accepted for enrollment at an institution for the purpose of obtaining a degree, certificate, or other recognized educational credential offered by that institution.

Expected Family Contribution (EFC) is the amount that the student's family is expected to contribute towards cost of attendance, usually based on the family income and assets, as evaluated by the formula known as "Federal Needs Analysis Methodology" specified in federal law.

Financial Need is the difference between the student's budget and the student's and family's resources as evaluated by the formula known as "Federal Needs Analysis Methodology" specified in federal law.

Full-time Graduate Student is a graduate student who is enrolled in at least eight semester or quarter hours per academic term.

Full-time Undergraduate Student is an undergraduate student who at minimum is enrolled for:

- twelve semester or quarter hours per regular academic term; or
- twenty-four clock hours per week.

In determining an undergraduate student's enrollment status, credits earned in basic skills courses may only be included for the first two semesters if the student is full-time.

Graduate student is a degree-seeking student who is in attendance at an institution of higher education and is enrolled in an academic program of instruction beyond the baccalaureate level. The term includes any portion of a program leading to either a degree or a baccalaureate degree, or a first-professional degree when at least three years of study at the pre-baccalaureate degree level are required for entrance into a program leading to such a degree. A student admitted as a special/provisional graduate student is eligible for financial aid for one term only.

Half-time Graduate Student is a graduate student who enrolls in four to seven semester or quarter hours per academic term.

Half-time Undergraduate Student is an undergraduate student who enrolls in:

- six to eleven semester or quarter hours per regular academic term; or
- twelve to twenty-three clock hours per week.

Independent Student is a student who meets the requirements for self-supporting or independent student status as defined in federal regulations and policy (Public Law 99-498 Section 480 - October 17, 1986).

Professional Student is a student who is enrolled in the schools of professional veterinary medicine, law, dentistry and medicine (M.D. program only).

State-funded student assistance refers to the state dollars appropriated to fund the following programs:

- Need-based Programs are the financial aid programs that use "expected family contribution" or income category as a necessary criterion in making the award, including:
  - Colorado Student Grant
  - Colorado Graduate Grant
  - Colorado Leveraging Educational Assistance Partnership (CLEAP) - formerly known as Colorado Student Incentive Grant (CSIG)
- Non-need-based Funds are those programs that may be awarded on criteria that do not include "expected family contribution" or income category as a necessary criterion, including:
  - Colorado Undergraduate Merit
  - Colorado Graduate Fellowship
- Colorado Work-Study

Colorado also approves special appropriations for certain groups of individuals (e.g., Tuition Assistance Programs Dependents of Deceased or Permanently Disabled Members of the Colorado National Guard, Law-Enforcement Personnel or POW/ MIA, Native American Tuition Assistance Program). These funds are referred to as categorical programs and have special criteria typically tied to funding.

Undergraduate Student is a student who is enrolled at an eligible institution for the purpose of obtaining a postsecondary certificate, associate degree, or first baccalaureate degree. The following limits apply to certain enrollment situations:

- Undergraduate students admitted as special students, and students enrolled exclusively in basic skills courses, are eligible for one term.
- Basic skills/remedial credits can be included in calculating a student's enrollment status up to the point where a student has attempted 30 total credit hours (remedial plus non-remedial).
- Students concurrently enrolled in high school are not eligible for any program of state-funded student assistance, including students enrolled under the Postsecondary Options Act.
- Students are considered as undergraduate students when they are enrolled in study abroad, continuing education, technology-delivered courses, or consortium courses if:
  - The student is admitted to a degree or certificate program at the home institution.
  - The credits are applicable toward the program as if the credits were earned in regular courses at the home institution and the student's transcript at the home institution shows the individual classes taken.
  - When the courses are offered by another institution, written agreements exist between the institutions describing the acceptance of the courses toward the program to which the student is admitted prior to that enrollment.

#### **4.00 Institutional Eligibility**

##### 4.01 Eligible Institutions

Institutions eligible for undergraduate financial aid must meet the requirements specified in 23-3.3-101 C.R.S., and include the following:

- state-supported two- and four-year institutions;
- state local district colleges;
- state area vocational/technical schools;
- non-public colleges, universities, and vocational (proprietary) schools. For these institutions, eligibility is legally tied to ownership. A change in ownership or control of a non-public institution terminates eligibility. A new application must be submitted by the current owners.

Institutions eligible for graduate financial aid must meet the requirements specified in 23-3.3-101 C.R.S., and include the following:

- state-supported institutions offering graduate programs;
- non-public colleges and universities offering graduate programs which have applied and been approved for participation.

#### 4.02 Application Process

The Commission accepts requests from institutions that wish to participate in state-funded financial aid programs each fall. To apply, the legal representative of the institution must submit a written request and attach evidence documenting that the institution has:

- operated two years in Colorado under the current ownership;
- administered federal financial aid programs for the two years under the current ownership; and
- participated in a federal audit of the financial aid operations and resolved any outstanding audit findings.

#### 4.03 Maintenance of Eligibility

In order for an approved postsecondary education institution to maintain eligibility to administer state-funded student assistance programs to its students, the following minimum administrative standards must be met:

- utilization of Colorado Student Aid funds consistent with policy;
- timely and corrected submission of required reports to CCHE;
- demonstration of compliance with policy guidelines set forth for administration of Colorado student aid funds;
- performance of a financial audit every two years; and
- resolution of audit concerns prior to the start of the following award year.

### 5.00 Student Eligibility

To be considered for a state-supported financial aid award, all students must meet the following requirements:

- be a U.S. citizen, permanent resident, or eligible non-citizen based on federal Title IV eligibility requirements for federal student aid;
- have registered for selective service, if required;
- be in good standing and demonstrate academic progress according to the institution's published Standards of Satisfactory Academic Progress for financial aid purposes;
- undergraduate students are eligible for state financial aid until they graduate, but not to exceed 150% of the program's graduation requirements, e.g. credit hours.

#### 5.01 Student Eligibility for Need-Based Financial Aid Programs

Colorado funds two state need-based financial aid grant programs, the Colorado Student Grant Program and the Colorado Graduate Grant Program, for Colorado residents.

##### 5.01.01 Colorado Student Grant

Colorado Student Grant is awarded annually. To be eligible to receive a Colorado Student Grant, the student must m

following minimum eligibility requirements:

- be an undergraduate student enrolled in an approved certificate or degree program;
- be a Colorado resident;
- be enrolled at least half-time (i.e., six credit hours per term);
- show documented financial need.

#### 5.01.02 Colorado Graduate Grant

Colorado Graduate Grant is awarded annually. To be eligible to receive a Colorado Graduate Grant, the student must meet the following minimum eligibility requirements:

- be a graduate student, enrolled in an approved degree program;
- be a Colorado resident;
- be enrolled at least half-time (i.e., four credit hours per term);
- show documented financial need.

#### 5.01.03 Eligibility Limits for Need-Based Grants

To ensure that state need-based dollars are directed to eligible Colorado resident students who have the least ability to pay for their education, CCHE policy defines three funding levels. Using Expected Family Contribution, at least 90% of the students awarded need-based aid should be from families whose circumstances qualify them for level 1. Reasonable administrative practices, such as application deadlines, are recognized as realistic and appropriate.

##### Level 1: Students with the Least Ability to Pay

Students with an Expected Family Contribution (EFC) between zero and 125% of that required for a PELL grant. The minimum award for this group of students is \$1,500 or the maximum amount of unmet need, whichever is less. The maximum award is \$5,000.

##### Level 2: Students with Documented Need and Moderate Ability to Pay

Students with an EFC that is twice that required for the minimum Pell grant award. Maximum award for this category of students is \$2,500, or the maximum amount of unmet need, whichever is less.

##### Level 3: Students with Documented Need and Average Ability to Pay

All other students who demonstrate financial need as calculated by the federal methodology. Maximum award for this category of students is \$500.

