

CCHE Agenda

May 4, 2000

Fletcher Room, College Center

Mesa State College

Grand Junction, Colorado

10:00 a.m.

- I. Approval of Minutes (April 6, 2000)
- II. Reports
 - A. Chair's Report -- Bracken
 - B. Commissioners' Reports
 - C. Advisory Committee Reports
- III. Consent Items

None
- IV. Action Items
 - A. Master Plan -- Foster (15 minutes)
 - B. CCHE-Capital Assets Pilot Design Project FY 01-02 -- Adkins/Ferris (30 minutes)
 - C. Low Enrollment Program Policy -- Samson (30 minutes)
 - D. Coordinated Degree Policy -- Samson (30 minutes)
- V. Items for Discussion and Possible Action
 - A. CCHE-Capital Assets Schedule FY 2001-02 -- Adkins (30 minutes)
 - B. Annual Admission Standards Report -- Samson (15 minutes)
- VI. Written Reports for Possible Discussion
 - A. Report on Out-of-State Instruction -- Breckel
 - B. Commission Meeting Schedule 2000-2001 -- Foster

COLORADO COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

April 6, 2000
Colorado History Museum
Denver, Colorado

MINUTES

Commissioners Present: Raymond T. Baker; Alexander E. Bracken, Chair; Terrance L. Farina; Marion Gottesfeld; David E. Greenberg; Robert A. Hessler; Peggy Lamm; Ralph J. Nagel, Vice Chair; and Dean Quamme.

Advisory Committee Present: Penelope Bauer; Senator Jim Dyer; Jane Duncan; Calvin M. Frazier; and Sandy Hume.

Commission Staff Present: Timothy E. Foster, Executive Director; Jeanne Adkins; JoAnn Evans; Patty O'Connor; Sharon Samson

I. Call to Order

The regular meeting of the Colorado Commission on Higher Education was called to order at 10:10 a.m. in Boe Auditorium in the Colorado History Museum Building in Denver, Colorado.

Action: Commissioner Hessler moved approval of the minutes of the March 4, 2000, Commission meeting. Commissioner Quamme seconded the motion, and the motion carried unanimously.

II. Reports

A. Chair's Report

The Chair, Commissioner Alexander E. Bracken, reported that Commissioner Lamar Allen has resigned from the Commission due to family illnesses. The Governor has appointed James M. Stewart of Colorado Springs to complete the term vacated by Dr. Allen. Mr. Stewart has formerly served on the State Board for the Colorado Community and Occupational Education System. Commissioners David Greenberg and Bill Vollbracht were excused absent. Commissioner Vollbracht was unable to participate by telephone as planned due to technical difficulties.

Chair Bracken reported that the Commission and the members of the State Board of Agriculture met for dinner on Wednesday evening, April 5, 2000. The Commission is scheduled to meet with the State Colleges Board at noon on Thursday, April 6, 2000, and plans to meet with the Board of Trustees of the University of Northern Colorado in the future. The Commission will continue the meetings with governing boards. Discuss a variety of issues of mutual concern.

He also reported that Commissioner Gottesfeld has been honored by the University of Denver (DU) by having a room named in her honor at the DU Ritchie Center.

B. Commissioners' Reports

No reports

C. Advisory Committee Reports

Dr. Penelope Bauer reminded the Commission that the Colorado Faculty Advisory Council (CFAC) will meet April 21, 2000, from 9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. at the Tivoli Student Union at the Auraria Campus.

III. Consent Items

None

IV. Action Items

A. Low Enrollment Program Appeals

Dr. Sharon Samson summarized the series of actions that preceded the appeals for low-demand degree programs, beginning in 1996 when the Commission modified the *Policy and Procedures for the Discontinuance of Academic Degree Programs With low Program Demand*. She commended the governing boards for the intervening, strengthening, and discontinuing degree programs. She noted that the governing boards have filed 11 appeals, including four appeals for one-year extensions, two appeals for extensions, four appeals for exemptions beyond those allowable in current policy, and one appeal for a graduate program.

Dr. Samson reviewed the rationale supporting the appeals for extensions, emphasizing that the data indicates it is probable each of these degree programs will meet CCHE benchmarks in that time period. She further explained why the staff did not recommend increasing the number of exemptions allowed in policy.

Dr. Samson concluded her presentation by listing the appeals that the staff did not support. She stated that the appeal process provides an opportunity for the Commission to reconsider and revise its Discontinuance Policy, if it feels it necessary. She offered an example of a possible policy change – to eliminate the thirty-day waiting period between the appeal hearing and discontinuance action – which would align the Low Enrollment, Low Demand Discontinuance Policy with other CCHE policies.

Testimony:

Dr. Marlene Strathe, UNC's Academic Vice President, and Dr. Sandra Flake, Dean of Arts and Sciences, asked the Commission to consider a two-year extension for Black Studies and the Graduate Interdisciplinary doctoral program. Strathe noted that UNC has initiated an extensive review of the degree programs and the number of students enrolling in the programs is increasing. UNC requested an extension to test if UNC can sustain and increase the enrollment. Dean Flake further explained the importance of the Black Studies B.A. program to UNC faculty and students and its role in fostering diversity on the campus. Dean Flake affirmed that UNC would have exempted the Black Studies Degree program if the policy did not prevent requesting one in response to a question from Commissioner Lamm. Commissioner Farina questioned if UNC considered making the program a minor. Dr. Strathe stated that UNC is committed to providing comparable experience if the program is not exempted.

Dr. Lee Halgren, Vice President of Academic and Student Affairs, supported the opportunities for the State Trustees to exercise a leadership role in the Discontinuance Policy. He noted that the Trustees spent considerable time discussing enrollment programs and evaluating options. They filed appeals on behalf of Surveying and Mapping because of its importance to the construction industry in Colorado and Black Studies because it could not be exempted due to the condition requiring a minimum of one graduate in each of the past three years. Dr. Cheryl Norton, Metro Provost, stated that Metro wished to adjust its exempt list but it needed additional time to increase the visibility and enrollment of the Black Studies and Surveying and Mapping. She noted that Surveying and Mapping is the only degree program in surveying in the state, only one of four degree programs in the western U.S., and that a change in curriculum and licensure procedures will help the program enrollment grow.

Commissioner Bracken questioned why Metro did not place Surveying and Mapping on the exempt list. Dr. Norton responded that Metro exempted the degree programs to protect the maximum number of teacher licensure programs. Responding to Commissioners' questions regarding the reauthorization of African American studies as a teacher preparation program, Dr. Norton indicated that the African American degree program is an important way to recognize the diversity of the Denver community and is requesting an extension to develop new strategies to increase its enrollment and graduation numbers. If the program demand is not justified in two years, the State Trustees will voluntarily discontinue the degree.

Commissioner Gottesfeld stated that the Commission understands why Metro wants to keep the degree program but also is sensitive that insufficient students are enrolled in this degree for many years. She is unconvinced that the enrollment will increase. Commissioner Farina asked if Metro has considered combining low-enrollment degree programs with programs offered on the Auraria campus. Dr. Norton responded that it is important to keep the degree programs open since institutions on the Auraria campus serve different student populations.

Commissioner Quamme asked why both campuses exempted Physics. Dr. Halgren responded that the Commission may see a coordinated degree program proposal in the near future combining Physics at the Auraria campus and a pilot

coordinated degree program between Adams State and Western State College.

Commissioner Lamm asked why Metro hadn't taken action earlier and been more aggressive in increasing the African American enrollment. Mr. George Walker urged the Commission to strengthen Black Studies degree programs throughout the state.

Dr. Herman George, Jr., UNC Professor, discussed the demographic change of American society, concluding that it would be a mistake to discontinue the Black Studies program. Dr. C. J. White, chairman of the African American Studies Department at Metro, advocated that the Commission consider the value of a program and the mission of the institution, not just the number of students in a program.

Ms. Jill Tietjen, representing the Professional Land Surveyors Board, explained that a licensed land surveyor must do land surveying. The licensing examination gives weight to degree credentials and Metro is the only institution to offer a degree program. Commissioner Lamm asked if a student could become a licensed land surveyor with a Civil Engineering degree. Ms. Tietjen responded that this is possible but most Civil Engineers choose to pursue other professions.

Commissioner Baker observed that the demand in this field is industry-driven, for continuing education, but not necessarily degree-seeking students.

Commissioner Farina moved approval of the one-year extensions for Adams State College, Physics B.S.; University of Colorado at Boulder, Communications MA; University of Colorado at Boulder, Molecular, Cellular and Developmental Biology (M.S.); and Western State College, Physics, BS. Commissioner Quamme seconded the motion. It was unanimously.

Commissioner Farina moved approval of a two-year extension for Adams State College, Geology BS and Colorado School of Mines, Chemistry MS, and a three-year extension for Western State College's Chemistry BS. Commissioner Quamme seconded the motion. The Commission approved the motion unanimously.

Commissioner Farina moved approval to ask the State Trustees to reaffirm their list of exempt degree programs. Commissioner Nagel seconded the motion. Commissioner Bracken amended Farina's motion to change the policy language in section 4.03 to substitute "three graduates in the past three years," replacing "at least one graduate in each of the past three years." Commissioner Hessler seconded the amendment. After the Commission adopted the amended motion to modify the policy unanimously, Commissioner Quamme suggested staff further review the policy and recommend changes that clarify the Commission's interpretation of the policy. He reiterated that the Commission is firm on limiting the number of exemptions to five. Executive Director Foster suggested that the staff examine a different number for large and small institutions.

Commissioner Farina's original motion requesting The Trustees of the State Colleges of Colorado to confirm its list of five exemptions by April 21 passed unanimously.

Commissioner Bracken summarized the Commission's expectations, including the need for a revised list of exemption from Metropolitan State College of Denver and a confirmation from UNC on the African American Studies program. He stated that if a governing board chooses not to limit its exemptions to the maximum mandated in policy either next month or in the future, the Commission will make the final selection to exempt the degree programs.

B. Financial Aid Policy

Dr. Sharon Samson presented the Financial Aid Policy that was discussed at the March 4, 2000, meeting. She confirmed that the purpose of the policy is to provide equal opportunity without regard to family financial level. Under the proposed policy, the Commission has substantive autonomy – the authority to define the goals and parameters – while the institutions have procedural authority to define how to administer the programs under the goals and parameters. Dr. Samson enumerated the policy changes that occurred since the last Commission meeting, including establishing eligibility ceiling for need-based aid as 150 percent of PELL eligibility and adding professional discretion. She provided data that verified that the minimum GPA for merit awards do not impact any degree program adversely; in fact, a percentage of visual and performing arts students qualify with a 3.0 GPA than other program areas. She explained the findings on the definition of full-time graduate status. Of the fifteen states that allocate state funds to support graduate merit awards, they all define full-time status as graduate students enrolled in nine or more credits per term.

Commissioner Hessler moved to approve the policy. Commissioner Nagel seconded the motion.

Dr. Christine Johnson, Vice President of the Community College System, supported the policy revisions and acknowledged the contribution of Patty O'Connor in ensuring a successful policy.

Dr. Michel Dahlin requested two changes to the proposed policy, including expanding the definition of full-time graduate student to consider graduate students who have completed all course work and are registered for at least three credits (thesis credit for four additional semesters). She suggested a change to section 6.02 to remove the minimum amount of fellowship awards because two CU institutions have limited dollars available for graduate fellowships and wish to offer \$500 fellowships instead of covering the cost of tuition. She called for clarification on the implementation timeframe believing that the effective date should be July 1, 2001.

Dr. Samson responded that institutional funds constitute the majority of dollars available for graduate financial aid. CCHE's Financial Aid Policy does not limit the authority of the institution to define its own criteria for institutional funds. If CU wishes to include part-time students as fellowship recipients for awards funded with institutional funds, the policy does not prevent it. The limited amount of state funds available for graduate fellowships supports limiting eligibility to full-time students and providing them sufficient funds to graduate in a timely manner. Dr. Samson further clarified the implementation timeline and confirmed the effective date of July 1, 2000. She explained that a graduate student who already received an award for 2000-2001 could retain their award even if the student does not meet the newly adopted criteria or full-time definition. Recipients of fellowships awarded after July 1, 2000, must meet the qualifying criteria specified in the Financial Aid Policy.

The motion to approve the Financial Aid Policy carried unanimously.

V. Items for Discussion and Possible Action

A. CCHE-Capital Assets Pilot Design Project FY 01-02

There was no discussion of this item due to time constraints. The CCHE-Capital Assets Pilot Design Project FY 01-02 will be discussed by the Commission at the May 4, 2000, meeting.

VI. Written Reports for Possible Discussion

A. Certificates and Degrees Conferred in Public Higher Education 1998-99

The Commission accepted the report on Certificates and Degrees conferred in Public Higher Education 1998-99.

B. Concept Papers:

- (1) The University of Northern Colorado (UNC) a Bachelor of Applied Science (BAS) and a Bachelor of Applied Technology (BAT)

The Commission accepted the concept paper for a Bachelor of Applied Science (BAS) and a Bachelor of Applied Technology (BAT) at the University of Northern Colorado.

- (2) Bachelor of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies, Fort Lewis College

The Commission accepted the concept paper for a Bachelor of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies at Fort Lewis College.

- (3) Bachelor of Arts in Interdisciplinary/Liberal Arts at Western State College

The Commission accepted the concept paper for a Bachelor of Arts in Interdisciplinary/Liberal Arts at Western State College.

C. CCHE-Capital Assets Quarterly Report

The Commission has delegated authority to the executive director, who has subsequently delegated authority to the director of policy and planning, to approve program plans, approve waivers and authorize cash-funded projects Commission guidelines and statutory authority.

The Commission accepted the report on the projects waived in the first quarter of 2000.

D. Degree Program Name Changes Metropolitan State College of Denver

The Commission accepted the degree program name changes that the Executive Director has approved during the past month.

Institution: Metropolitan State College of Denver
Current Program Name: Music Performance (B.A.)
New Name: Music (B.A./B.M.)
Approved by: Trustees of The State Colleges (March 17, 2000)

Rationale:

- To align the degree program with other Music programs offered in Colorado.
- To reduce the number of Music degree programs from three to two.
- To focus the curriculum of the Music majors; students will be able to complete the graduation curriculum required for Music without the extra courses required for an IDP degree.

Scope of Proposed Change:

Merger of degree programs removes Music Performance from low-demand program list.

E. Report on Out-of-State Instruction

The Commission accepted the report of instruction offered out-of-state beyond the seven contiguous states approved by the Executive Director:

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.

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.

Action: Commissioner Hessler moved adjournment of the meeting. Commissioner Baker seconded the motion, and motion carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE)
May 4, 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)
May 4, 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)
May 4, 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)
May 4, 2000
Agenda Item IV, A

TOPIC: MASTER PLAN

PREPARED BY: TIM FOSTER

I. SUMMARY

This item provides the final draft of the master plan for the Colorado Commission on Higher Education. The master plan is an outline of the goals and objectives for Colorado postsecondary education.

II. BACKGROUND

During the development of the master plan, meetings were held with higher education governing boards, student groups, legislators, and several other groups to provide an opportunity for input and coordination in the development of the statewide expectations and goals (C.R.S. 23-1-108). The master plan is designed to assure achievement of the statewide expectations and goals in the most timely, efficient, and effective manner.

The draft master plan was discussed by the Commission at the October 7, 1999, November 4, 1999, and the December 2, 1999, Commission meetings. Commissioners and CCHE staff met with each governing board during the months of December 1999 and January 2000. These meetings provided an opportunity for dialogue and idea sharing among the boards, faculty and the Commission. All recommendations were incorporated into the master plan.

III. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Commission approve the Colorado Commission on Higher Education [Master Plan](#).

Appendix A

STATUTORY AUTHORITY

23-1-108. Duties and powers of the commission with regard to systemwide planning. (1) The commission shall develop and submit to the governor and the general assembly a master plan for Colorado postsecondary education. In developing the master plan, the commission shall examine the statewide expectations and goals specified in sections 23-13-103 and 23-13-104 and recommend that the general assembly amend the statewide expectations and goals if necessary.

COLORADO COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Master Plan

May 4, 2000

I. Introduction

The Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) has developed this master plan to outline the Commission's vision of higher education as expressed by six priority goals. Building on the accomplishments of previous master plans, the priority goals and goal attainment strategies outlined in this master plan provide a foundation for CCHE's mission of providing access to high-quality, affordable education that is student-centered, quality driven and performance-based.

Institutions of higher learning in the State of Colorado are among the best in the nation. CCHE is committed to continuing to build opportunities for Colorado students and citizens to avail themselves of this high quality education with superior service at an affordable price.

II. Overview of the Colorado Commission on Higher Education

The Colorado Commission on Higher Education, as an agency within the Department of Higher Education, is the central policy and coordinating board for Colorado's system of public higher education. CCHE serves as a bridge between the Governor, General Assembly, and the governing boards of the state-supported institutions of higher education.

Eleven commissioners (changed from nine in HB99-1359) oversee the state's system of higher education, work with constitutionally-created and five statutorily-created governing boards. As the state entity charged with the responsibility of overseeing Colorado's public higher education system, the Department of Higher Education also has oversight over the Division of Private Occupational Schools, Colorado Council on the Arts, Colorado Historical Society, and the Colorado Student Leadership Program. Statutory authority for the department is contained in Title 23, Colorado Revised Statutes.

A. Commission Members

The eleven members of the Colorado Commission on Higher Education are appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Senate. Six are appointed from each congressional district, and five are appointed at large. They serve staggered terms of four years, and meet periodically throughout the year to discuss and act on statewide higher education policy. The Commissioners and Commission staff work in consultation with governing boards to implement legislative directives and statewide higher education policy.

During 1999-2000, the Commissioners are:

Raymond T. Baker, Greenwood Village
Alexander ("Sandy") E. Bracken, Boulder (Chair)
Terrance ("Terry") L. Farina, Grand Junction
Marion S. Gottesfeld, Denver
David E. Greenberg, Denver
Robert A. Hessler, Greeley
Peggy Lamm, Superior
Ralph J. Nagel, Denver
Dean L. Quamme, Grand Junction
James M. Stewart, Colorado Springs
William B. Vollbracht, Denver

B. Governing Boards and State-Supported Institutions of Higher Education

The governing boards and the state-supported institutions comprising Colorado's public higher education system include:

- The Regents of the University of Colorado -- University of Colorado-Boulder, University of Colorado Health Sciences Center, University of Colorado-Denver, University of Colorado-Colorado Springs;
- The Trustees of The State Colleges of Colorado -- Western State College, Mesa State College, Adams State College, and Metropolitan State College of Denver;

- The State Board of Agriculture -- Colorado State University, Fort Lewis College, and University of Southern Colorado;
- The Trustees of the Colorado School of Mines -- Colorado School of Mines;
- The Trustees of the University of Northern Colorado -- University of Northern Colorado;
- The State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education – Arapahoe Community College, Aurora Community College, Community College of Denver, Front Range Community College, Lamar Community College, Morgan Community College, Northeastern Junior College, Northwestern Community College, Otero Community College, Pikes Peak Community College, Pueblo Community College, Red Rocks Community College, and Trinidad State Junior College. This Board also oversees the Colorado Electronic Community College and the Higher Education Advanced Technology (HEAT) Center at Lowry in Denver.
- Two local district colleges, Aims Community College and Colorado Mountain College, have independent governing boards and both receive some general fund support in addition to local property tax support.
- With the exception of the Board of Regents of the University of Colorado, whose members are elected, all members of governing boards are appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Senate.

While not a governing board, the Auraria Higher Education Center (AHEC) operates the single campus in Denver that provides common services to the Community College of Denver, Metropolitan State College of Denver, and the University of Colorado-Denver.

Independent of the governing boards and state-supported institutions of higher education are six area vocational technical operating in Colorado – Arapahoe-Douglas Area Vocational School, Delta-Montrose Area Vocational Technical Center, Er Griffith Opportunity School, San Juan Basin Area Vocational-Technical School, T.H. Pickens Technical School, and Warren Tech.

C. Commission Roles and Responsibilities

The Colorado Commission on Higher Education is an entity serving dual functions – executive policy and legislative implementation. As part of the Department of Higher Education, CCHE functions as an executive agency, supporting the Governor’s initiatives for higher education. In addition, in accordance with its authorizing statutes, CCHE is also responsible for implementing legislative directives. For example, CCHE functions as the higher education financing entity for the Colorado General Assembly. As such, CCHE distributes the appropriated single line item in the budget for higher education and is charged with creating a budget formula for dispersing funds to Colorado’s institutions of higher learning. As a result, CCHE plays an important role in policy implementation not only for the Governor of the State of Colorado, but also on behalf of the Colorado General Assembly.

By statute, CCHE is responsible for the following:

- Higher Education Finance and Appropriations: CCHE’s total state-appropriated budget for FY99-00 was approximately \$1.46 billion. The general fund contributed 49 percent of the funding, while tuition and fee revenues (cash funds) provided most of the remaining appropriation. Higher Education’s \$716 million in general fund support equates to 14.3 percent of total statewide general fund appropriations. Total revenue to Colorado’s public institutions of higher education exceeded \$2.6 billion in 1999. Total revenues (including federal grants and contracts, as well as private and other gifts and grants) rose by 85 percent over the past decade, increasing from the \$1.4 billion generated in 1989. State general fund support, tuition and fees and state and local grants amounted to 49.9 percent of total receipts in 1999.
- Academic Programs and Systemwide Planning. The Commission adopts statewide policies on academic planning; undergraduate degree approval and discontinuance; higher education access, including financial aid policies; teacher education, admission standards, minority participation and achievement; school – college partnerships; and pre-collegiate academic preparation. The Commission ensures that academic programs offered across the state are broadly responsive to market and student needs as it reviews and approves new degree programs and coordinates statewide planning activities.
- Capital Construction and Long-Range Planning. CCHE has a statutory and fiduciary responsibility to ensure institutions manage the system’s capital assets effectively. The State of Colorado has made a significant investment in the construction and maintenance of higher education institutions. The majority of buildings in the system have been paid for by Colorado taxpayers. In essence, the institutions are a party to a contract with Colorado taxpayers: the institutions have used public funds to purchase and construct buildings and campus amenities, and, in return, they are obligated to protect and maintain those facilities for future generations. In this capacity, the Commission’s responsibility is to work with the governing boards and the institutions to increase and utilize existing facilities more effectively, as well as ensure that funds are set aside annually for routine maintenance and for structural and technical upgrades needed every ten to twenty years.
- Advanced Technology. With the passage of HB 1359 in 1999, CCHE is responsible for overseeing the administration of a

research grant program that focuses on developing new technologies and materials in the universities' research laboratories and bringing those them into the marketplace for the benefit of all Colorado residents. This responsibility ties the often-misunderstood benefits of research on campuses directly to the citizens whose tax dollars annually help provide the seed money for dozens of research grants. CCHE's role is to establish a process for judging the scientific value of these projects and the potential commercial value, award the grant funds and evaluate the effectiveness of the projects.

III. External and Internal Factors Impacting Higher Education in Colorado

A number of factors influenced the Commission's decision to update its master plan. First, CCHE's most recent master plan five-year plan, covered the period 1993-1998. It is time for the Commission to take a thoughtful long-term deliberative view where higher education efforts and initiatives in Colorado need to be directed. Second, there has been a change in Administration since the last master plan was written. Third, the Commission's focus has been sharpened by recently-enacted legislation. A finally, a number of trends in higher education have been identified as a result of completing the first phase of a statutorily-directed study of higher education in Colorado. Each of these factors drive the need to re-examine the Commission's priorities, goals and objectives, and are discussed in greater detail below.

A. Administrative Changes

Administrative changes have influenced Commission priorities. In November 1998, the citizens of Colorado elected Bill C governor of the State of Colorado. During the first six months of 1999, CCHE was restructured to reflect the new Administration's policies and organizational priorities and to include the integration of the former Colorado Advanced Technology Institute (CATI). In addition, the composition of the eleven-member Commission changed with Governor appointment of seven new Commissioners.

B. Audit Findings and Recommendations

A second major administrative impetus for updating the CCHE master plan has been recommendations resulting from recent audit assessments of Commission activities. The State Auditor concluded that several Commission functions need improvement including systemwide planning, accountability, and funding allocation. In addition, the audit report specifically states, "Commission has not promoted significant improvements in the efficiency of the higher education system." Other findings from the performance audit include a need for the Commission to:

- Improve efficiency through a restructuring of faculty teaching load.
- Incorporate performance factors in funding allocation formulas.
- Improve accountability using systemwide performance indicators.

A major purpose of updating the Commission's master plan is to address these audit findings.

C. Statutory and Legislative Directives

The Commission's focus has changed to implement recent legislation. The 1996 General Assembly directed CCHE to adopt a Quality Indicator System to measure, both qualitatively and quantitatively, the performance and progress of Colorado's institutions of higher education. This directive was refined and reinforced during the 1999 session by HB99-229.

Two other legislative directives enacted during the 1999 session include HB99-1289, requiring an extensive evaluation of major higher education issues, and SB99-154, which requires a new review and approval process in the evaluation of the state's education programs.

These legislative directives are addressed in this master plan.

D. Trends in Higher Education in Colorado

In January 2000, CCHE published the first of two reports required by the Colorado General Assembly in House Bill 99-1289. The "1289 Study" resulted in a number of key findings and trends in higher education which provide the foundation for the Commission's master plan. Key trends and conclusions of this study include the following:

- College education in Colorado today is affordable because the General Assembly made a \$20 million multi-year commitment to maintain tuition at affordable levels. This affordability, together with other initiatives such as the Governor's Opportunity Scholarships for low-income students, ensures access for all citizens to the state's public institutions. It is important to this Commission that access to high-quality, affordable higher education be maintained.