#### 5.02 Student Eligibility for Merit-Based Financial Aid Programs

Colorado funds two state merit-based financial aid grant programs, Colorado Undergraduate Merit and Colorado C Fellowship. State-supported merit aid is awarded annually. Students must qualify for these competitive awards each year meeting all criteria. Institutions may adopt other eligibility criteria, in accordance with their institutional role and mission. The policy minimum standards only imply that a student may be considered for a merit award. They do not guarantee an award.

##### 5.02.01 Colorado Undergraduate Merit

To be eligible to receive a Colorado Undergraduate Merit Award, the student must meet the following minimum requirements:

- be an undergraduate student enrolled as a degree or certificate seeking student;
- be a Colorado resident;
- continuing students must demonstrate academic excellence by achieving and maintaining at least a 3.0 cumulative college GPA at the institution in which they are enrolled;
- prospective freshmen applying for merit-based aid must provide evidence of academic achievement, as defined by the institution, in one or more of the following areas:

- high school GPA or high school rank from an accredited high school;
- standardized test scores;
- competitive audition or portfolio review.

While freshmen applicants may receive initial merit awards on these criteria, renewal of merit aid is contingent upon achieving and maintaining a cumulative college GPA of 3.0 or better.

#### 5.02.02 Colorado Graduate Fellowship

To be eligible for a Colorado Graduate Fellowship, the student must meet the following minimum eligibility requirements:

- be a graduate student enrolled in an approved degree program;
- be enrolled full-time (i.e., eight credit hours per term).

#### 5.03 Student Eligibility for Work-Based Financial Aid Program

In order to participate in the Colorado Work-Study Program, a student must meet the following eligibility requirements:

- be an undergraduate student in an approved certificate or degree program;
- be a Colorado resident;
- be enrolled at least half-time in an eligible program, except during vacation periods between consecutive terms of enrollment;
- show documented need. This criterion applies to at least 70 percent of work-based funds. The institution has the discretion to use up to 30 percent of work-based funds to award to students on a basis other than need.

### 6.00 Implementation

New requirements for administering programs go into effect July 1, 2000.

To assure a smooth transition for currently enrolled students, the following conditions will apply:

6.01 Undergraduate students who were enrolled in the 1999-2000 academic year will maintain eligibility for merit programs under the financial aid guidelines published in CCHE's Policy Manual on July 1, 1999. These students may be awarded based on the following requirements:

- three additional years for Fall 1999 Freshmen;
- two additional years for Fall 1999 Sophomores;
- one additional year for Fall 1999 Juniors.

This statement does not preclude these students from receiving merit aid beyond this point if they meet the new requirements.

6.02 Incoming undergraduate students may be considered for merit awards in the 2000-2001 year based on the July 1, 1999, requirements, but must meet the new minimum criteria for any succeeding years.

6.03 New requirements for all new and currently enrolled graduate students receiving merit-based aid go into effect on July 1, 2000.

6.04 Institutional packaging policies established after July 1, 2000, must reflect the new policy criteria for awarding students in the 2001-2002 academic year. Students awarded financial aid for the 2000-2001 academic year may be awarded based on the July 1, 1999, policy requirements.

The Commission will review Policies for State-Funded Student Assistance Programs – the goals and the outcomes – three years after the effective date.

Attachment 2

## Major Proposed Changes in State Financial Aid Programs

NEW POLICY	OLD POLICY
<b>General</b>	
Full-time hours for Graduate students = 8, including thesis credits	Full-time hours for Graduate students = institutional discretion
No exceptions on number of hours required for full-time status for graduates doing thesis/dissertation only	Number of hours for full-time was up to institutional discretion
Basic skills/remedial credits can be included in calculating undergraduate enrollment status until the student has attempted 30 total credit hours (remedial plus non-remedial)	No limit to number of remedial credits that could be attempted
To be eligible for any state aid program, must be U.S. citizen, permanent resident or eligible non-citizen	No citizenship requirement for some of the programs
Eligibility for state aid excludes students who already have a Bachelor's Degree	These students were eligible
No state aid to less-than-half-time students	These students were eligible
Diversity Grant, Part-Time Grant, and Extended Studies Grant will no longer be separate allocation line items. They will be rolled up into the general Need-Based and Merit-Based allocations.	These programs were separate allocation items
<b>Merit-Based</b>	
Undergraduates must achieve and maintain 3.0 cumulative GPA for merit-based aid	No GPA limit
Out-of-state students are not eligible for undergraduate merit-based aid	Out-of-state students eligible
<b>Need-Based</b>	
Eligibility categories for need-based grants	No priority eligibility categories

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE)  
March 2, 2000  
Agenda Item VI, A

**TOPIC:                TECHNOLOGY LEARNING GRANT AND REVOLVING LOAN  
PROGRAM 2000 REPORT**

**PREPARED BY:    JEFF RICHARDSON**

**I. SUMMARY**

Three key objectives have been accomplished through the Technology Learning Grant and Revolving Loan Fund:

- Moving forward the agenda for using technology in our schools, colleges and libraries for access to information, instruction, and learning;
- Serving as a catalyst for isolated communities to come together to develop strategies for participating in the Information Age.
- Achieving access and connectivity, in exploring the integration of technology, in providing training, and in making both financial and organizational long-term commitments to technology and its role in achieving the goals of schools, colleges, and libraries.

**II. BACKGROUND**

This is the third annual report on the subject program. It was filed with the Legislature on January 31, 2000. A copy of the report is attached for your information. While previous reports focused on administrative aspects and summary statistics of this program, the present report focused more on outcomes.

**III. STAFF ANALYSIS**

The outcomes of this program were analyzed in terms of (a) its impact on access and connectivity, (b) sustainability, (c) training, (d) technology integration, (e) regional cooperation and awareness, and (f) material impact on telecommunications infrastructure. The program was analyzed in the context of related programs currently active in the state, including: the Multi-Use Network, the Beanpole Fund, the CCHE's Technology Quality Indicator System, federal grant programs, the federal E-rate program, and the status of connectivity in Colorado public schools. Findings from the analysis are summarized above and presented in full in the [attached report](#).

**IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION (Motion for Commission action)**

**The attached report contains two recommendations which follow, as stated in the letter of transmittal to the Legislature:**

**"To sustain the benefits, achievements, and momentum of the TLC, and in recognition of the importance technology is beginning to play in our schools, colleges, libraries, homes, businesses and communities, we would request and urge favorable consideration by the General Assembly of the following recommendations:**

- 1. The General Assembly should consider appropriating resources at a continuing level to the Beanpole Fund, as established by House Bill 99-1102, in the upcoming budget bill.**
- 2. The General Assembly should consider reauthorizing the Technology Learning Grant Fund and continuing the Revolving Loan Fund for a second round of funding. The initial funding level for the grant and loan program was \$20 million."**

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE)  
March 2, 2000  
Agenda Item VI, A

Attachment 1

January 31, 2000

Sen. Ray Powers, President  
Speaker Russell George  
Colorado General Assembly  
State Capitol  
Denver, CO 80202

Dear President Powers and Speaker George:

Please find enclosed the Year 2000 annual report on the Technology Learning Grant and Revolving Loan Fund (TLC) as required by Senate Bill 96-197.

I am proud to report that our analysis of the program finds that the Technology Learning Grant and Revolving Loan Fund established by the General Assembly:

- has moved forward the agenda for using technology in our schools, colleges and libraries for access to information, instruction, and learning.
- has been a catalyst for isolated communities to come together to develop strategies for participating in the Information Age.
- has been particularly successful in achieving access and connectivity, in exploring the integration of technology, in providing training, and in making both financial and organizational long-term commitments to technology and its role in achieving the goals of schools, colleges, and libraries.

To sustain the benefits, achievements, and momentum of the TLC, and in recognition of the importance technology is beginning to play in our schools, colleges, libraries, homes, businesses, and communities, we would request and urge favorable consideration by the General Assembly of two recommendations:

1. The General Assembly should consider appropriating resources at a continuing level to the Beanpole Fund, as established by House Bill 99-1102, in the upcoming budget bill.
2. The General Assembly should consider re-authorizing the Technology Learning Grant Fund and continuing the Revolving Loan Fund for a second round of funding. The initial funding level for the grant and loan program was \$20 million.