- Colorado's history of attracting and retaining quality faculty is not in danger of eroding, despite the loss of some marquee names to out-of-state institutions. Overall faculty turnover is not significant. However, gender-based salary discrepancies exist at several institutions. In addition, disproportionate workloads between tenured and non-tenured faculty at some institutions should be addressed.
- Enrollment in Colorado's institutions of higher learning has remained relatively stable during the past five years, despite fairly significant increases in the state's population and in the number of graduating high school seniors. During the past five years, only the 1997-98 and 1998-99 school years saw increases above 1.5%. Two of the years in this five-year timeframe saw increases in resident FTE of less than one percent, a growth rate significantly lower than state population growth. Projections of growth for the next five years indicate Colorado's higher education enrollment will show modest increases -- from 139,610 to 143,960 full-time-equivalent students -- according to Legislative Council estimates. These enrollment figures are puzzling, as they neither conform to state population growth nor to the numbers of eligible graduating high school students who could be enrolling in the state's public institutions, but are not. The Commission must carefully analyze these enrollment figures as they have implications for long-term capital construction planning as well as for hiring new faculty and administrators, and authorizing new degrees and certificates.
- Enrollment declines or static enrollments are or have negatively affected some of the state's smaller institutions. Fluctuating enrollment poses significant resource problems for smaller institutions that can easily be absorbed year-to-year by the larger colleges and universities. If access to higher education statewide is important, and the Commission believes it is, continuing to subsidize student growth at the state's most expensive institutions at significantly greater rates forces those with more static enrollments to continue to reallocate resources to maintain the status quo.
- The Internet has transformed our daily lives and will surely transform higher education and the way we learn. This 30-year-old entity, created using universities as its base, will profoundly change not only how education is delivered but also the source of its delivery. Allowing each institution to spend limited resources to develop similar distance learning programs with slight variations is inefficient. A single provider for developing general distance learning courses could eliminate costly duplication and allow reallocation of resources to technology innovation.
- Funding for graduate and undergraduate education should be distinct and separate. Graduate programs account for only nine percent of the student FTE (full-time equivalent students) in Colorado. However, they occupy a disproportionate share of funding efforts.
- Duplication is inevitable in a multi-institutional system. However, some duplication saps resources and stifles innovation. Reassessing administrative, instructional and operational duplication is crucial. Eliminating duplication is not a zero-sum game if the focus is on improving efficiency and student learning. Addressing the duplication issue in the same way as it has always been addressed -- defining winners and losers -- is unproductive. The debate should be refocused to put the students' interests first and the institutional interests second. At the Auraria Higher Education Center (AHEC), for example, 50 percent of programs are duplicated among the three institutions (the University of Colorado at Denver, Metropolitan State College, and the Community College of Denver). While AHEC does an excellent job in sharing physical resources, the institutions could do more in the academic arena. Significant resources to focus on unique degree programs and innovative ideas could be freed up by addressing this issue statewide.

IV. Commission Mission, Goals and Objectives

A. Mission Statement

CCHE's mission is to provide access to high-quality, affordable education for all Colorado residents that is student-centered, quality driven and performance-based. CCHE's primary "customers" are Colorado students and citizens. CCHE is committed to providing the best quality education at the best price with the best possible service for its customers.

B. Goals and Objectives

Focusing on a student-centered higher education system, the Colorado Commission on Higher Education is proposing to focus the state's colleges and universities on improving services to students in six priority areas, each with initiatives that challenge institutions to look toward the future.

The six priority goals are to:

1. Improve access to higher education for all students, focusing on (a) the affordability of higher education for Colorado students and (b) access for rural Colorado residents to the broadest array of higher educational opportunities.

(a) The Governor's Opportunity Scholarship program, detailed more fully in a later section of this document, is an

(a) The Governor's Opportunity Scholarship program, detailed more fully in a later section of this document, is an integral element of achieving the first part of this objective as it focuses on increasing opportunities for low income Coloradans to attend college.

(b) The Commission is exploring the use of some of the community colleges and local district colleges as a platform for the delivery of some four-year baccalaureate degree programs to provide more advanced higher education opportunities.

2. Move the state's colleges and universities toward performance-based budgeting (C.R.S. 23-1-105), beginning with a portion of the appropriation requested for operational budgets in the FY00-01 budget year.
3. Implement fully the Quality Indicator System set out by the Colorado General Assembly in C.R.S. 23-13-107, which calls for collecting and reporting institutional performance based on various qualitative and quantitative measures and the presentation certain key elements of those measures in a consumer guide.
4. Improve and maximize the wise use of the state's capital asset investment for higher education, focusing on the best maintenance of existing facilities and targeting new capital projects toward student-centered needs.
5. Direct resources toward technology at the colleges and universities to ensure institutions are maximizing the use of appropriate technology as an instructional tool and to ensure that students are trained in the use and application of current and future technology as they prepare themselves for their future careers.
6. Improve overall system effectiveness and efficiency by implementing other legislative directives, including HB 99-1289 and SB 99-154.

These six goals are discussed fully below.

Goal #1: Improved Access to Higher Education

The Commission's goal is to ensure that income levels and geographic location do not exclude Colorado residents who want an education beyond high school. To that end, Colorado will have the nation's highest rate of Colorado's high school graduates enrolled in a public institution's two-year or a four-year degree program regardless of income level or geographic location.

In pursuit of this goal, CCHE has implemented a pilot program, the Governor's Opportunity Scholarship Program, for the Fall 1999 semester that targets \$1.9 million to provide significant financial aid to approximately 450 students whose family incomes fall in the bottom quartile within the state. These scholarships will allow these students, many of whom are the first ever to a college from their families, to pursue two-year and four-year degrees.

CCHE will monitor this program to ensure that the Commission's goals are met and to determine whether additional resource should be added.

Other objectives to meet the goal of improved student access include:

- Examination of all financial aid policies to ensure that financial aid is being allocated in the best, most efficient manner and targeted to the appropriate students. This review includes reassessment of the need-based scholarship funding to ensure that these resources are directed toward the students and families most in need of financial aid. In addition, students receiving merit-based funding will be required to maintain a high level of academic performance to receive aid.
- A comprehensive pricing and marketing study to assess whether tuition and fees at Colorado's various institutions are priced appropriately in today's market.

To improve geographic access for students across Colorado, CCHE is exploring ways to use the existing community college network for four-year institutions to deliver baccalaureate and a limited number of graduate degree programs across the state. Expanding distance learning programs and ensuring connectivity of all non-metropolitan institutions to the Internet for both direct and indirect delivery of courses to outlying institutions and to the individual student's home is another objective. CCHE's goal is to increase access to degree programs offered in the state's rural communities.

Goal #2: Performance-Based Budgeting

The Commission's goal is to implement a performance-based budgeting system that rewards performance in funding allocation decisions.

Implementation of Colorado statutes 23-13-104, 23-13-105, and 23-13-107, the 1996 adopted Quality Indicator System

implementation of Colorado statutes 25-15-104, 25-15-105, and 25-15-107, the 1996-adopted Quality Indicator System incorporating the changes made in SB99-229 focuses CCHE's efforts on measuring both qualitative and quantitative goals at state's institutions of higher education. The indicators will function as a short list of measurements to serve as the basis for funding for FY00-01 and ensuing years.

Indicators for the future years are likely to include:

- Graduation rates
- Faculty instructional productivity.
- Freshmen retention and persistence.
- Achievement rates on various exams.
- Class sizes in freshman and sophomore courses and the proportion of classes with less than 20 students or more than 50 students.
- Availability of required and core courses.
- Institutional support costs (i.e., administrative overhead)
- Scores on a general education competency test.
- Scores on major field knowledge exams.

Goal #3: Quality Indicator System

The Commission's goal is to implement a comprehensive Quality Indicator System which will address the issues first identified in the 1996 legislative session and amended by SB 99-229 during the 1999 legislative session.

Senate Bill 99-229 identifies eleven goals and twenty-three required institutional actions to implement these goals. These provide the framework for the Quality Indicator System which, initially, measures achievement in five basic areas:

1. Institutional performance in achieving the goals for improved faculty and administrative efficiency and productivity and student performance;
2. Student satisfaction and success, including access to services at all levels and affordability of the institution;
3. Employer satisfaction;
4. The level of performance of the statewide system of higher education and progress toward meeting the statewide goals and expectations; and
5. Institutional performance in achieving increased productivity and effectiveness in providing services to students.

Goal #4: Improved Asset Management

The Commission's goal is to ensure that the state's capital assets are maintained and that the state makes sound decisions regarding new capital investments.

A new benchmark for use of classrooms, laboratories, and other educational facilities on the state's college and university campuses reflect the goal of improved space utilization.

CCHE plans to focus on directing resources to complete long-deferred maintenance on many campuses and intends to set forth a plan for the Legislature that begins to address the growing maintenance backlog. In addition, institutional resources must be set aside annually for the regular upkeep of the existing building inventory.

Other objectives focusing on long-term goals call for CCHE to:

- Prioritize deferred maintenance on campuses and outline a plan for institutions to include regular maintenance funding in their operational budgets once the deferred maintenance deficit is cleared.
- Encourage institutions to share existing buildings with other institutions.
- Expand CCHE's database to include capital asset information so that CCHE will be able to evaluate and prioritize construction requests and allow facility and academic planning to be integrated.

Goal #5: Technology Focus

The Commission's goal is to improve the use of technology in delivering instruction and ensure that students are trained to use current and future industry technology.

Initiatives to achieve this objective include:

- Develop a plan for coordinating Internet and other distance education course offerings and encourage institutions to develop courses cooperatively to save course development costs and minimize delivery duplication.
- Ensure that all programs, in both traditional and distance courses, incorporate technology in an appropriate way to enhance content and to facilitate instruction.
- Assess the needs of Colorado employers for technology workers, forecast the future workforce needs, provide the leadership to institutions to respond with the appropriate curricular changes and new certificate or degree programs, and work cooperatively with the Colorado Institute of Technology towards these ends.
- Evaluate the technology infrastructure to ensure equitable statewide on-campus and off-campus delivery of student services.
- Ensure Internet access on every campus.
- Develop a long-term technology master plan to upgrade technology to accommodate changes at all institutions.
- Promote university-industry technology transfer.

The Commission has been given a new role with the passage of HB99-1359, which dissolved the Colorado Advanced Technology Institute and placed its overall responsibility for funding advanced technology research in Colorado with CCHE. Transformed into a "Technology Advancement Group" (TAG), this new CCHE team is evaluating all existing FY 99-00 programs receiving state funding and will establish new guidelines for continued and future funding in this arena.

Responding to a Legislative Audit Committee report completed in August 1999, the Commission will request a continued level of funding for the TAG programs for FY00-01. Existing programs will be asked to develop funding proposals that accomplish the following:

- Move more funds from day-to-day administrative budgets into actual advanced technology research projects;
- Project ways programs can become less dependent on the Technology Advancement Grants to free resources for new short-term research programs in other technology areas;
- Provide measurable performance goals to provide a sound basis for continued short-term funding or single-project funding to show how state funds have been used to benefit Colorado through the project; and
- Finally, the Commission intends to work with the Governor's office and the General Assembly to find ways to satisfy the audit recommendation for development of long-term funding resources other than the general fund to support advanced technology research at the state's research universities. Acting on the recommendation of the auditor, the Commission is pursuing other resources that will allow potential creation of an endowment that would fund long-term research.

Goal # 6: Legislative Directives

The Commission's goal is to implement HB 99-1289 and SB 99-154, and other legislative directives as they are enacted in a timely and responsive manner.

In addition to the statutory responsibilities noted above related to the Quality Indicator System and Performance-Based Budgeting as prioritized by the Commission, CCHE has two other significant legislative mandates to meet in FY00-01 that will require time and resources from the department, the governing boards, and the institutions.

Adopted by the General Assembly last session, HB99-1289 requires an extensive evaluation of many higher education issues over a two-year period, including:

- Analysis of the institutional roles and missions in statutes and the current governance structure of higher education in Colorado. This effort will involve an outside consultant.
- A technology integration study, including developing a long-term technology master plan.
- Examination of the long-term capital needs for higher education, including both new construction and long-term maintenance needs.
- A study of privatization issues and the potential use of a voucher system for higher education funding. The latter has been completed and submitted to the General Assembly.
- Examination of distance learning and Internet delivery systems.
- A longitudinal study of faculty salaries and faculty productivity.
- Evaluation of the costs and effectiveness of existing remedial programs which will include addressing long-term issues of college readiness.

The first phase of the study was presented to the General Assembly on January 15, 2000; the second phase is to be presented

The first phase of the study was presented to the General Assembly on January 18, 2000; the second phase is to be presented in January, 2001. These studies are the foundation of many policy issues addressed in this master plan.

Correspondingly, the Commission has been charged with establishing a new review and approval process to evaluate the state teacher education programs in SB99-154. The Colorado Department of Education has been tasked with establishing the performance criteria by which teacher education programs will be evaluated and matching that criteria to the student performance standards in grades K-12 adopted by the Colorado General Assembly. CCHE then has the responsibility for assessing whether existing programs meet those performance objectives.

After the program evaluations, the Commission must either approve the continuation of an existing program to train teachers. Programs not continued by the Commission will automatically expire. CCHE has established a program review schedule to regularly assess these programs at all institutions offering teacher education, provide for remedial assistance for programs that do not meet standards, and ultimately for the discontinuance of those programs.

V. Conclusion

CCHE's mission is to provide the best education at the best price with the best service. This goal can only be achieved through a collaborative partnership involving students and parents, Colorado's higher education institutions and governing boards, the Colorado General Assembly, the Governor, and the business community. Such a partnership will ensure high-quality, student-centered, and performance-based higher education for all Colorado citizens.

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE)
May 4, 2000
Agenda Item IV, B

TOPIC: CCHE-CAPITAL ASSETS PILOT DESIGN PROJECT FY01-02

PREPARED BY: JEANNE ADKINS AND LAUREEN FERRIS

I. SUMMARY

The Commission Capital Assets Subcommittee, in reviewing capital project proposals last fall, concluded the information developed in the program plans by institutions was sometimes insufficient and outdated and made rendering decisions on project prioritization or approval difficult.

During prioritization discussions, committee members decided to propose a pilot project for the coming fiscal year would focus on developing better cost and project development information. The General Assembly's Capital Development Committee and Joint Budget Committee agreed to allow CCHE to develop a new concept design process using these projects as the foundation.

Attachment A, for your review and discussion, outlines the four phases staff suggest for this capital process. Upon evaluation of the results of the study of these four projects, staff will recommend that this process either replace the existing program plan process or that the existing process be maintained.