Sincerely,

Timothy E. Foster  
Executive Director

Cc: Honorable Ken Arnold, Chairman of the Senate Education Committee  
Honorable Debbie Allen, Chairman of the House Education Committee  
Honorable Steve Tool, Chairman of the Joint Budget Committee  
Honorable Gayle Berry  
Honorable Todd Saliman  
Honorable Elsie Lacy  
Honorable Dave Owen  
Honorable Gloria Tanner  
Honorable Brad Young  
Honorable Ron Teck

\*\*\*\*\*

**2000 Report  
Technology Learning Grant and Revolving Loan Program**

Prepared by the Colorado Commission on Higher Education  
Submitted to  
Colorado General Assembly  
January 31, 2000

## 1. Introduction

Thirty of 43 projects funded under the Technology Learning Grant and Revolving Loan Program (TLC) have been completed and final reports submitted. Descriptions of the goals and outcomes of these projects are presented in Table 1. Table 2 lists projects still in process.

To work with technology is to master a hierarchy of concerns. There are four stages involved in deploying technology: obtain the technology, applying the technology, integrating the impact into existing systems to produce desired outcomes, and influencing policy decisions necessary to provide and sustain technology.

The goals established for TLC program follow this model. Through its Request For Proposals, the TLC program establishes objectives: access, equity, connections, content and training. As is apparent, these objectives move from the fundamental obtaining technology to the more sophisticated questions of its use.

Results from the TLC program to date also follow this model. Most of the projects focused on deploying technology. At the inception of the program, most applicants did not have basic access to technology. For many, access was a primary objective – and the primary achievement. Some were able to advance to higher layers in the hierarchy, and many explored the application and integration of the access and connectivity they had achieved. As for policy, it is up to the program itself and to its sponsor, the General Assembly, to address the issues involved in sustaining access and application of technology in our schools, colleges, libraries, and communities.

## 2. Findings

The Technology Learning Grant and Revolving Loan Fund has moved forward the agenda for using technology in our schools, colleges and libraries for access to information, instruction, and learning. The grant program has been a catalyst for its communities to come together to develop strategies for moving forward into the Information Age. A large number of the grants were successful, particularly in achieving access and connectivity goals, but also in exploring the integration of technology, providing training, and in making both financial and organizational long-term commitments to technology and its role in achieving the goals of their institution.

The preponderance of project activity, funding, and outcomes focused on access and connectivity. In addition, substantial achievement was made in applying the technology, specifically in its integration into the curriculum, in the development of distance learning courses, and in the establishment of technology committees. The broad objectives of the 30 projects completed to date may be summarized as follows:

Focus	Projects
LAN or WAN and Internet Access	18
Library	5
Curriculum	3
Content	1
Distance Learning	1

**2.1 Access and Connectivity** The program had its most dramatic impact in access to the Internet in classrooms, libraries, community centers, and homes throughout Colorado. Sample statements drawn from Table 1 include:

- "Access was more than double, from about 40 students per Internet computer to 20."
- "Provided Internet access to all classrooms in all schools."
- "Access to the Internet is now universally available."
- "Connected at least one computer in each high school classroom to the Internet."
- "Increased access to families who do not have access to computers either at home or at work."
- "All teachers in the district now have Internet Access. Prior to this grant, the Internet was not available to students at all."
- "Prior to the grant, there was essentially no access."

- Prior to the grant, there was essentially no access ...
- "Each student and community member have access to the Internet and e-mail."

Colorado institutions made dramatic strides toward connectivity during the past three years due to this program. This is a fortunate outcome as it was precisely this timeframe when the Internet became a universal component of modern life.

## 2.2 Sustainability

Almost universally, the final reports indicated an institutional commitment to sustain the advances made. The commitment is both financial, through continuing budget allocations, and organizational, through technology committees. Sample statements include:

- "This district has an ongoing commitment to maintaining the curriculum."
- "The district has formed a Technology Committee to provide ongoing guidance."
- "The district will allocate funds for continued operation."

## 2.3 Training

Training was one of the desired outcomes established by the program. The final reports document that training was in fact a substantial component of grant activity. However, the testimonials also document the need for ongoing training, and in part the difficulty of providing adequate training:

- "Project training goal was over-ambitious given available resources, but the college is committed to supporting needed ongoing training to its faculty and staff."
- "Provided training to over 500 patrons who never used the Internet before."
- "Keeping up with technology is a challenge, including teacher training."

## 2.4 Technology Integration

The whole purpose of technology is to be applied toward useful ends. To what extent did the TLC grants reach this goal? The higher level objective of the program, which reaches beyond access and connectivity, has been harder to address. This is understandable. To use technology, first it must be installed (not to mention understood). As the program began, most applicants did not have the technology in place, and understandably, they put much of their energy and efforts into access and connectivity. These efforts were largely successful as documented above. However, the full use of these new tools in the curriculum and by the communities involved, while addressed in good measure, still requires further development. Examples from Table 1 include:

- "Most of the partner schools were still dealing with access issues at the end of the grant."
- "The extent to which the technology had been used by students and other community members was not yet fully realized; the potential for improved services and greater service integration is significant."
- "Remaining challenges are to better integrate the technology into the curriculum."
- "The district's goal of at least 50 percent of their students using technology to meet one or more content standards was premature and not attained during the duration of this grant."

Given these examples of the challenge of technology integration, several projects did report success in this area:

- "Much was learned about how, through technology, the teacher-centered classroom can be reoriented to a student-centered one."
- "Students focused more of their time on understanding projects rather than manual manipulation of data."
- "Five percent of the student body are utilizing the technologies in place."
- "Specific instructional outcomes have been established, such as: students publishing their own work on the Internet, students viewing others' work, students will complete at least one research project in which they utilize the Internet, and students using the Internet to communicate with someone outside the classroom."

Several projects focused directly on use, by developing and delivering distance learning:

- "Thirty-six students enrolled in graduate level Nurse Practitioner and Certified Nurse-Midwifery programs on the Western Slope."
- "A completely new curriculum for industrial technology was developed."
- "Developed four distance learning courses in Geographic Information Systems."
- "The college now uses the network to deliver over 40 online courses."

## **2.5 Regional Cooperation and Awareness**

Several of the larger projects had tremendous geographical scope. These led to the formation of alliances that will have a lasting legacy in the history of technological advance in Colorado. Already it is apparent that the planning occurring with regard to House Bill 99-1102, the "Beanpole Bill," is based on the regional alliances developed through this program.

## **2.6 Material Impact on Telecommunications Infrastructure**

It is clear that telecommunications infrastructure is critical to the achievement of the objectives set forth in the proposals generated by this program. It is equally clear that, with one significant exception, the program, focused mainly on educational institutions, lacked the scope and scale to materially impact private sector investment in telecommunications infrastructure. This is not a fault of the program, for improving the infrastructure was not one of its goals. However, given the successful results of the program, the importance of infrastructure to the goals of the program is clear. One program demonstrated the potential to stimulate infrastructure improvements, Connect Colorado.

### Connect Colorado

The Connect Colorado project is in the Arkansas Valley region of southeastern Colorado. There, after discovering that the project's goals could not be met through the existing infrastructure – primarily due to cost – the program catalyzed a public-private partnership that resulted in the deployment of 600 miles of state-of-the-art fiber optic telecommunications infrastructure to over 80 educational, library, and medical facilities in 23 separate communities. Moreover, this partnership created a residual capacity available to provide similar services to homes and businesses in these communities. In a sense, Connect Colorado has served as a test-bed or pilot case for the strategy embodied in the Beanpole Bill. That strategy is to combine the purchasing power of the public sector to aggregate sufficient demand to attract to a region the necessary investment needed to make material improvements in the telecommunications infrastructure. Importantly, the investment made in infrastructure through Connect Colorado is available for further development under the Beanpole Fund.

## **3. Background on The Technology Learning Grant and Revolving Loan Program**

This is the third annual report on the Technology Learning Grant and Revolving Loan Program as required by Senate Bill 96-197. Prior reports, filed in January of 1998 and 1999, detailed the establishment of the program, proposals received, awards made, and impacts to date. In capsule form, this is what was reported (please refer to the prior reports for full details):

- 178 proposals were received, 57 from the northeastern region of the state; 19 from the southeast; 83 from central Colorado; 2 from the southwest; and 17 from the northwest. Applicants requested approximately \$100 million in grants and \$4 million in loans. The program's staff interpreted this strong response as an indication of the outstanding needs in Colorado for educational technology support and assistance.
- Expenditures sought were \$60 million hardware; \$14 million telecommunications; \$10 million software or databases; \$6 million installation; \$4 million professional development; \$5 million other. Proposals ranged from \$12 million to \$6,000. Requests were received from 43 school districts; 40 schools; five BOCES; 18 libraries; 55 higher education institutions.
- Funded projects submitted reports in 1997 and 1998 which, quoting from the 1999 Annual Report on the program, "indicated that award recipients implemented their projects in accordance with the proposal they submitted and their original or revised budget projections." As reported in 1998, the projects resulted in:
  - 80,000 new technology users, growing to 110,000 by program end
  - 800 new local area networks
  - 146 new wide area network nodes
  - 12,000 new computers

## **4. Background on Related State and Federal Programs**

An appropriate assessment of the impact of the Technology Learning Grant and Revolving Loan Fund cannot be made in isolation from other relevant programs of state and federal government with complementary objectives.

### **4.1 The Multi-Use Network**

The State, through the Division of Telecommunications of the Department of General Services is currently implementing a strategy to stimulate telecommunications investment in under-served regions of the state. The approach is to aggregate the purchasing power of State government into one state-wide procurement with the aim of guaranteeing enough business to the winning vendor to justify upgrades in infrastructure required in the procurement. At present, the Request For Proposals has been issued, several competitive bids are expected, and an award is anticipated in April. The effect of this strategy will be to establish

in each county seat "point of presence" capable of carrying high-speed ("broadband") digital traffic suitable for voice, data, and video.

#### **4.2 The Beanpole Fund**

In a way analogous to the Multi-Use Network, the Beanpole Fund, established under House Bill 99-1102 (the "Beanpole Bill" seeks to implement the same "demand aggregation" at the local level, aggregating the demand of specific local communities. Local Communities will act as procurement agents for the traffic of the public offices in the community. To help communities implement this strategy, the State has established a fund to which communities may apply for matching dollars to help stimulate a scale of demand necessary to attract investment.

If the Beanpole Fund and its companion program, the Multi-Use Network, are successful, they will in the long-run, reduce the cost to local communities for access to information networks such as the Internet. This will enable them, from the savings realized in the cost of bandwidth, to put more of their resources into content development and training. The Beanpole Fund serves as a short-term catalyst to stimulate the capitalization of information networks. Working separately, rural institutions do not have sufficient resources to fund this capitalization, but working together, their aggregated demand stands a better chance of attracting the needed investment from the private sector. After this investment is made, the institutions, separately, will have operational funds to maintain ongoing connectivity. An important benefit of this strategy is that the newly established infrastructure will also be available to homes and businesses, fostering community and economic development throughout the state.

#### **4.3 The Technology Quality Indicator of the Colorado Commission on Higher Education**

The Colorado Commission on Higher Education has established a goal of integrating the use of technology into 50 percent of courses. One reason for this policy is that technology has the potential to increase the effectiveness and reduce the cost of instruction. Another reason is that, in an increasingly technological society, it is important to integrate technology into teaching and learning to keep pace with how technology is becoming a part of how we work and play. To reach this objective, the tenants of the Technology Learning Grant and Revolving Loan Fund must be met: colleges, communities, and homes (from where students may access distance learning programs) must have access and connectivity, teachers and students alike need training in the use of technology, and instructional content is needed to support learning outcomes. The integration of technology into courses will occur in the traditional classroom, but also in the new online classrooms served by distance learning programs.

Distance learning enables students to learn when and where it is convenient for them, increasing their access to higher education. There were 27,000 distance learning class enrollments across all public higher educational institutions in 1999. Distance learning will be a principal tool of the Colorado Institute of Technology to provide education and training services to help meet the workforce needs of the growing information technology industry in Colorado. Because of the importance of distance learning to the future of higher education, the Colorado Commission on Higher Education (as documented in its 2000 HB 99-1289 report, chapter on distance education) supports the efforts of the state to ensure the availability of telecommunications infrastructure in all regions of the state, making it possible for rural residents to access higher education.

#### **4.4 Federal Technology Literacy Challenge**

The U.S. Department of Education funds the Technology Literacy Challenge program. Annual appropriations from this fund have been received by Colorado based on our Title 1 student population. The present year has provided \$3.7 million. The program is expected to continue for several more years. Managed through the Colorado Department of Education, these funds have been used to increase and sustain access to modern computers and the Internet, to provide effective online resources and software, and to provide training resources. To reach these broad goals, the department has allocated eight \$100,000 grants to regional groups for professional development, one \$1.5 million multi-year grant, \$700,000 in infrastructure grants for schools and school districts that do not have at least the minimal dedicated connectivity (56 kbps) to the Internet, and three \$150,000 grants for content and online courses utilizing the Internet or interactive video.

#### **4.5 Federal E-Rate Program**

The E-Rate program is a special program created through the 1996 Federal Telecommunications Act. It is designed to establish parity in access to modern telecommunications networks among all schools in the nation, whether metropolitan, suburban, or rural. The program provides a subsidy for schools in high-cost areas so that their net cost of connecting is the same as is available in metropolitan areas. In this way, rural schools are not disadvantaged by location. The funds may be used to offset telecommunications cost, professional development, access to Internet service providers, and internal wiring for the poorest schools. The E-rate has and is helping Colorado schools tremendously. Overall, Colorado schools and libraries have received \$10.7 million dollars in relief from the E-rate.

#### **4.6 Status of Colorado Public Schools**

At present, about 50 percent of Colorado school districts have dedicated connectivity. As for applications, a few K-12 groups have been formed to develop content, but this new area is having to compete for funds with other district priorities, including capital construction. At present, the K-12 system lacks a universal policy directive to embrace technology, such as the Quality Indicator for technology under consideration for higher education. K-12 also faces challenges not faced by higher education in that its students do not pay tuition and cannot be charged differential tuition for access to distance learning K-12 courses. In spite of this, a number of districts have distinguished themselves as leaders in the use of technology, including Academy School District 20 in El Paso County, the Poudre School District in Fort Collins, and school districts in Boulder, Delta, Eagle, and Rifle.

#### **5. Recommendations**

Having described the outcomes of the Technology Learning Grant and Revolving Loan Program and the context established by other, complementary programs, two key recommendations are possible and appropriate at this point as the program's activity nears an end:

##### **5.1 Follow through with the Multi-Use Network and the Beanpole Fund designed to assure adequate telecommunications infrastructure in under-served parts of the state.**

As described above, the demand of a single sector, e.g., education, was, with certain exceptions, not sufficient to attract investment and materially improve the basic telecommunications infrastructure. But the state has in place two strategies that greatly broaden the scope of demand for services that together stand a good chance of causing the material improvements needed to provide broadband network connectivity to our schools, colleges, libraries, communities, homes, and businesses. This strategy is at risk because the local community level (the Beanpole Fund) is unfunded beyond the present fiscal year budget (FY2000). In view of the good that has been demonstrated through the Technology Learning Grant and Revolving Loan Program, and the parallel initiatives in secondary and higher education critical to the future of Colorado, the General Assembly should strongly consider continuation funding, for the Beanpole Fund be incorporated in the coming fiscal year budget.