II. BACKGROUND

Statutes and CCHE policy require that CCHE approve program plans for capital construction, regardless of the source of funding, for projects over \$500,000. Waiver is an option for projects under \$500,000 and may be considered between \$500,000 and \$1.5 million for cash-funded projects.

Most projects above \$500,000 that involve a request for state funding, even if the funding incorporates institutional cash funds or federal funds, must now submit a program plan prior to being eligible for prioritization and ultimate funding in the Long Bill. The program plan must be approved by CCHE by statute (23-1-106 (5)) prior to expenditure of any funds on the proposed project regardless of source.

While reviewing the program plans submitted for funding in the current fiscal year, the Capital Assets Subcommittee meeting with staff, concluded that in some cases, information on which to evaluate a proposal was not sufficient justified under the current program plan requirements. Assessing the tie to academic planning at the institution was general in the program plans to draw legitimate conclusions concerning overall academic needs and priorities and how those needs would be addressed by the facility proposed.

The discussions lead to a conclusion that greater emphasis is needed to be placed on connecting the academic planning at an institution with the facility planning. The committee in presenting the prioritization list to the Capital Development Committee in December proposed that four projects be funded in FY00-01 as pilot projects to accomplish this goal. One project involves an extensive renovation-remodel at Adams State College, another remodeling and an extensive addition to a facility at CSU, a third project involves remodeling one building and building another new one at UNC, and the fourth involves a project for the State Historical Society, which proposes to expand the Colorado History Museum.

A fifth potential project may enable yet another review of the pilot elements from a different perspective – the concept paper analysis. The State Veterinarian, whose office falls under the Department of Agriculture, has determined through a needs study that a replacement laboratory facility is necessary. Some new laboratory facilities also are needed at Colorado State University Veterinary Medical School. The two parties are exploring using the pilot process to bring forward a joint concept paper that could lead to a phase two proposal for a joint lab project.

Preliminary meetings have been conducted with CSU and Adams State facility representatives. The diversity of

projects selected should allow an assessment of the proposed process under the most common circumstances for facility funding requests.

All projects are either totally state-funded as proposed or involve a mix of state and cash-funded financing.

The CDC and JBC approved the proposals contingent on CCHE acting to approve the program plans for these projects. Both committees have asked that the ultimate recommendations be brought back to them for review.

Although the Long Bill has not been approved by the General Assembly, it appears that one or more of these project will be included this year for funding. That requires that CCHE have the policy in place under which these projects can proceed to meet the goals of the pilot.

Attachment A is a proposal of the four-phase pilot project. Sufficient information should be available after the first year to assess the validity of moving forward in this manner for all projects in the future.

III. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the Commission tentatively approve the guidelines for the pilot projects and that any ch recommended following review by a professional committee that includes architects and the State Buildings Div director be reviewed by the Capital Assets Subcommittee for inclusion in the project guidelines this year.

Evaluation of the pilot project should occur as staff and the subcommittee review the project submittals and a report will be made to the Commission in November.

[Attachment A](#): 8% Design Development Concept Proposal

Proposed Requirements
Conceptual Design Development – Review Package
Colorado Commission on Higher Education Capital Assets

Phase 1:

Part A – Design Development Concept Report

This phase will consist of a written report outlining the requirements for the proposed capital project. This document should be brief and concise and should clearly address the following:

- Three viable options available to the institution to resolve the perceived facility need.
- The existing programmatic requirements to be satisfied by the project.
- An assessment of how students and/or the campus benefit directly from the proposal.
- Enrollment or program growth statistics, which document the need for the project (both historically documented and projected statistics). This should include a competitive redundancy analysis that focuses on which programs are growing and/or declining and where enrollment shifts are occurring.
- How the proposal is integrated with the previously submitted academic master plan for the institution and what academic needs it will satisfy.
- An assessment of how the proposal impacts the projections for the campuses within the same governing board and other institutions that may offer similar academic programming.
- The project size, and estimated cost with inflationary considerations factored into the cost development.
- Possible areas physically impacted by any proposed remodel, renovation or demolition.
- Existing conditions survey done by a third party for any existing buildings affected.
- Direct impact of proposal in meeting current physical master plan concepts, including overall campus density, parking considerations (if applicable), any infrastructure upgrades necessary, implementation of technology systems.

Part B - Cost Estimate Outline Determining the Applicable Fee

The concept report should also include a fee estimate should the project be chosen to continue into the conceptual design phase. These fees may be established using the following methods.

Presently, the Professional Services fees are 10% of the project construction cost (not total project cost), and are allotted as follows:

- 15% of that fee is spent to develop the first phase – Schematic Design Phase.
- 20% of the fee is the second phase – Design Development Phase.
- 40% of the fee is the final drawing -- Construction Document Phase.
- The remaining fee is applied to the Bidding and Construction Administration Phase.

Criteria

A:

Since the new Concept Design Document asks for basically 1/2 of the Schematic Design Phase to be complete submitted for review to approve continued funding, the fee would equate to approximately 8% of the total Professional Services Fee.

Criteria

B:

With some projects, costs are not developed enough and are not available during the initial phase of the project. Therefore, information is not specific enough to develop the fee totals so the second option would be to propose a range of 2-2.5% of the construction costs, which is usually 60-70% of the total project cost. The basis for these

developed from historical costs with inflationary measures applied.

Criteria

C:

Some projects have a lower total project cost, and 2% of the construction cost is not enough to do the initial design phase. In these cases, using the 8% process to determine the fee will be necessary.

Below are some examples of the criteria as it might be applied:

Example A: A high technology building that will house a new program with task-specific program requirements

This project’s complexity would require an extended amount of base research. The total project cost is high enough to use the 8% equation, and enough detail should be available to calculate the fee using this method.

Estimated Total Project Cost	\$28,500,000
Estimated Construction Costs (65% total cost)	\$18,500,000
Estimated Professional Services	\$ 2,800,000
Criteria A: (8% of total professional services)	\$224,000
Total fee for concept development review package	

Example B: A basic classroom building addition

This project type is basic enough, that a preliminary cost estimate could be developed using historical cost data percentage increases for inflation. For example, if approximately 65,000 GSF is required, historically similar size projects on this campus would put the potential cost estimate at \$195 per square foot.

Estimated Total Project Cost	\$ 12,675,000
Estimated Construction Costs (65% total cost)	\$ 8,238,750
Criteria B: (2% of total construction cost)	\$ 164,775
Total fee for concept development review package	

Example C: A 28,000-square-foot library addition

This project is estimated to cost approximately \$200 per square foot. This option would generate a concept development review package fee of only \$29,120, which is 8% of the fees for the total estimated construction costs. This total would not be appropriate to fund the initial study, so in the example, the fee should be calculated by using the 2.5% of the total construction cost.

Total Project Cost	\$5,600,000
Construction Costs	\$3,640,000
Professional Services	\$ 364,000
Criteria A:	\$29,120 (8% of professional fees)
Criteria B:	\$91,000 (2.5% of the construction cost)

Criteria B would provide an appropriate professional fee to develop the concept development review package.

Once the preliminary phase I report is reviewed and approved, the institutions would be given the funding approval to continue into phase II.

Phase II:
Conceptual Design Development Report – Basic Elements

These requirements apply to all project types.

- New construction
- Building Additions
- Building Renovations
- Building Restoration
- Facility Remodels
- Technology Upgrades
- Infrastructure Upgrade and Expansion

The architect selected for this initial phase should be used consistently throughout the project contingent upon a positive performance evaluation by the institutions at the end of the 8% process.

The concept of continuity will help alleviate duplication, create more ownership in the preliminary process, and reduce misconceptions from one phase to another.

All cost estimate information and fees should assume that the project would be constructed within the fiscal year following the completion and submittal of the 8% report. Should the project not get funded, a new estimate would be developed and submitted the following year and updated figures would be applied with appropriate inflationary allocated. No project would remain on the list for consecutive years, the conceptual work, however, would start originally submitted and all cost estimates and relevant enrollment and program growth projections would be revised.

The goal of the report is to:

- Document the programming process.
- Thoroughly develop building requirements and verify programmatic growth projections made in Phase I for proposed project.
- Document conceptual design specific to building type and program requirements and building systems to be utilized.
- Outline of proposed building materials.
- Inventory of included spaces, and equipment to be included.
- Establish a construction budget that will be maintained throughout the design and construction process.
- Further develop the concept submitted in Phase I concept paper.
- Provide information on long-term maintenance of facility, including estimate of additional operating costs and how those costs will be integrated in the institutional operating budget.

This report should contain all information pertinent to making a clear decision on the appropriateness of the project and its financing. The report should include but is not limited to:

- Initial implications on the current approved master plan.
- Enrollment or program growth statistics, which document the need for the project (both historically documented and projected statistics).
- A summary analysis of spatial requirements.

- Diagrammatic documentation of all required relationships (including vertical relationships).
- Building materials system outline (proposed).
- Basic siting concepts.
- Outline summary of all required systems (including mechanical, electrical, technology, structural and any specialty systems).
- Specific technology requirements and system applications.
- Code analysis.
- Life-cycle cost analysis on systems, construction type and operations (completed project operating expenses and funding source).
- Projected controlled maintenance requirements and the future funding source for that element.
- An inventory list of all areas, services, equipment and technology components to be included in the final product (for construction document and post-construction evaluations).

Phase III:

Construction Document Analysis Report

A summary report will be submitted which outlines spaces, equipment and systems to be included at the completion of construction to confirm the submittal made at the end of the 8% submittal package. Any changes should be documented and submitted for review.

Phase IV:

Post-Construction Analysis Report

Within 90 days following construction completion, each institution will submit to CCHE and State Build post-construction document to be provided to them by CCHE. This document will record the following information:

- Construction Type
- Material Systems
- Mechanical Systems
- Technology Systems
- Operations Plan (including funding)
- Controlled Maintenance plan (including funding)
- Total Construction Budget Utilization (including contingencies)

It will also include a Post-Occupancy evaluation describing the value engineering process that took place during construction. This information should track back to the inventory list submitted in the first phase of the 8% development.

NOTE: All written documentation noted above shall be submitted electronically.

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE)
May 4, 2000
Agenda Item IV, C

TOPIC: LOW ENROLLMENT PROGRAM POLICY AND ACTION

PREPARED BY: SHARON M. SAMSON

I. SUMMARY

In April the Commission heard appeals from several governing boards for short-term extensions and policy appeals. . part of the appeals discussion, the Commission clarified several points, including that (1) the baccalaureate exemption privilege is limited to five degree programs; (2) it is open to appeals for short-term extension as long as the degree program is showing evidence of the effect of prior governing board intervention; and (3) if a governing board chooses not to make the final exemption selection, the Commission will re-assume its responsibility and make the final decision. Following the Commission discussion, these clarifications were incorporated into proposed policy revisions that presented as part of this agenda item ([Attachment A](#)).

The policy change adopted on April 6, 2000, modified the number of graduates a program must have to qualify for exemption that was approved at the April Commission meeting. It affected the degree programs that the Trustees for The State Colleges and the Trustees of the University of Northern Colorado could consider for exemptions. The governing boards have confirmed the final exempted degree program list and taken other necessary actions to bring their institutions into compliance with the policy (Attachment B & C*). All institutions meet the current Discontinuance Policy guidelines.

The staff recommendation includes approval of policy changes to CCHE's Discontinuance Policy and a corrective discontinuance action that covers all low-demand degree programs that have not been exempted or discontinued by a specific governing board action by May 4, 2000 ([Attachment D](#)).

II. ISSUES DISCUSSED

At the April meeting, the Commission modified the policy language pertaining to qualified exemptions to read "the degree program must graduate at least three graduates in the past three years to qualify as an exemption." This minor change allowed the governing boards a slight degree of additional latitude when selecting which degree programs will be exempt.

Prior to the April Commission meeting, Metropolitan State College at Denver forwarded a list of five exempted programs and an appeal for an extension for African American Studies and a permanent exemption for its Surveying and Mapping program. After the Commission affirmed its maximum exemption limit, the Trustees for The State Colleges merged Metropolitan State College of Denver's Music and Music Performance Degree. In addition, MSCD recommended that the Trustees eliminate the Industrial and Technical Studies (B.S.) degree. Because the results of the State Colleges April 27 board meeting are not available at the time of the CCHE agenda printing, the final decision will be presented on the floor of the Commission. Anticipating that the State Trustees will support the discontinuance of the Industrial and Technical Studies, MSCD reviewed its list of exempted degree programs and resubmitted a new exemption list that contains the following degree programs:

- Chicano Studies (BA)
- African American Studies (BA)
- Modern Languages (BA)
- Physics (BA/BS)
- Surveying and Mapping (BS)

With only five programs exempted, all MSCD issues are resolved and no further Commission action is required.

In addition to modifying paragraph 2 of Section 4.03.02 at the April meeting, the Commission directed staff to examine

several other parts of the Discontinuance Policy, including:

- The role and responsibility of the governing boards.
- The role and authority of the Commission.
- The undergraduate exemption limit.

for clarity and specificity.

Since this was the first year that the governing boards had an opportunity to exercise their discontinuance authority, April appeals were, in essence, a test if the policy contained appropriate language to put the policy into practice. A careful consideration of the policy, staff proposes to revise sections of the Discontinuance Policy to clarify the purposes and options.

The simplest revision proposed concerns the elimination of the mandatory wait period between discussion and action (Section 4.04.03 and 4.04.04). Recently, several Commission policies have eliminated the mandatory wait period between discussion and action (e.g., Degree Approval). The two-month discussion/action sequence in the Discontinuance Policy implies that the Commission is making decisions on program appeals when in fact it is making extensions and policy appeals. The new language allows the Commission to act at the same meeting that the appeals are discussed, but elimination of the 30-day waiting period does not prevent the Commission from tabling a policy decision.

The second proposed revision (Section 4.03.02) differentiates the number of exemptions for institutions with large undergraduate enrollment and those that have smaller enrollment numbers. Large institutions (i.e., those with undergraduate FTE enrollment greater than 5,000) are allowed three exemptions. Small institutions are allowed to exercise five exemptions. FTE was selected rather than headcount because FTE factors in part-time students – equivalent of students enrolled in 30 credits per semester. The new proposed exemption levels were determined in two ways. When CCHE contacted regional accrediting associations to determine what number of low-demand programs an institution reasonably sustain, the responses averaged between three and five. The second method was to examine the ratio between student FTE numbers and the number of approved degree programs. Ideally, an institution with 5,000 FTE and 50 approved degree programs would average 100 enrolled FTE students and 20 graduates per program. Exemptions mean that six percent of the approved degrees are operating below the benchmark. Granting five exemptions means that 10 percent of the approved degree programs are operating below the benchmarks. Large institutions have larger numbers of enrolled students and potentially higher graduation numbers, regardless if the students are enrolled full-or part-time. The only factor that counters this assumption is a very high attrition rate. Under the proposed, the policy provides a three-year period for governing boards affected by new exemption limit to examine which of its exempted degree programs will meet the standards prior to 2003 and which may need restructuring or closure.

The third language change (Section 4.04.02) specifies the outcome if a governing board submits more than the allowable number of exemptions. With this language, the Commission communicates its conviction that the governing board has to make a final decision. However, if political complications or pragmatic barriers prevent a governing board from making a decision, the Commission notifies the governing board that it will determine which programs will exempt. Section 4.04.04 further recognizes the governing boards' responsibility by stating that if the Commission denies a filed appeal, the implied governing board decision is to discontinue the degree program.

III. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

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

Appendix A

Statutory Authority

C.R.S. 23-1-107 (2) reads:

- a) The commission shall establish, after consultation with the governing boards of institutions, policies and criteria for the discontinuance of academic or vocational programs. The commission shall direct the respective governing boards of institutions, including the board of regents of the university of Colorado, to discontinue an academic or vocational degree program area, as program area is defined in commission policies.
- b) The governing board of a state-supported institution of higher education directed to discontinue an academic or vocational degree program area pursuant to this subsection (2) shall have not more than four years to discontinue graduate and baccalaureate programs and not more than two years to discontinue associate programs following the commission's directive to phase out said program area.
- c) If the commission directs the governing board of an institution to discontinue an academic or vocational degree program area, and the governing board refuses to do so, the commission may require such governing board to remit to the general fund any moneys appropriated for such program area.
- d) Each governing board of the state-supported institutions of higher education shall submit to the commission a plan describing the procedures and schedule for periodic program reviews and evaluation of each academic program at each institution consistent with the role and mission of each institution. The information to be provided to the commission shall include, but shall not be limited to, the procedures for using internal and external evaluators, the sequence of such reviews, and the anticipated use of the evaluations.
- e) Prior to the discontinuance of a program, the governing boards of state institutions of higher education are directed, subject to commission approval, to develop appropriate early retirement, professional retraining, and other programs to assist faculty members who may be displaced as a result of discontinued programs.
- f) The commission shall assure that each institution has an orderly process for the phase-out of the programs.

*** Please note that Attachments B and C are not available on the Web. Contact CCHE (303-866-2723) or e-mail us at the address below to request a copy.**

SECTION I

PART G POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR THE DISCONTINUANCE OF ACADEMIC DEGREES WITH LOW PROGRAM DEMAND

1.00 Introduction

This policy specifies the Commission's expectations for academic programs with low program demand, that is, those with low student enrollment and graduation. Governing boards are responsible for taking appropriate action, including program closure, for such academic degree programs. The policy does not limit the Commission's authority to act or conduct other studies of academic degree programs that might result in program closure.

The policy applies to baccalaureate and graduate degree programs. It complements the other Commission policies that pertain to academic degree approval, including CCHE Policy I-B: *POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR THE APPROVAL OF NEW ACADEMIC PROGRAMS IN STATE-SUPPORTED INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN COLORADO*, and CCHE Policy I-C: *POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR THE REVIEW OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS*, and CCHE Policy I-S: *POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR THE ANNUAL FOLLOW-UP OF NEWLY APPROVED DEGREE PROGRAMS*.

2.00 Statutory Authority

By statute, the Colorado Commission on Higher Education has the responsibility to define criteria and ensure that governing boards discontinue those academic degree programs that do not satisfy state criteria. The statute (C.R. 23-1-107 (2)) reads:

- a) The commission shall establish, after consultation with the governing boards of institutions, policies and criteria for the discontinuance of academic or vocational programs. The commission shall direct the respective governing institutions, including the board of regents of the university of Colorado, to discontinue an academic or vocational degree program area, as program area is defined in commission policies.
- b) The governing board of a state-supported institution of higher education directed to discontinue an academic or vocational degree program area pursuant to this subsection (2) shall have not more than four years to discontinue graduate and baccalaureate programs and not more than two years to discontinue associate programs following the commission's directive to phase out said program area.
- c) If the commission directs the governing board of an institution to discontinue an academic or vocational degree program area, and the governing board refuses to do so, the commission may require such governing board to remit to the general fund any moneys appropriated for such program area.
- d) Each governing board of the state-supported institutions of higher education shall submit to the commission a report describing the procedures and schedule for periodic program reviews and evaluation of each academic program at the institution consistent with the role and mission of each institution. The information to be provided to the commission shall include, but shall not be limited to, the procedures for using internal and external evaluators, the sequence of reviews, and the anticipated use of the evaluations.
- e) Prior to the discontinuance of a program, the governing boards of state institutions of higher education are directed, subject to commission approval, to develop appropriate early retirement, professional retraining, and other programs to assist faculty members who may be displaced as a result of discontinued programs.
- f) The commission shall assure that each institution has an orderly process for the phaseout of the programs.

3.00 Goals, Principles, and Terminology

3.01 Policy Goals

The goals of CCHE=s discontinuance policy include:

- To establish state criteria that guide the review and discontinuance of academic degree programs with low student enrollment and graduation.
- To ensure that higher education institutions have an appropriate program array that reflects state priorities and needs, specifically that the programs respond to the current market environment in Colorado.
- To reaffirm the governing boards
= statutory responsibility to discontinue degree programs that do not meet state criteria.
- To assure that enrolled students have a reasonable opportunity to complete the degree requirements of a discontinued program.
- To foster sound academic planning by linking planning, evaluation, and budgeting decisions.

3.02 Principles

The *Policy and Procedures for the Discontinuance of Academic Degree Programs With Low Program Demand* is based on the following principles:

1. A degree program consists of an approved curriculum that meets academic standards, leads to an academic degree and is approved by the Colorado Commission on Higher Education.
2. The legislature specified three levels of access to degree programs: broad access to baccalaureate degree programs, limited access to master=s degree programs, and highly selective access to doctoral degree programs.
3. The Commission is accountable to the General Assembly and the taxpayers of Colorado for wise stewardship of state resources and protecting the rights of students who pursue degree programs in the public system of higher education.
4. The governing boards are accountable to the state and the public to review degree programs regularly and discontinue those that fail to meet the state criteria.
5. An appropriate degree program array may include offering a limited number of low enrollment programs that are central to an institution=s role and mission.

3.03 Evaluation Criteria and Documentation

The Commission has established degree approval criteria, one of which requires sufficient program demand. Because the programs under examination for possible discontinuance include those that exhibit nonexistent or low student demand, the evaluation of low demand programs considers other criteria that demonstrate program need:

3.03.01 Centrality of the Program to the Institution=s Role and Mission. Based on clear evidence that a degree program is critical to the institution=s fulfilling its statutory mission, an institution may exempt it from further examination and review (see Section 4.03.02).

3.03.02 Quality of Educational Experience. In this context, the success of the program=s graduates demonstrates the quality of the educational experience. A detailed, not summary, report of the program=s students showing what career path they pursued after graduation shall substantiate this factor.

3.03.03 Student Access. The Commission promotes broad access to baccalaureate programs, limited access to master=s degrees, and highly selective access to doctoral programs. In this context, convenience is an insufficient factor to justify access. Clear evidence that other degree programs cannot meet the enrolled students= needs or educational delivery mechanisms shall substantiate this factor.

3.03.04 Appropriate/Essential Duplication. A comparative analysis that highlights the way a program serves a distinct group of students or fulfills a distinctly different set of program goals shall substantiate this factor.

3.03.05 Contribution to Economic Development. A degree program may attract external funds to the institution and/state. A three-year cost-benefit analysis comparing program costs to external funds or other financial analysis shall document this factor.

3.04 Definition of Policy Terms

Academic year is the period extending from the first day of summer term of a calendar year and ending on the last day of spring term of the succeeding year.

Central to Role and Mission means those degree programs that define an institution's statutory role and mission without which it ceases to operate as a research university, polytechnical college, liberal arts college, or community college. Usually, degree programs central to an institution's role and mission are those programs with the highest enrollment levels.

Compatible with Role and Mission in this policy context means those degree programs that support the institution in meeting its mission statement but are not by themselves indispensable.

Discontinuance refers to a governing board or Commission action to formally close a degree program.

Graduation number is defined as the number of degrees conferred under a specific program name during an academic year. A student who completes the graduation requirements of two different degrees will count in the graduation numbers of both degree programs.

Phase-Out Period is the time during which currently enrolled students may complete the degree graduation requirements for a discontinued program. Colorado statute limits this period to no more than four years for graduate and baccalaureate programs and no more than two years for associate degree programs. The phase-out period begins at the end of the academic year in which the discontinuance action occurs.

Program Closure is defined as the official date after which students may not enroll in the degree program and the institution may not confer a diploma bearing the program name. The official date of program closure is the last day of the degree program's allowable phase-out period.

Program Need is demonstrated by student demand and market demand. Student demand, the number of students who enroll and graduate from a program, shows whether a program attracts sufficient numbers to justify its existence. Market demand, the undersupply of qualified individuals by job title, shows the significance of the program to Colorado's market environment and the value of the program to the individual student.

4.00 Process and Procedures

4.01 Governing Board Policies

By October 15, 1997, governing boards will submit to the Commission their discontinuance policies. The policies will:

- Comply with the guidelines defined in this policy;
- Identify the governing board criteria that supplement the state criteria;
- Specify the governing board's discontinuance procedures;
- Specify the institution's responsibilities during the four-year phase-out period (Section 4.02)

Specify the institution's responsibilities during the four-year phase-out period (Section 4.02).

The Commission may accept or ask the governing board to modify its policy. The governing boards shall resub subsequent changes to board policies for Commission acceptance.

4.01.02 Statutory Responsibilities During the Phase-Out Period

The Commission shall exercise its statutory responsibility to establish an orderly process for the phase-out of de programs through governing board policies. The governing board policy shall specify that the institution is accountable to implement the following process as soon as the governing board or the Commission acts to close a degree program. The governing board policy may specify additional procedures according to its bylaws and procedures.

4.01.02.01 Notify all affected students and faculty members that the program has been discontinued and will phased-out and closed.

4.01.02.02 Cease admitting new or transfer students into a discontinued program and notify the admission office of this action.

4.01.02.03 Counsel students in the discontinued program into alternative programs when completion of the program prior to the final discontinuance date is not possible.

4.01.02.04 Ensure that an institution offers the required courses of the discontinued program to the greatest extent possible before the closure date so that currently enrolled students have a reasonable opportunity to complete requirements.

4.01.02.05 Implement institutional reduction-in-force plans.

4.02 Commission Identification of Degree Programs for Examination

The Commission will notify the governing boards of low demand academic degree programs, that is, those programs that fail to meet the minimum enrollment and graduation standards specified in this policy. The group of degree programs will consist of those degree programs that are under the governing board review policies and not included in the Commission's annual follow-up of newly approved degree programs.

4.02.01 CCHE staff will identify low demand academic programs by compiling a three-year history of degrees conferred and identify all degree programs that fall below the following parameters:

4.02.01.01 Baccalaureate degrees must graduate ten (10) students in the most recently reported year or a total of students in the last three years.

4.02.01.02 Masters degree programs must graduate three (3) students in the most recently reported year or a total of five (5) in the past three years.

4.02.01.03 Doctoral degree programs must graduate at least one (1) student in the most recently reported year or a total of three (3) in the last three years.

4.02.02 In November of each year CCHE staff will notify the governing boards of all degree programs that fail to meet the criteria specified in Section 4.02.01.

The Commission expects the governing boards to discontinue degree programs that fail to meet the graduation criteria for three consecutive years, unless compelling evidence exists.

4.03 Governing Board Examination and Action

The governing board will review the programs forwarded by the Commission according to its approved policies and procedures.

4.03.01 Governing Board Review

4.03.01 Governing Board Review

The governing board shall monitor all programs identified as low demand degree programs and intervene where necessary to assist the degree programs in meeting their program enrollment and graduation goals and the student productivity goals.

4.03.02 Governing Board Examination

The governing board shall examine the low demand degree programs that have performed below the specified productivity criteria for three consecutive years using the criteria specified in Section 3.03 of this policy.

In keeping with the Commission's undergraduate priority, each institution may exempt ~~no more than five (5)~~ **a certain number** of low-demand baccalaureate degree programs from closure. The Commission intends this exemption privilege to address an institutional need to offer certain baccalaureate degree programs that may have low demand but are central to institution's role and mission. The exemption applies only to baccalaureate degree programs, but excludes any degree program that did not graduate at least three students in the past three years.