##### **5.2 Reauthorize the Technology Learning Grant and Revolving Loan Fund for a second phase of funding.**

The Technology Learning Grant and Revolving Loan Fund was able to only accomplish part of its ambitious slate of objectives. This does not mean it failed. On the contrary, as is clearly documented in Table 1, it succeeded in laying the foundation for further development of technology applications. The failure would be to stop at this juncture and not follow through with additional support to the recipients and those like them who, now with a modicum of access and connectivity in hand, need additional support in the truly more challenging task of integrating that technology into their missions. Access to technology is no longer an option, but a requirement for the full participation in our economy, society and future. The state must examine its obligation to support technology advancement in its institutions, through its own resources and in concert with federal and local funds. The cross-disciplinary funding strategy (higher education, K-12, and libraries) in the first round of the TLC has stimulated many useful partnerships among these institutions and with the communities they serve and should be retained as the model for future funding cycles. We therefore recommend the General Assembly consider reauthorization of the grant and revolving program, through the Colorado Commission on Higher Education. The funds would be allocated for a second round of projects. The initial grant and loan program funding was \$20 million.

The benefits anticipated from a reauthorization of this program – especially in the achievement of objectives that lie at higher levels of the technology hierarchy than access and connectivity - include:

- For libraries, increased development on-line catalogs, increased training for citizens on the use of the Internet, increased use of digital media as a source of bibliographic material.
- For schools, integrating technology into the curriculum, that is, using technology as a learning tool, and using this tool to shift from teacher-centered pedagogy to learner-centered. This also means more focus on learning about technology per se, as information technology and the knowledge worker increasingly become the primary economic engines of our society.
- For colleges and universities, dramatic increases in the provision of online, distance learning instruction, and in the incorporation of technology into the traditional classroom. But the effective use of technology will require accommodations in the way we teach and learn. For example, it means sharing courseware development across institutions, especially for popular, large enrollment courses.

**TABLE 1**  
**Year 2000 Report on the Technology Learning Grant and Revolving Loan Fund**

## Summary of Completed Projects

Recipient	Project Title	Award Amount	Project Type	Project Description
CCCOES	Connect Colorado in Arkansas Valley	\$3,323,713	WAN/ Internet Access	Leveraged state resources over 2-to-1 to install a 600 mile, high-capacity fiber-optic system spanning 23 communities in the Arkansas Valley area of southeast Colorado. Serves schools, colleges, libraries, and medical facilities in the valley through 12 fiber-optic strands and leaves 24 additional strands available for commercial, private sector use. While the project goals included integration of technology into the curriculum and instructional delivery, most of the partner schools were still dealing with access issues at the end of the grant period. Purchased 230 new computers. Affects about 3,900 students at present.
Community College of Denver	Denver Metro Technology Learning Partnership	\$1,433,313	PCs, WAN, Broad Urban Partnership	Connects and provides services to clients of six interrelated institutions: the Community College of Denver, the Adams County Employment Center, Adams Count School District 14, the Denver Housing Authority, the Denver Public Library, and the Mayor's Office of Employment and Training. In all, 280 PCs were purchased and installed. Partnership also installed a two-way interactive video network among the sites. By the end of the grant period most partners were operating the new technology to provide education and employment services, although the extent to which the technology had been used by students and other community members was not yet fully realized; the potential for improved services and greater service integration is significant.
Fort Lewis College	Southwest Colorado Interactive Learning Network (SCILnet)	\$1,000,000	WAN/ Internet Access	Provides Internet access to more than 14,500 K-12 students and schools, libraries, and colleges of 12 southwest Colorado communities. Each is now connected to the Internet and equipped with hardware. Access was more than doubled, from about 40 students per Internet computer to 20. Access was coupled with an aggressive training program; measures of perceived skill level of teachers increased significantly. Remaining challenges are to better integrate technology into the curriculum, to implement high school post-graduate programs through distance learning, and to implement a K-12 master teacher training program.
Univ. of Northern Colorado	Colorado Union Catalog	\$ 640,000	Library	Merged and made available online bibliographic records of the sixteen academic, public, and special libraries in Colorado permitting access to over 10 million books, journals, sound recordings, films, videotapes, and other materials held in these libraries. With a single search, users can identify and borrow materials from collections and have them delivered to a local library.
Adams Twelve Five Star Schools	Adams County Partnership	\$ 494,457	WAN/ Internet Access  Distance Learning	Networked and provided Internet access to all classrooms in all schools. Acquired 279 new computers and added 6,747 new users. Districts have budgeted to sustain their current systems and provide online access to their combined 29,595 students. All schools have developed plans that address technology equipment, connections, training, and the integration of technology into the curriculum. All software acquired directly supports the curriculum. The districts' goal of at least 50 percent of their students using technology to meet one or more content standards was premature and not attained during the duration of this grant.

Arapahoe Community College	Arapahoe Comm. College Technology Initiative	\$ 426,232	WAN/ Internet Access	Internet technology infrastructure was installed at the college to support over 800 users. College now uses network to deliver over 40 on-line courses. A parallel effort to explore two-way video delivery of college classes to a near-by high school was not successful; most students preferred attending the college classes in person. However, the college did successfully join the state-wide community college videoconferencing network. Project training goal was over-ambitious given available resources, but the college is committed to supporting needed ongoing training to its faculty and staff.
Red Rocks Community College	LEARN	\$420,465	Video Network/ Internet Access/ Computers/ Distance Learning	Linked community college with high schools in service area. Provided variety of services, from library access, to child care, to interactive video distance learning. All students have e-mail accounts for interaction with instructors. Collaborated with area universities in providing distance learning classes, including Physician's Assistant class, introductory class on DNA in teacher enrichment program, Introduction to Computer Applications, and Teaching in the Digital Age. Established complete computer labs at each participating school. Employed videoconferencing network to support meetings for faculty and staff. Provided training.
University of Northern Colorado	Excellence in Learning Through Technology	\$ 342,000	Curriculum	Leveraged National Science Foundation curriculum development grant in chemistry. The purpose of the NSF grant was to explore a learner-centered, project-oriented, inquiry-based pedagogy through the incorporation of computers into the chemistry curriculum. State funds were used to provide the necessary equipment to set up model high-technology science classrooms in each of ten Colorado schools. Then, in these classrooms the NSF ChemQuest curriculum was piloted. All of the ten schools now have Internet access, some as a result of this grant. Much was learned about how, through technology, the teacher-centered classroom can be reoriented to a student-centered one. The adjustment to project-based, independent learning was not easy for some students, who preferred to be told what to do. The teacher's role changed from that of lecturer/director to one of guide or facilitator. ChemQuest students worked at computers 37 percent of the time accessing a rich set of electronic materials. 150 new computers purchased. Affects about 8,000 users.
University of Colorado Health Science Center	Excellence in Health Education through Technology	\$ 341,000	Video Network Distance Learning	Increased access to graduate and professional level health education on Western Slope. Expanded the University of Colorado's Area Health Education Center capacity by establishing telehealth learning centers in Craig, Montrose, and Cortez. Connectivity between the Denver-based Health Sciences Campus and the Western slope sites was facilitated through the CIVICS (Cooperative Interactive Video In Colorado State Government) System, a video network connecting some 47 educational institutions, state offices, medical facilities, and corrections facilities. During the first five months of 1999, utilization of the network averaged 120 hours per month at the Health Sciences Campus site, 6 hours per month at the Craig site, 6 hours per month at the Montrose site, and 55 hours per month at the Cortez site. Usage trends at all three sites are growing. Thirty-six students enrolled in graduate level Nurse Practitioner and Certified Nurse-Midwifery programs on the Western Slope. The Cortez site now serves the Four-Corners region. Two faculty "reverse" commute from (one from Montrose, one from Craig)

				to teach in Denver at Red Rocks Community College.
Thompson R2-J School District	Industrial Technology	\$ 329,886	Curriculum	Five schools made "quantum leap" from classic industrial science to new industrial technology program. A completely new curriculum for industrial technology was developed. Then the necessary equipment needed to support the equipment was procured. Every year, an estimated 2,500 students will be involved in the new curriculum. This district has an on-going commitment to maintaining the curriculum and has installed a technology lab in a sixth school at its own expense.
Colorado State University	Virtual Library Connections	\$ 281,475	Library	Infrastructure and equipment to support electronic transmission of journal articles over the Internet among 30 libraries in rural and mountain areas of Colorado.
Pikes Peak Libraries	Community Access to the Web	\$ 207,000	WAN/ Internet Access	Upgrade Internet circuits, cable public library buildings, and install public Web browsing stations at 11 public library locations. Provided Web access to library catalog. Provided training to over 500 patrons who had never used the Internet before. Trained over 100 staff.
Poudre School District	Colorado Modelnet Project	\$ 202,125	WAN/ Internet Access	Provides 5,000 students and teachers with high speed, high capacity access to online resources. A wide area network was installed between numerous schools in the district, including three mountain schools, three high schools, and three junior high schools. For parts of the network, wireless technology was used.
Wiggins RE-50J	Creation of WAN	\$ 190,000	WAN/ Internet Access	Networked all district's computers. School building complex was connected together using fiber optics. Access to the Internet is now universally available to the district's 530 students and 82 employees. The district has allocated ongoing budget for technology. Keeping up with technology is a challenge, including teacher training, software compatibility, acceptable use policies, supervision, and maintenance.
Colorado State University Mechanical Engineering Department	Video Over Internet Protocol	\$ 183,466	Curriculum	Equipment and hardware to support chemistry and physics classes.
Platte Canyon School District #1	Excellence in Learning Through Technology	\$ 180,000	WAN/ Internet Access	Connected at least one computer in each high school classroom to the Internet. Computer labs in the middle and elementary schools were enhanced. Seven video units for Platte Canyon High school were purchased. Library automation systems were installed at the middle school and public library. Difficulty was encountered in access to adequate telecommunications infrastructure in Fairplay, which precluded linking the school, county offices, and library.
Fort Collins Public Library	Electronic Literacy Connection	\$ 175,000	Library	Upgraded overall library technology, increasing access to families who do not have access to computers either at home or at work. "This small computer lab has been a godsend for them." The grant has been an important catalyst in expanding access to technology in the Fort Collins Community. Affects 7,378 students.
Lincoln Alternative High School	Lincoln High School Network	\$ 142,461	LAN/ Internet Access	Twenty-eight computers were acquired for student and staff use. The school now has at least one Internet station in each classroom. Software and courseware purchased to support

	Building Project			student instruction. Training was provided to staff, student, and parents. The school is continuing to address the use of technology in the educational program.
Brush Public School, Morgan County RE2J	Excellence in Learning Through Technology	\$ 133,667	WAN/ Internet Access	Installed wide area network connecting the high school, middle school, two elementary schools, and the administration to the Internet. As a result, all teachers in the district have Internet access from their classroom computer; and 62 percent of teachers have received formal training in the use of this new technology. Prior to this grant, the Internet was not available to students at all. Further, the district offers use of their equipment to the public and other institutions. The district has formed a Technology Committee to provide ongoing guidance.
University of Northern Colorado	UNC Technology Initiative	\$113,048	Computer Classroom	Constructed computer classroom and training area to provide computer and writing instruction for all students enrolled in General Education writing courses, approximately 3,000 students.
Colorado State University	Chemtrek II, CSMATE	\$ 93,250	WAN/ Internet Access	Nine high schools have expanded their usage of the Internet. Approximately 1,100 new users; 500 new computers.
Nederland M/S HS	Excellence in Learning Through Technology	\$ 86,371	Curriculum	Equipment was purchased to support the science curriculum: nine student stations, one teacher station, and a server, all networked together, located in two science labs. With the new computers, students focus more of their time on understanding projects rather than manual manipulation of data. This resulted in a marked increase in student interest and motivation, with a side-benefit that students became more proficient with technology. The grant has thus contributed toward the school's goal of increasing the percentage of the graduating class taking more science than required.
University of Colorado at Denver	The Electronic Library of Colorado	\$ 85,860	Content	Developed Web site documenting images and information about approximately 100 buildings and sites in Colorado.
Weld County RE-4	The Windsor Connection	\$ 70,139	WAN/ Internet Access	Installed wide area network between the schools, town, and libraries in Windsor, Colorado, bringing Internet access to these facilities. Prior to the grant, there was essentially no access; now all school, library, and town hall computers are connected serving 2,600 students and staff in the schools, 300 town and library employees. Public access to the town's 9,000 residents is now available through the library and school. The project has resulted in 600 additional computers being connected to the Internet.
Kit Carson R-1	Networking the District	\$ 69,935	WAN/ Internet Access	In a small, rural district with only 18 full time faculty, the project linked the district's two buildings, fully connected to a central file server. Still pending is a WAN connection to community building. The district will allocate funds for the continued operation and maintenance of this network. Affects 100 students.
University of Colorado at Denver	Colorado GIS Online	\$ 65,000	Distance Learning	Developed four distance learning courses in Geographic Information Systems. Delivered these over the course of two semesters to a total of 20 students. Found that students take on-line courses because of convenience, and that students would prefer an entire degree program be offered via distance learning instead of a mix of courses. Students want courses delivered to their home or office and are willing to pay an

				delivered to their home or office and are willing to pay an extra fee charged by the university for access to this form of instruction. Were supported in the project by the CU Online Program, and the UCD Office of Teaching Effectiveness. Found in-house WebCT supported by the campus' information services division to be easier to use for course development and delivery than outside vendor services.
Security Public Library	Swirl	\$ 56,282	WAN/ Internet Access	Developed Internet access at the public library, all secondary schools, the community center in Security/Widefield community of Colorado. Provided training, created community homepage, enabled email requests for interlibrary loans.
Pueblo East High School	Funds for Computer Literacy	\$ 50,000	LAN/ Internet Access	Wiring, hardware, software, Internet connectivity, education. Five percent of the study body at East High School are utilizing the technologies in place at the school.
Buffalo School District	Excellence in Learning Through Technology	\$ 34,731	WAN/ Internet Access	Through the grant, the district acquired 15 modern computers with connection to the Internet; developed an online version of the library catalog; and provided training to district staff. Each student and community member have access to the Internet and e-mail. Internet access is available in classrooms, computer labs, and the library.
Martin Park/High Peaks Elementary	Network to Literacy	\$ 20,364	LAN/ Internet/ Integration of Technology	Every classroom is now wired to the Internet. The school has an active Technology Committee. It maintains a Technology Plan, updated annually. Specific instructional outcomes have been established, such as: students publishing their own work on the Internet, student's viewing others' work, students will complete at least one research project in which they utilize the Internet as a primary source of information, and students using the Internet to communicate with someone outside their classroom. For example, 4th grade students spent part of the year communicating with an arctic explorer via the Internet.
Haxtun School District	Computer Cluster	\$ 10,504	Library	Developed a compeer cluster consisting of Internet, ACLIN, CD-ROM, and automated library collection access. 5 new computers.
Lower Arkansas Valley	Excellence in Learning Through Technology	\$ 6,606	Library	Bookmobile project; added middle and high school; purchased 15 computers; Internet access.

**TABLE 2**  
**Year 2000 Report**  
**Technology Learning Grant and Revolving Loan Fund**  
**Summary of Projects Pending Completion or Final Project Report**

<b>Recipient</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>Award Amount</b>	<b>Status</b>
Northwest BOCES	Western Slope Consortium for Excellence in Learning	\$2,686,035	Report due 1/31/00
Jefferson County Public Schools R-1	Phoenix Project	\$1,251,000	To be completed 12/31/99

Mountain BOCES	Mountain Tech/Telecom	\$1,083,457	To be completed, report due 1/31/00
Weld County RE-8	Community Tech. System	\$ 932,925	To be completed 12/31/99
Mesa County Valley School	LAN Implementation	\$ 908,718	To be completed June 2000, report due 7/31/00
Western State College	Excellence in Learning Through Technology RMOTE	\$ 787,231	Final report pending
Bennett School District 29J	Smart Classrooms	\$ 418,000	Final report pending
Colorado Springs School District 11	Excellence in Learning Through Technology	\$ 225,000	Project extended to 6/30/00
Pueblo Centennial High School	Smart Classroom	\$ 198,998	Funds not yet fully expended.
Boulder Valley Schools	Excellence Through Technology	\$ 154,000	Unexpended balance
Ryan Elementary	Pen-pals Around the World	\$ 146,306	Final report pending

**TOPIC: CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION CASH-FUNDED PROGRAMS**

**PREPARED BY: JEANNE M. ADKINS**

**I. SUMMARY**

The Commission is directed by statute to review and approve program plans submitted for cash-funding spending authority in the Long Bill. This process is required to enable the legislature to review the allocation of cash funds following the passage of the Taxpayer Bill of Rights amendment to the Colorado Constitution. Any project exceed \$250,000 statutory threshold on which an institution wishes to spend cash funds from any source must have explicit spending authority granted by the legislature. Program plan approval is necessary as part of that process.