To help maintain a reasonable program array at small institutions (i.e., institutions enrolling less than undergraduate FTE), a governing board may designate a maximum of five baccalaureate degree programs. All other institutions may designate a maximum of three baccalaureate degree programs, selecting those that are central to an institution's role and mission. The three-program limit for institutions becomes effective January 2001.

A degree program carries the exempted designation until the governing board acts to remove it. As institutions adapt to the current market environment, a new academic program may supplant a degree program that once was central to institution's role and mission. The governing board may replace a degree program on the exemption list with a new program. However, a low-demand degree program replaced by another is subject to immediate governing board review if it does not meet the program demand criteria specified in Section 4.02.01.

4.03.03 Governing Board Action

The point of governing board action occurs during the third year that a program graduates fewer than the minimal number of students specified in this policy. The governing board will vote whether to discontinue the degree program under examination.

4.03.04 Governing Board Report

By March 31 of each year, the governing board shall identify the degree programs it discontinued and those that it did not to the Commission. If the governing board chooses not to discontinue a low demand degree program, it shall provide the Commission a summary of its position and the documentation that supports its position as specified in Section 3.03.

4.04 **Action on Appeals and Exemption** ~~Commission Examination and Action.~~

At its April meeting, the Commission will review **appeals filed by the governing board for** low-demand degree programs that the governing board did not discontinue. ~~It will not review the baccalaureate degree programs the governing board designated under its exemption privilege.~~

4.04.01 CCHE staff shall evaluate **the appeals for one- or two-year extensions** for low demand degree programs not discontinued by the governing boards, examining **the probability that the program can meet its graduation goals** ~~context of the state and Commission priorities, and the governing board rationale.~~ CCHE staff may request additional information from the governing board staff.

4.04.02

~~CCHE staff degree programs for discontinuance, and present a rationale for the recommendation to the Commission.~~ **No more than five exemptions are permitted under this policy. If a governing board chooses to submit more than the maximum number of exemptions allowed under policy, the Commission shall determine which programs are exempt.**

4.04.03 The Commission **will act on** discuss the staff recommendations at a regularly scheduled Commission meeting. **Prior to the action, the governing boards filing an appeal** representing the degree programs under Commission review will have an opportunity to testify before the Commission during the discussion.

~~4.04.04 The Commission will act on the programs recommended for discontinuance at its next meeting. If the Commission denies an appeal, the Commission in effect is voting to discontinue the degree program. No further action to discontinue is required by the Commission or the governing board.~~

5.00 Implementation of Governing Board or Commission Discontinuance

A degree program may be closed by governing board or Commission action. The only difference between the two actions is the formal notification process. All other guidelines apply regardless of which board initiated the action. A discontinued program will enter a phase-out period, followed by discontinuance.

5.01 Program Discontinuance by Governing Board Action

When a governing board discontinues a degree program, it shall notify the Commission of its action by letter and the final date it intends to confer degrees in the program. A governing board may choose to close a program sooner than the date allowed under statute, but it may not exceed the four-year statutory limitation.

It shall also notify the institution to carry out the phase-out procedures specified in the governing board's discontinuance policy immediately.

5.02 Program Discontinuance by Commission Action

The Commission shall notify the governing board to discontinue a degree program immediately following its decision to discontinue the program. The governing board shall carry out the Commission's decision according to the governing board's discontinuance policy and procedures.

5.03 Notification of Discontinuance to Other Agencies and Organizations.

The Commission shall notify the appropriate accrediting and credentialing agencies, including WICHE and the Colorado Department of Education, of discontinued degree programs.

6.00 Commission Responsibilities

6.01 Monitoring of Discontinued Degree Programs During the Phase-Out Period.

6.01.01 CCHE will monitor the enrollment data submitted to the Commission to determine if the institution is following its governing board's policies regarding admission to discontinued programs.

6.01.02 CCHE staff will alert the governing board staff if its institutions are ignoring the governing board's discontinuance policies. The governing board staff is responsible for resolving the situation, including informing the institution of potential consequences for failing to follow the phase-out plan specified in policy.

6.01.03 The Commission may choose to table new degree program proposals submitted by institutions that are not in compliance with CCHE's or a governing board's discontinuance policies.

6.02 Monitoring of Discontinued Degree Programs After the Closure Date

6.02.01 CCHE will monitor the enrollment and graduation of students in discontinued degree programs. It will use SURDS data, submitted to the Commission and verified by the institution, to detect whether an institution is continuing a discontinued program beyond its closure date.

6.02.02 If an institution operates a discontinued program beyond its closure date, the governing board is liable for the

0.02.02 If an institution operates a discontinued program beyond its closure date, the governing board is liable for a cost of the FTE generated by the discontinued program. The cost of an FTE for this policy shall be the institution's average General Fund per resident FTE cost (Format 30 Report) times the total FTE required to meet the de requirements. The board will return this amount to the state through an enrollment adjustment in the next funding period.

Overview of Governing Board Decisions Pertaining to Low-Enrollment Degree Programs

Table D-1: Final List of Degree Programs Exempted by the Governing Boards

Adams State College	Chemistry (BA/BS) Music (BA) Spanish (BA) Speech-Theatre (BA)
Colorado School of Mines	Geological Engineering (PE) Geophysical Engineering (PE)
Colorado State University	Bio-Agricultural Science (BS) Bio-resource/Agricultural Engineering (BS) Consumer & Family Studies (BS) Engineering Science (BS)
Fort Lewis College	Economics (BA) Philosophy (BA) Physics (BA) Southwest Studies (BA)
Metropolitan State College at Denver	African American Studies (BA) Chicano Studies (BA) Modern Languages (BA) Physics (BA/BS) Surveying and Mapping (BS)
University of Colorado at Boulder	Asian Studies (BA) Dance (BA/BFA) Italian (BA) Linguistics (BA) Russian Studies (BA)
University of Colorado at Colorado Springs	Applied Mathematics (BS) Physics (BS) Spanish (BA)

University of Colorado at Denver	French (BA) German (BA) Geology (BS) Physics (BS)
University of Northern Colorado	Black Studies (BA) Mexican American Studies (BA) French (BA) German (BA)
University of Southern Colorado	Business Economics (BS/BA) History (BA) Physics (BS)
Western State College	Economics (BA) Mathematics (BA) Music (BA) Spanish (BA)

Table D-2: Degree Programs Discontinued by the Governing Boards

Adams State College	Hispanic Southwest Studies (BA) Medical Technology (BS)
Colorado School of Mines	Engineer of Mines (PE) Petroleum Engineer (PE) Chemical and Petroleum Refining Engineering (ME) Geophysical Engineering (ME) Metallurgical & Materials Engineering (ME)
Colorado State University	Agricultural Journalism (BA) German (BA) French (BA) Spanish (BA) Pathology (MS) Statistics (BS)
Fort Lewis College	General Science (BS)
Metropolitan State College at Denver	Technical & Industrial Administration (BS) Urban Studies (BA)

University of Colorado at Boulder	Central & East European Studies (BA) Latin American Studies (BA) Mathematical Physics (Ph.D.) Individually Structured Major (BA)
University of Colorado at Colorado Springs	None
University of Colorado at Denver	Design Studies (MS) Applied Mathematics (BS)
University of Colorado Health Sciences Center	Pathology (MS) Pharmaceutical Sciences (MS)
University of Northern Colorado	Elementary Bilingual/Bicultural (MA) Graduate Interdisciplinary Degree (Ed.S) Graduate Interdisciplinary Degree (DA/Ed.D) Music Education (MM) Science Education (MA) Special Education/Mental Retardation (MA)
University of Southern Colorado	None
Western State College	French (BA) Technology (BS)

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE)
May 4, 2000
Agenda Item IV, D

TOPIC: COORDINATED DEGREE POLICY

PREPARED BY: SHARON M. SAMSON

I. SUMMARY

This agenda item presents a proposed revision to CCHE's Coordinated Degree Policy ([Attachment 1](#)). Adopted in 1986 and revised in 1995, the policy promotes inter-institutional cooperation in the delivery of degree programs. The current policy, however, limits collaboration to institutions within a governing board. The proposed revision eliminates this restriction and permits inter-governing board collaboration. The governing boards support the revision.

The Coordinated Degree Policy is designed to:

- Encourage collaboration among institutions.
- Provide the quality and type of educational opportunity that one institution alone could not offer.
- Maximize the use of existing state resources.
- Extend access to programs in areas of the state that exceed reasonable travel distances from an existing program.

If no institution takes advantage of the coordinated degree option within five years, the policy will terminate (i.e., June 2005) without further Commission action.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed revisions to the Coordinated Degree Policy.

II. BACKGROUND

The unique characteristics of a coordinated degree program are that:

- The program is a single academic entity, with a single curriculum and a single set of graduation requirements.
- The quality of a coordinated degree program shall meet the same quality standards as a stand-alone degree program.
- The quality of a coordinated program is not compromised or diminished when extended from the institution with the original degree authorization to one or more other institutions.
- The program predominantly benefits the State of Colorado and its residents.
- No participating institution offers the full curriculum.
- The host institution must be a Colorado institution.

At this time, only the University of Colorado has applied for coordinated degree approval. Applied Mathematics (Ph.D.) is coordinated between the University of Colorado at Denver and the University of Colorado at Boulder. Engineering is coordinated between the University of Colorado at Denver and the University of Colorado at Boulder.

Under the current policy, Colorado School of Mines and the University of Northern Colorado are ineligible to participate in the coordinated degree policy because they are governed by single-institution governing boards. When the presidents of CSU and UNC signed an MOU last year, faculty and administrators expressed interest in exploring the coordinated degree program option between Colorado State University and the University of Northern Colorado.

III. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Commission approve the proposed revisions to the Coordinated Degree Policy.

SECTION I

PART I POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR THE APPROVAL OF PROPOSALS FOR COORDINATED ACADEMIC DEGREE PROGRAMS

1.00 Introduction

This policy describes the approval criteria, incentives, and transition procedures for coordinated degree programs -- those programs that are jointly offered by multiple institutions of higher education, including at least one Colorado public institution of higher education. A coordinated degree may not be offered at a Colorado state-funded postsecondary institution unless approved under this policy. Proposals for stand-alone degree programs are reviewed and approved under CCHE Policy I-C: *Policy and Procedures for Approval of New Academic Degree Programs in State-Supported Institutions of Higher Education in Colorado*

2.00 Statutory Authority

By statute, the Colorado Commission on Higher Education has the responsibility to review and approve proposals for new 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 expectations and goals, the proposal for any new program before its establishment in any institution and transmit its decision to the institution within a reasonable time after receipt of such proposal. No institution shall establish a new program without first receiving the approval of the commission. As used in this subsection (1), "new program" includes any new curriculum which 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 which define programs and procedures for approval of new academic or vocational program offerings.

The Commission shall develop cooperative programs among state-supported institutions of higher education (C.R.S. 23-1-108(2)).

3.00 Goals, Principles, and Terminology

3.01 Policy Goals

The goals of a coordinated degree program include:

3.01.01 To encourage collaboration among institutions.

3.01.02 To provide the quality and type of educational opportunity that one institution alone could not offer.

3.01.03 To maximize the use of existing state resources.

3.01.04 To extend access to programs in areas of the state that exceed reasonable travel distances from an existing program.

3.02 Principles

The principles that exemplify a coordinated degree program include:

- The program is a single academic entity, with a single curriculum and a single set of graduation requirements.
- The quality of a coordinated degree program shall meet the same quality standards as a stand-alone degree program.
- The quality of a coordinated program is not compromised or diminished when extended from the institution with the original degree authorization to one or more other institutions.
- The program predominantly benefits the State of Colorado and its residents.
- The host institution must be a Colorado institution.

3.03 Definition of Terms and Limits

3.03.01 A **coordinated degree program** is a single program that the Commission has approved for more than one college or university to offer jointly. It is characterized by a single curriculum, a common set of admission criteria, a single set of graduation requirements, and shared resources

3.03.02 All participating institutions **share** in the delivery of the coordinated degree program curriculum. Consequently, all institutions that participate in a coordinated degree program will offer courses to fulfill the curricular requirements and no single institution will offer the complete curriculum.

3.03.03 A coordinated program may include **collaboration** among Colorado public institutions under the same or different governing boards or between a Colorado public institution and an out-of-state or international college or university.

3.03.04 **Degree conferral authority** of a coordinated degree program is limited by the statutory role and mission of the participating institutions. Approval of a coordinated degree program does not alter nor imply modification of an institution's role and mission. The various type of relationships supported by the Coordinated Degree Approval Policy include:

(1) A coordinated degree program proposed between two or more Colorado public institutions of higher education with parallel degree authority. If all participating institutions have explicit statutory authority for the degree program (e.g., baccalaureate), all institutions may confer the degree.

(2) A coordinated degree program proposed between two or more Colorado public institutions of higher education with non-parallel degree authority. Only the institution with the explicit statutory authority may confer the degree.

(3) A coordinated degree program that involves a consortium of public, private, and out-of-state institutions of higher education. Degree authority will be determined by statutory role and mission of the participating institutions or the accreditation status of participating private institutions.

(4) A coordinated degree program that evolves from merging two or more existing degree programs. All institutions may confer the degree.

(5) A coordinated degree program that evolves from extending an existing degree to another institution of higher education.

3.03.05 The Commission's approval of a coordinated degree program is limited to the institutions specified in the proposal.