**II. BACKGROUND**

Under the Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) Policy for Self-Funded Capital Construction, Section III, Part revised and approved July 1, 1999, the Cash Funds Fiscal Accountability Reporting Policy and Implementation I established pursuant to FY 1989-90 Long Bill (S.B. 245), Footnote 34. The legislature asked that the Commission develop recommendations on the use of cash funds for capital construction and controlled maintenance projects. The CCHE policy was ratified by the legislative Capital Development Committee and Joint Budget Committee in November 1989. At the July 1, 1999, meeting, a unanimous motion by the Commission amended the policy to comply with requirements of Section 23-1-106, C.R.S.

Under the new policy, cash-funded projects under the \$250,000 statutory threshold do not need spending authority with the Long Bill. CCHE has authority to review and approve the spending associated with those projects involving institutional cash funds or other outside funding (federal). Projects exceeding that threshold must have specific spending authority. Those projects are included in Attachment 1 to this agenda item, which is reported in final form for your review.

Unlike the capital construction projects, which are required by statute to be prioritized, these projects are forwarded to the legislature for inclusion in the budget for spending authority once program plan approval, or a program waiver, has been granted by CCHE.

The Commission has delegated the authority to approve these program plans to the Executive Director by policy. Subsequent delegation of that authority in writing has been made by the director to the Director of Policy and Planning. Similar delegation has occurred in determining whether waivers from specific program planning requirements will be granted.

In examining the requests for program plan approvals for cash-funded projects, staff seeks to ensure that student fees, tuition fees and general fund are not used for academic facility construction in compliance with the CCHE Tuition and Fees Policy. Funding resources for the cash-funded project are examined to determine that resources pledged to the project are appropriate to that project. Where fees are used for funding, staff examines whether those fees are allowed for that purpose.

Under the existing policy, governing boards, which actually have statutory duties to direct the expenditure of all cash funds and appropriation, must approve the submission of a program plan to CCHE. CCHE's program plan approval process is the same for both types of projects.

CCHE Policy Section III, Part Q, 3.01(a) states that neither governing boards nor institutions may "authorize, or acquire sites or initiate any program or activity requiring capital construction for the use of state-supported institutions, regardless of the source of funding, unless it has obtained the prior approval of CCHE. This includes acquisition or utilization of real property for the use of a state-supported institution of higher education by lease, lease-purchase, purchase, gift or otherwise."

Governing boards must document findings of fact on cash-funded projects to the Commission that sufficient cash funds are on hand to pay the project costs, that operating revenues will not be significantly affected by the construction project, the source of the funding and the use of the funding for the project.

[Attachment 1](#): List of Cash-Funded, SB202-Funded Projects referred to the General Assembly, Capital Development Committee and Joint Budget Committee for FY00-01.

Colorado Commission on Higher Education								
Final 02/15/00 Proposed Cash Funded Projects for 2000-2001								
CCHE	G/BD	Category	Institution	Project	Total Project Cost	Funding Sources	Prior Appropriation	FY 00-01
- Approved Jan 20-00	Jan.-00	Cash Funded	University of Colorado - Boulder	Student Residence/Dining Hall Reno (SB 202)	\$56,083,000	\$56,083,000 CFE	\$0	\$55,000,000
-	Withdrawn	Cash Funded	University of Colorado - Boulder	Potts Track and Field (SB 202)	-	CF	\$0	\$1,500,000
- Approved Jan 11-00	-	Cash Funded	University of Colorado - Boulder	Stadium Lighting (SB 202)	\$850,000	\$850,000 CFE	\$0	\$850,000
- Approved Sept 29-99	-	Cash Funded	University of Colorado - Boulder	Acquisition of Lesser Home	\$150,000	\$150,000 CFE	\$0	-
- Approved Jan 24-99	-	Cash Funded	University of Colorado - Colorado Springs	Purchase of Bennett Property	\$357,000	\$357,000 CFE	\$0	-
- Approved June 22-99	-	Cash Funded	University of Colorado - Boulder	Purchase of Real Property, 3720 Walnut, Boulder	\$30,000	-	-	-
- Approved Sept 7-99	-	Cash Funded	University of Colorado - Boulder	Conversion of Studio into Computer Classrooms/Lab	\$50,372	\$50,372 CFE	\$0	-
-	-	-	-	<b>Sub-Total CU System</b>	<b>\$57,520,372</b>	<b>\$57,490,372CF</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$57,350,000</b>
- Approved Dec 1-99	July '98	Cash Funded	University of Colorado - HSC	Auditorium Remodel	\$2,195,296	\$2,195,296 CF	\$0	\$2,195,296
- Approved Nov 19-99	Sep-99	Cash Funded	University of Colorado - HSC	Perinatal Research Expansion (SB 202)	\$3,436,377	\$3,436,377CF CF	\$0	\$3,436,377
- Approved Sep 14-99	-	Cash Funded	University of Colorado - HSC	Research I Complex	\$216,000,000	\$181,000,000 CFE	\$0	\$0
-	-	-	-	<b>Sub-Total UC - HSC</b>	<b>\$221,631,673</b>	<b>\$221,631,673 CF</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$5,631,673</b>
- Approved Nov 9-99	Feb-99	Cash Funded	Colorado School of Mines	Housing Unit Fraternity Row (SB 202)	\$761,520	\$761,520 CFE	\$0	\$761,520
- Approved Apr 16-99	Feb-99	Cash Funded	Colorado School of Mines	Mines Park Housing Phase 2 (SB 202)	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000 CFE	\$0	\$1,000,000
- Approved Nov 9-99	Feb-99	Cash Funded	Colorado School of Mines	Student Center Addition (SB 202)	\$2,829,892	\$2,829,892 CFE	\$0	\$2,829,892
- Approved Nov 30-99	Feb-99	Cash Funded	Colorado School of Mines	Residence Halls Renovation Projects (SB 202)	\$3,348,000	\$3,348,000 CFE	\$0	-
-	-	-	-	<b>Sub-Total CS Mines</b>	<b>\$7,939,412</b>	<b>\$7,939,412 CF</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$4,591,412</b>
- Approved Nov 17-99	Sep-99	Cash Funded	Colorado State University	Microbiology Addition	\$5,800,000	\$5,800,000 CFE	\$0	\$5,800,000
- Approved July 26-99	Sep-99	Cash Funded	Colorado State University	Relocate Chemistry Lab	\$481,000	\$481,000 CFE	\$0	\$481,000
- Approved Nov 30-99	Sep-99	Cash Funded	Colorado State University	Main Campus - Land Acquisition	\$480,000	\$480,000 CFE	\$0	\$480,000