4.00 Criteria and Procedures

4.01 Criteria

Coordinated degree programs will meet several specific criteria pertaining to quality and efficiency:

- That a coordinated degree program has a common predefined curriculum.
- That the participating institutions have designed or arranged for a common accreditation and program review process.
- That a coordinated degree program has a fiscal infrastructure delineated in a memorandum of understanding.
- That a coordinated degree program creatively employs information technologies in the teaching and learning processes.
- That a doctoral coordinated degree must be justified by its excellence, national recognition, and unique contribution to the statewide program array.

4.02 Approval Process

The approval process for new coordinated degree program proposals (coordinated programs #1, #2, #3) requires a concept paper, a full proposal, and memorandum of understanding. The approval process for a coordinated degree program that originates from one or more pre-existing degree programs (coordinated programs #4 and #5) requires a full proposal and a memorandum of understanding.

4.02.01 The participating institutions shall notify CCHE of their intent to develop a coordinated degree program through the academic planning process.

4.02.02 The institutions interested in collaborating shall prepare a concept paper containing a brief statement that describes the proposed program and addresses the following issues:

- Relation to institutional missions, strategic plans, goals, and objectives.
- Projected sources of resources (e.g., reallocation, external funds, and state funding for enrollment growth).
- Student and program demand (aggregate).
- Relation to other degree programs in the system and the region.
- Statement of degree authority.
- Contribution by each participating institution.

4.02.03 After sharing the concept paper with all governing boards, the Commission will discuss the concept paper, statewide issues, and issues related to coordinated status. The concept paper does not require governing board review or approval prior to Commission discussion.

4.02.04 The institutions and governing boards shall prepare a proposal and negotiate a memorandum of understanding that specifies:

- Curriculum design and the curricular components that the participating institutions will deliver.
- Admission process and criteria.
- Graduation requirements.
- Resources needed to support the program, including faculty, library, student affairs, physical facilities, telecommunications and plan to finance the program as proposed.
- Program administration responsibilities.
- Plans for program recognition for financial aid eligibility.
- Plans for coordinated accreditation or program review.
- Organizational chart diagramming relationships among participating institutions.
- Mechanism for communicating between programs/institutions.
- Plans for technology: immediate and under development as appropriate.
- The required forms (Table 1C- Enrollment Projections, Table 2C - Physical Capacity Estimates, and Table 3C - Projected Expense and Revenue Estimates) shall be submitted with a proposal for a coordinated degree program.

4.02.05 CCHE distributes the full proposal to the governing boards to solicit comments and recommendations from their respective institutions. If the coordinated degree program proposal pertains to a graduate program, CCHE selects an external reviewer to review the proposal.

4.02.06 Each governing board of the participating institutions shall review and act on the full proposal, including peer review, external reviewer comments, and the memorandum of understanding, prior to forwarding the proposal to the Commission. Affirmative action by the governing boards means that they pledge to support the coordinated degree program at the resource level specified in the memorandum of understanding.

4.02.07 The Commission will act on the coordinated degree proposal at the January and June Commission meetings. The degree program will have provisional status until it meets its enrollment and graduation projections.

4.03 Exit and Transition Procedures

4.03.01 If, after five years, a coordinated degree program fails to meet its enrollment or graduation projections, the Commission shall decide whether the program is to continue. If the program does not have the support of at least six Commissioners, the coordinated degree program shall close at all coordinated sites.

4.03.02 If, after five years, a coordinated degree program meets its enrollment and graduation projections, the Commission shall confer full approval status to the degree program.

4.03.03 A coordinated baccalaureate degree program with full approval status that meets or exceeds CCHE's graduation benchmarks at each participating site for three or more consecutive years may request stand-alone degree authority from the Commission. Each institution participating in the coordinated degree participants will submit a proposal following CCHE's Degree Approval Policy.

4.03.04 A coordinated graduate degree program with full approval status that meets or exceeds CCHE's graduation benchmarks at each participating site for three or more consecutive years may request stand-alone degree authority. Graduate programs must document that the degree program's goals

cannot be achieved under the coordinated status and undergo an in-depth comprehensive review by an external reviewer selected by the Commission.

4.03.05 CCHE's low enrollment benchmarks apply to coordinated degree programs collectively. If the participating institutions fail to meet the benchmark for three successive years, the Commission will rule on the continuation of the coordinated degree program. Program continuation requires six affirmative votes for a low enrollment coordinated degree program to continue.

4.04 Student Status

Students who are admitted into a coordinated degree program receive a degree from the institution at which they matriculate provided this institution has the authority to confer a degree. Because a coordinated degree program operates as a single entity, students wishing to change institutions do not need to transfer from one participating institution to another. They are considered continuing students as long as the student maintains good academic standing. Initial admission to the degree program is honored.

5.00 Policy Effective Dates

This policy will sunset if no institution applies for coordinated degree program status within five years of the date this policy is adopted.

TABLE C1 - ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS: Coordinated degree program

Name of Program: _____

Name of Institutions: _____

PURPOSE:

The following table provides evidence of student demand for the coordinated degree program.

DEFINITIONS:

Academic year is defined as the period beginning July 1 and concluding June 30.

Headcount represents the number of program majors projected to enroll per year. Program majors include only those students officially admitted into the program and enrolled at the institution in the program during the academic year.

FTE is defined as the full-time equivalent enrollment of program majors during a single academic year.

A completer is defined as a student who finishes all academic program requirements within an academic year and officially receives a degree from the institution.

DIRECTIONS:

To calculate program headcount, add new enrollees to the enrollment of the previous year and subtract the number of completers from this total. Adjust by the attrition rate.

To calculate FTE, multiply the number of program majors times the number of credit hours program majors are projected to take per year, and divide the total by 30.

The data reported on this form is based on annual **unduplicated** number of program majors. Unlike traditional budget formats, this data measures program majors and **all** the credit hours they take, regardless of department. Neither headcount nor FTE may include enrollment data from non-degree seeking students or students who have not been formally admitted to the department.

	Inst	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Program Headcount						
Program FTE						
Program Completers					-	

TABLE C2 - PHYSICAL CAPACITY ESTIMATES

Name of Program: _____

Name of Institutions: _____

Purpose: This table documents the physical capacity of the institution to offer the program and/or the plan for achieving the capacity. Complete A or B.

Part A

I certify that the institution can fully implement this proposed degree program and accommodate the enrollment projections provided in this proposal without requiring additional space or renovating existing space during the first five years.

Governing Board Capital Construction Officer

Date

Part B All data in the table refer to the **extended site(s) only**. Use a separate form for each site.

17	Other fund sources *	-	-	-	-	-	-
18	Institutional Reallocation *	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL REVENUE		-	-	-	-	-	-

*If reallocated, identify the specific departments that provided the reallocated funds and the impact the reallocation will have.

Signature of Person who completed the Expense/Revenue Table _____ Title _____

DEFINITIONS for TABLE 3C: PROJECTED EXPENSES AND REVENUE ESTIMATES

COST DEFINITIONS:	
Faculty:	Compensation for instructional faculty (salaries and benefits).
Financial Aid:	The total amount of grants, scholarships, teaching assistantships, and work study dollars that are designated for students enrolled in the proposed program.
Instructional Materials:	The total dollars budgeted for instructional materials, computer support for the proposed Program.
Program Administration:	Compensation for secretarial staff and the department chair, travel, and non-instructional materials. Do not include the costs attributed to executive management costs.
Rent/Lease:	The actual costs associated with renting space necessary for the program.
Other Operating Costs:	Any other operating costs that are program related that are not included elsewhere.
Total Operating Exp.	The sum of Equipment, Faculty, Financial Aid, Instructional Materials, Program Administration, Rent/Lease, and Other Operating costs.
Capital Construction:	The estimated capital construction costs for program space needs identified in Table 2.
Equipment Acquisitions:	The capital expenditures for new equipment necessary to deliver the program as proposed (one-time costs), excluding maintenance and upgrades.
Library Acquisition:	The dollars in the library budget that will support the proposed degree program's needs.
Total Program Start-Up Expenses:	The sum of all one-time expenditures associated with implementing the program, including capital construction, equipment acquisitions, and library acquisitions.
Total Program Expense:	The sum of Total Operating Expenses and Total Program Start-Up Expenses.

REVENUE DEFINITIONS:

General Fund: State Support	The state funds that will be generated using the current higher education funding formula (average state appropriation per resident FTE times by projected program FTE).
Cash Revenue: Tuition	Cash generated from the tuition charged to students who enroll in the program.
Cash Revenue: Fees	Cash generated from program or course fees charged to students who enroll in the program.
Federal Grants:	The portion of revenue received from federal grants programs that will directly support the program or the program's students.
Corporate Grants /Donations:	Corporate grants, endowments, or donations that will support the academic program teaching or research activities.
Other Fund Sources:	Outside funds not included above that will support the program if approved.
Inst. Reallocation:	The funds that the institution has committed to support the program to meet expenses.
Total Program Revenue:	The sum of General Fund, Tuition, Fees, Federal Grants, Corporate Grants, Institutional Reallocation, and Other Revenue.

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE)
May 4, 2000
Agenda Item V, A

TOPIC: CCHE-CAPITAL ASSETS SCHEDULE FY01-02

PREPARED BY: JEANNE ADKINS

I. SUMMARY

The Commission Capital Assets staff has reviewed the submission deadlines and process for program plan review FY01-02 funding cycle. Although four projects will go through the pilot project procedures outlined in the previous agenda item, the remainder will follow the traditional program plan prioritization review process the Commission established.

Staff is recommending new submission dates and a calendar for both state-funded projects and cash-funded projects proposed by the institutions. Dates generally are listed as windows to allow some flexibility for commission and governing board schedules. However, the dates for submissions will be considered final deadlines. As policy requires, the governing boards must approve the projects and reprioritize them for the new funding year. Any project not funded in the current year must be resubmitted for review and reprioritization in the following fiscal year cycle. Program plan approvals will not automatically be extended from year to year.

II. BACKGROUND

Because there are several master plans that are to be reviewed over the next four to six months, as well, ensuring institutions are all aware of the capital deadlines for projects is crucial. Simultaneously, staff will be involved in preparation for the site visit in connection with the Urban Land Institute review of the Fitzsimons Research/Medical Center project.

In March a memo with tentative dates was circulated to members of the Capital Assets Subcommittee for review. The intent is to have the final state-funded priority list to the full commission for discussion and action at the November 2 2000, meeting. Although it would be possible to have a December teleconference to approve any changes to the list later in November, the schedule outlined in this agenda item anticipates referral of the prioritized list to the General Assembly Capital Development Committee in December 2000.

Staff will request in writing that governing boards submit a tentative list of state-funded projects to us by June 7. This will allow internal planning to determine where site visits should be scheduled and provide an early workload assessment.

Working with the Office of State Planning and Budgeting, we hope to bring the capital budget instructions for commission review and comment at the June 2000 commission meeting and would then send them to the institutions.

Tentatively, unless OSPB alters the timeframe, preliminary budget forms would be due to the Department of Higher Education June 19-23, 2000.

Backing out the appropriate time for committee meetings and realizing that this work should be completed in mid-October for a commission decision at the November 2000 meeting, the window for program plan submission deadline will be July 17. If a governing board has not had the opportunity to officially prioritize systemwide projects by this date, governing board offices may authorize preliminary submission of a program plan, but a letter from the system office must accompany the program plan indicating the date the governing board would act to prioritize and review projects.

Final priority lists for all state-funded projects by governing boards must be submitted to CCHE by August 15, 2000.

The four projects recommended for inclusion in the pilot program for 2% conceptual design review will be reviewed within this same timeframe. However, the General Assembly has agreed in the recently adopted Long Bill that approval

of that design stage would forward the projects for full A&E funding to the Capital Development Committee with FY00-01 budget year.

To allow for the additional questions being raised by the subcommittee following the internal project review, the schedule would put subcommittee meetings in early September, right after Labor Day for review. Any subcommittee campus visits the committee believes might be needed after that review could be scheduled mid-September and completed by October 1.

This would then allow an additional subcommittee meeting with campus representatives in early October before prioritization of the capital list. The final calendar would be as follows:

- Preliminary budget forms due to CCHE between June 19-23, 2000
- Program plan submissions due Monday, July 17, 2000, for state funding
- Internal staff reviews and campus visits completed August 28-September 3, 2000, and sent to subcommittee
- Subcommittee meetings with staff, between September 6-15, 2000
- Subcommittee meetings with campus representatives and/or site visits, September 15-30, 2000
- Subcommittee prioritization meetings, October 1-12, 2000
- Preparation of agenda item for November 2, 2000, Commission meeting, due October 25, 2000
- Commission Action November 2, 2000,
- Referral of prioritized list to Capital Development Committee following action.

For non-state-funded projects and the SB202, cash-funded projects, which have a deadline to the General Assembly that is approximately 6 weeks later than the state-funded projects, staff suggests the following schedule:

- Preliminary budget forms submitted: Same schedule as state-funded programs
- Program plans due August 25, 2000
- Internal staff review completed, October 20, 2000
- Subcommittee discussion of any issues on cash-funded/SB202 projects November 10-15, 2000
- Action by Commission at December 2000 teleconference, referral to Capital Development Committee following meeting.

III. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the Commission adopt the Capital Assets project review schedule as outlined above.