-	Approved Nov 30-99	Sep-99	Cash Funded	Colorado State University	Foothills Campus - Land Acquisition	\$326,000	\$326,000	CFE	\$0	\$326,000
-	Approved Nov 10-99	Sep-99	Cash Funded	Colorado State University	Moby Arena - Air Conditioning	\$750,000	\$750,000	CFE	\$0	\$750,000
-	Approved July 26-99		Cash Funded	Colorado State University	Hartshorn Health Center Remodel	\$249,921	-		\$0	-
-	Approved July 26-99		Cash Funded	Colorado State University	Anatomy/Zoology E212 Remodel	\$200,000	\$249,921	CFE	-	\$0
-	Approved July 26-99		Cash Funded	Colorado State University	Microbiology B430-431 Remodel	\$75,000	\$75,000	CFE	\$0	-
-	Approved July 26-99		Cash Funded	Colorado State University	Weber 221-201 Remodel	\$61,000	\$61,000	CFE	\$0	-
-	Approved July 26-99		Cash Funded	Colorado State University	Lear Lab	\$249,957	\$249,957	CFE	\$0	-
-	Approved July 26-99		Cash Funded	Colorado State University	Coop 'A' Lab Parking Lot Expansion	\$86,250	\$86,250	CFE	\$0	-
-	Approved July 26-99		Cash Funded	Colorado State University	Parking Lot-Allison Hall - W	\$172,000	\$172,000	CFE	\$0	-
-	Approved July 26-99		Cash Funded	Colorado State University	Parking Lot Landscaping	\$93,000	\$93,000	CFE	\$0	-
-	Approved July 26-99		Cash Funded	Colorado State University	Lory Student Center Security Cameras	\$100,000	\$100,000	CFE	\$0	-
-	Approved Nov 16-99	Sep-99	Cash Funded	Colorado State University	Corbett/Parmelee Dish Room Exp	\$625,000	\$625,000	CFE	\$0	\$625,000
-	Approved July 26-99		Cash Funded	Colorado State University	Equine Center Improvements (Program Plan Amendments)	\$1,905,712	\$1,905,712	CFE	\$0	-
-	Approved Dec 15-99		Cash Funded	Colorado State University	Muni Lease Purchase #44-Matrix Assisted Laser Deorption Mass Spectrometer	\$212,000	\$212,000	CFE	\$0	-
-	Approved Dec 15-99		Cash Funded	Colorado State University	Muni Lease Purchase #45-Circular Dichroism Spectrometer	\$90,712	\$90,712	CFE	\$0	-
-	Approved Dec 15-99		Cash Funded	Colorado State University	Muni Lease Purchase #46-Digital Instruments Bioscope AFM	\$120,000	\$120,000	CFE	\$0	-
-	Approved Dec 15-99		Cash Funded	Colorado State University	Muni Lease Purchase #47-Peripheral Radiology Equipment	\$203,144	\$203,144	CFE	\$0	-
-	Approved Feb 10-00		Cash Funded	Colorado State University	Muni Lease Purchase #48-Equine Sports Medicine Mobil Unit	\$291,143	\$291,143	CFE	\$0	-
-	Approved Dec 15-99		Cash Funded	Colorado State University	Acquire 1/2 Acre Surrounded by Pingree Park	\$10,000	\$10,000	CFE	\$0	-
-	Approved Nov 15-99	Sep-99	Cash Funded	Colorado State University	Hughes Stadium Field Lighting	\$825,000	\$825,000	CFE	\$0	\$825,000
-	Approved Nov 30-99		Cash Funded	Colorado State University	Remodel C5-C3C Chemistry	\$97,320	\$97,320	CFE	\$0	-
-	Approved July 26-99		Cash Funded	Colorado State University	Remodel Room 159 Molecular and Radiological Biosciences Building	\$109,000	\$109,000	CFE	\$0	-
-	Approved July 26-99		Cash Funded	Colorado State University	Clark Building Dean's Office Remodel	\$207,000	\$207,000	CFE	\$0	-

-	Approved July 19-99	-	Cash Funded	Colorado State University	Clark C235 Multi-Media Lab Remodel	\$65,150	\$65,150	CFE	\$0	-
-	Approved Nov 18-99	Dec-99	Cash Funded	Fort Lewis College	Miller Student Center Renovation Phase III-Records	\$895,000	\$895,000	CFE	\$0	-
-	Approved Aug 9-99	-	Cash Funded	University of Southern Colorado	Replacement of Telephone System	\$467,000	\$420,300	CF	\$0	-
-	Approved Nov 15-99	-	Cash Funded	Colorado State University	Engineering Building Entry Enhancement	\$400,000	\$400,000	CFE	\$0	-
-	Approved July 19-99	-	Cash Funded	Colorado State University	Remodel Dog Facility for Insectary	\$97,320	\$97,320	CFE	\$0	\$400,000
					<b>Sub-Total CSU System</b>	<b>\$15,744,629</b>	<b>\$15,744,629</b>	<b>CF</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$9,687,000</b>
-	Approved Nov 30-99	July 14-99	Cash Funded	Aims Community College	Enclosure for Aviation Simulator	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	CFE	\$0	\$1,000,000
					<b>Sub-Total Local District Colleges</b>	<b>\$1,000,000</b>	<b>\$1,000,000</b>	<b>CF</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$1,000,000</b>
-	Approved Sept 27-99	-	Cash Funded	Red Rocks Community College	Student Life Center Office Remodel	\$25,000	\$25,000	CF	\$0	-
-	Approved Jan 3-00	Nov.-99	Cash Funded	Northeastern Junior College	Revised Parking Lot Request (SB 202)	\$230,000	\$230,000	CF	\$0	-
					<b>Sub-Total CCCOES</b>	<b>\$230,000</b>	<b>\$230,000</b>	<b>CF</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
					<b>Sub-Total State Colleges</b>				<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE)  
March 2, 2000  
Agenda Item VI, C

**TOPIC: REPORT ON OUT-OF-STATE INSTRUCTION**

**PREPARED BY: TIM GRIEDER**

### **I. SUMMARY**

The Commission holds statutory responsibility to approve instruction offered out-of-state beyond the seven contiguous states. By action of the Commission in 1986 the Executive Director may act for the Commission to approve or c requests from governing boards for approval of courses and programs to be offered by their institutions. This agend item includes additional instruction that the Executive Director has certified as meeting the criteria for out-of-st delivery. It is sponsored by the Trustees of The State Colleges and the Board of Regents of the University of Colorado.

### **II. BACKGROUND**

Prior to 1983, instruction out-of-state was offered at will by Colorado institutions, primarily through the Extende Studies Program, but an Attorney General opinion of July 3, 1980, concluded that there was no authorizing legislati and out-of-state programs were discontinued. In 1983, the General Assembly enacted legislation that a non-state-funded out-of-state instruction but also required governing board approval. When the instruction is beyond the contiguous states, Commission approval is required as well.

At its meeting of May 2, 1986, the Commission delegated authority to the Executive Director to determine w out-of-state instruction beyond the contiguous states complies with statutory requirements. In June 1986, th Commission received the first notification of out-of-state instruction certified by the Executive Director. Addit approved out-of-state instruction is reported to the Commission as it is received and reviewed.

### **III. ACTION**

The Executive Director has approved the following out-of-state instruction:

To be delivered by Adams State College:

ED 589, *Multicultural Studies/Hawaii* delivered in Hawaii May 19-26, 2000;

ED 589, *Eye Exercises to Make Learning Easy* delivered in Hawaii July 12-17, 2000;

ED 589, *Simple Self-Healing Techniques* delivered in Hawaii March 30-April 9, 2000;

ED 589, *Time to Teach* delivered in Washington February 28, 2000.

To be delivered by Western State College in England, July 15-August 12, 2000:

HIST 397 or HNRS 397, *The Historical Landscape of England*;

ENG 397 or HNRS 397, *The Literary Landscape of England*;

COTH 397, ENG 397, or HNRS 397, *The Dramatic Landscape of England*.

To be delivered by the University of Colorado at Denver:

EDUC 5836, *Employment Consultant Training Program* to be delivered in Utah February 1-3, 2000; in South Dakota February 8-11, 2000; in North Dakota March 7-9, 2000, and in Montana April 25-27, 2000.

EDUC 5836, *Paraeducator Supervision Academy* to be delivered in Japan February 10-11 and February 15-16, 2000; in Korea February 17-18, 2000; and in Germany March 9-10, 2000.

## **Appendix A**

### **STATUTORY AUTHORITY**

The Commission is given responsibility for approval of out-of-state instruction beyond the contiguous states in 23-5-116.