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE)
May 4, 2000
Agenda Item V, B

TOPIC: ANNUAL ADMISSION STANDARDS REPORT

PREPARED BY: SHARON M. SAMSON

I. SUMMARY

The Commission annually reviews the admission data of the public higher education system. The dual purpose of Admission Standard Policy is to maintain a differentiated system of admission standards and assure individual students entry into institutions for which they are best prepared and at which they will be most successful. Consequently, the aspects of admission data that the Commission is particularly interested in monitoring include institutional compliance with the prescribed admission standards and the academic success of students who meet the admission standards. To assure compliance responsibility, the staff analysis section of this agenda item provides a summary of the admission standards data for fiscal year 1998-99 -- the last full year reported to the Commission as of this date -- and the fall data of the current year. The statewide data indicates that:

- All institutions were in compliance in 1998-99 with CCHE's Admission Standards, with the individual window size ranging from 4 to 20 percent of admitted applicants who did not meet admission standards.
- In 1998-99, the public four-year institutions admitted approximately 41,000 freshman students. Of the admitted students, 17 percent did not meet the admission standards for the institutions to which they applied.
- Of the 6,938 students in the "window," 26% of the students offered admission were minority students.
- In 1998-99, 16,901 new freshmen enrolled in Colorado public institutions -- approximately one-third of the applicant pool.
- In addition, 9,608 transfer students enrolled at a public institution in 1998-99.

To address the student success policy goal, the staff analysis includes excerpts from a recently released national report that examined numerous college-entry indicators and identified the factors that most influence a student's ability to succeed in college. The national study presents some ideas that open a broader discussion of Colorado's Statewide Admission Standards Policy. Most significantly, the national data indicate that academic preparation (i.e., high school courses) is a stronger variable than socio-economic status in explaining what really makes a difference in college degree completion.

Staff, in consultation with the Academic Council, plan to study and analyze Colorado's data to see if they parallel the national findings.

II. BACKGROUND

Highlights of CCHE's Admission Standards Policy

The Commission adopted the *Statewide Admission Standards Policy* (Section I, Part F) in spring 1986 and implemented it in fall 1987. The policy established specific and separate admission criteria for first-time freshman and transfer students. Certain groups of students were exempt from admission standards, notably foreign students and returning adults (i.e. students who are 21 or older) and allowed each institution to use other rigorous criteria in lieu of the index score. Transfer freshmen and transfer admission standards were different for each type of institution as determined by the statutory role and mission statement -- highly selective, selective, moderately selective, and modified open. As open admission institutions, the colleges with two-year missions, primarily the fifteen community colleges, provide access to students who do not meet state-defined admission standards. They are also the access point for students needing remediation. Similar to most Colorado colleges, admission standards are analyzed by the students that a college admits. Colleges control admission standards while student choice determines the actual enrollment of new students.

CCHE's Statewide Admission Policy defines the first-time freshman admission criteria with an index score that is calculated from standardized test scores and high school GPA. The transfer criteria vary by the number of college credits earned after high school. Transfer students who attempt to transfer less than 12 college credits must meet the freshman standards, although they count in the transfer window. Students who attempt to transfer 30 college credits must

meet the 2.0 college GPA criterion. Students who attempt to transfer 12 to 29 credit hours may meet either the freshman transfer standards.

The Commission reviewed and revised its freshman admission standards policy in 1995. This action was, in part, an attempt to bring institutions into compliance with the statutory 20 percent window. Each four-year college president has the opportunity to select its index score from a range of scores:

- Highly selective colleges 93 - 110
- Selective colleges 90 - 92
- Moderately selective colleges 80 - 89
- Modified open colleges 70 - 79

All four-year colleges remain accountable for admitting at least 80 percent of its first-time freshman and transfer student who meet the admission criteria. As the following chart shows, much differentiation exists in the highly selective category, but selective and moderately selective colleges use a common index score. The minimum index score defined for institutions are as follows:

Table 1: First-time Freshman Admission Standards

Institution	Role and Mission	Index Score
Adams State College	Moderately selective	80
Colorado School of Mines	Highly selective	110
Colorado State University	Highly selective	101
Fort Lewis College	Moderately selective	80
Mesa State College	Moderately selective	80
Metropolitan State College of Denver	Modified Open	76
University of Colorado at Boulder	Highly selective	103
University of Colorado at Colorado Springs	Selective	92
University of Colorado at Denver	Highly selective	93
University of Northern Colorado	Selective	92
University of Southern Colorado	Moderately selective	80
Western State College	Moderately selective	80

Admission Highlights of the 1289 Study Published January 2000

Chapter 9 of the 1289 Study analyzed the student performance of institutions that fall into one of the admission categories – highly selective, selective, moderately selective, modified open and open – emphasizing graduation rates colleges with different admission roles and graduation rates within degree programs. Why choose degree attainment as means to evaluate the effectiveness of admission standards? Because students don't go to college with the objective of merely getting to the second year. The bottom line for students, their families, institutions, and state legislature is completion. The key findings of the 1289 study provide context to the data analysis:

- Colorado's retention rates are fairly comparable to retention rates in other states. The national data show that 71 percent of four-year college freshmen and 53 percent of community college freshmen return for the sophomore year.
- Seventy percent of freshmen enrolled at Colorado's public colleges enrolled at the same institution the following fall. This has increased from the 1995 freshman-to-sophomore retention rate of 68 percent. Most importantly, Colorado's retention rate is improving while the national average is flat.
- The colleges with high freshman admission standards, i.e., those colleges that admit freshmen with the strongest pre-college academic records, have the highest retention rates in the system. Colorado's selective admission institutions (CSU and UCB) have higher retention rates than selective institutions in other states.
- Students who complete the core curriculum at a Colorado community college graduate from four-year institutions at considerably higher rates than community college students who transfer less than the required 33 credit hours. Colorado community college students who complete an Associate of Arts (AA) or an Associate of Science (AS) lose no credits when transferring and enter the four-year colleges as juniors. Community college students with vocational certificates or degrees often lose credit for the remedial and vocational courses that fulfill the degree requirements.
- Transfer policies and transcript evaluation practices in Colorado do not appear to delay graduation of transfer students. Poor advising -- both pre-transfer and post-transfer -- may negatively impact a transfer student's ability to graduate in a timely manner.
- Four-year college students who declare a major in their sophomore year are more likely to graduate in four years than those who have not.
- While advising systems vary in quality and intensity, any institutional shortcoming may be compounded by student behavior. Not only do students avoid advising sessions, but in some cases, they ignore or postpone acting on advice. For example, a student's test scores may indicate weakness in mathematical skills, but the student fails to enroll in remedial course work.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

A state policy board operating under a performance model is most effective when focusing on student behavioral patterns. Higher education systems do not have tools to change student college aspirations or orchestrate effective influences students' acceptance decisions. On the other hand, admission standards do provide state policy boards with a tool to improve the quality of pre-college curricula, coordinate enrollment levels within a system, position incoming college students for productive first-year college performance, and keep community college transfer students from jumping ship to the four-year institution too early.

Colorado Data

The 1998-99 admission data show that all institutions are in compliance with CCHE's Admission Standards Policy.

Table 2: Analysis of the 1998-99 First-Time Freshman Admission Data

	Applied	Denied	Accepted	Enrolled	Enr. Yield	Window
ASC	1,412	48	1,364	475	35%	88
CSM	2,073	562	1,511	555	37%	169

CSU	11,042	3,067	7,975	3,141	39%	1,589
FLC	3,075	396	2,679	1,082	40%	398
MESA	1,739	182	1,557	791	51%	64
METRO	3,337	586	2,751	1,646	60%	358
UCB	14,138	2,163	11,975	4,332	36%	2,392
UCCS	2,015	418	1,597	789	49%	181
UCD	1,256	335	921	492	53%	182
UNC	6,567	1,000	5,567	2,231	40%	1,088
USC	1,482	133	1,349	721	53%	199
WSC	1,789	195	1,594	646	41%	230
STATE	49,925	9,085	40,840	16,901	41%	6,938
-	-	18%	82%	34%	41%	-

Table 3: Percent of First-Time Freshmen who Applied, Were Admitted or Enrolled, FY 98-99

-	Denied	Accepted	Enrolled	Below Adm. Standard
ASC	3%	97%	34%	6%
CSM	27%	73%	27%	11%
CSU	28%	72%	28%	20%
FLC	13%	87%	35%	15%
MESA	10%	90%	45%	4%
METRO	18%	82%	49%	13%
UCB	15%	85%	31%	20%
UCCS	21%	79%	39%	11%
UCD	27%	73%	39%	20%
UNC	15%	85%	34%	20%

USC	9%	91%	49%	15%
WSC	11%	89%	36%	14%
STATE	18%	82%	34%	17%

Table 4: Analysis of the 1998-99 Transfer Data

-	Admitted	Below Standard	Met Standard	Window Percent	Percent
ASC	340	12	328	4%	96%
CSM	246	60	186	24%	76%
CSU	3,762	284	3,478	8%	92%
FLC	913	24	889	3%	97%
MESA	736	44	692	6%	94%
METRO	374	47	327	13%	87%
UCB	2,727	76	2,651	3%	97%
UCCS	1,396	63	1,333	5%	95%
UCD	2,138	87	2,051	4%	96%
UNC	1,939	252	1,687	13%	87%
USC	696	106	590	15%	85%
WSC	574	54	520	9%	91%
STATE	15,841	1,109	14,732	7%	93%

Analysis of Credits Earned Prior to Transfer

-	<12 Hr	12 – 29	> 30	Enrolled	Enr. Yield
ASC	10	84	235	187	57%
CSM	25	1	158	107	58%
CSU	36	1,210	2,402	2,545	70%
FLC	27	227	864	1,118	78%
MESA	25	187	643	855	77%
METRO	10	267	357	634	77%
UCB	10	1,007	1,610	2,627	79%
UCCS	10	227	1,153	1,390	81%
UCD	10	1,007	1,610	2,627	79%
UNC	10	1,007	1,610	2,627	79%
USC	10	1,007	1,610	2,627	79%
WSC	10	1,007	1,610	2,627	79%
STATE	27	2,227	10,014	11,368	80%

FLC	37	235	604	505	58%
MESA	24	151	503	448	66%
METRO	8	39	94	57	40%
UCB	86	583	1,977	1,670	63%
UCCS	31	255	1,081	690	50%
UCD	42	399	1,673	1,439	68%
UNC	162	644	1,127	1,207	62%
USC	7	32	568	458	75%
WSC	37	153	331	295	57%
STATE	505	3,786	10,753	9,608	-
Percent	3%	25%	71%		64%

Table 5: Preliminary Summary of 1999-2000 Freshman Admission Data
(Fall and Summer data only)

	Applied	Denied	Accepted	Enrolled	Window
ASC	1,848	40	1,808	726	88
CSM	1,449	473	976	567	166
CSU	11,247	3,151	8,096	3,145	1,611
FLC	2,876	267	2,609	1,012	482
MESA	1,707	267	1,440	679	51
METRO	2,785	455	2,330	1,382	350
UCB	14,504	2,196	12,308	4,568	2,240
UCCS	2,011	455	1,556	770	180
UCD	1,440	436	1,004	543	206
UNC	6,579	903	5,676	2,330	1,134
USC	816	34	782	667	122

WSC	3,667	193	1,422	569	202
STATE	50,929	8,870	40,007	16,958	6,832

Table 6: Percent of First-Time Freshmen who Applied, Were Admitted or Enrolled, Preliminary (Summer and Fall 1999 only).

-	Denied	Accepted	Enrolled	Below Adm. Standard
ASC	2%	98%	39%	5%
CSM	33%	67%	39%	17%
CSU	28%	72%	28%	20%
FLC	9%	91%	35%	19%
MESA	16%	84%	40%	4%
METRO	16%	84%	50%	15%
UCB	15%	85%	32%	18%
UCCS	23%	77%	38%	12%
UCD	30%	70%	38%	20%
UNC	14%	86%	35%	20%
USC	4%	96%	82%	16%
WSC	5%	39%	16%	14%
STATE	17%	79%	33%	17%

Table 7: Preliminary Analysis of the Use of the Freshman Window By Ethnicity

-	Non-Resident Alien	Black	Indian	Asian	Hispanic	White
ASC	0	9	1	0	20	61
CSM	33	3	4	9	19	98
CSU	8	103	40	95	175	1,190
FLC	0	20	86	5	44	327

MESA	0	4	1	0	3	43
METRO	0	45	3	23	74	205
UCB	15	97	36	153	236	1,903
UCCS	1	24	3	11	26	115
UCD	1	18	9	46	53	79
UNC	1	43	7	53	156	874
USC	0	9	5	6	46	56
WSC	0	6	0	6	17	173
STATE	59	381	195	407	869	5,124

Table 8: Preliminary Analysis of the 1999-2000 Transfer Data

The 1999-2000 transfer data is only presented in terms of credit hours earned prior to transfer. Because many student transfer in spring semester, only the credit hour patterns are informative at this point.

-	<12 Hr	12 - 29	> 30	Enrolled	Enr. Yield
ASC	9	57	167	127	55%
CSM	14	0	113	69	54%
CSU	36	766	1,872	1,786	67%
FLC	17	166	461	370	57%
MESA	24	121	443	391	66%
METRO	4	34	45	83	100%
UCB	56	538	1,549	1,330	62%
UCCS	22	175	779	630	65%
UCD	30	279	1,188	966	65%
UNC	135	424	930	831	56%
USC	3	45	416	353	76%
WSC	16	107	301	234	55%

STATE	366	2,712	8,264	7,170	-
Percent	3%	24%	73%	63%	-

National Findings

Dr. Cliff Adelman conducted a longitudinal analysis of high school sophomores enrolled in 1980 and tracked their educational history for 17 years. His findings illustrate the college graduation rates of this cohort at age 30 and the factors that most influence college graduation. The following bullets summarize his findings.

High School Background

- High school curriculum reflects 41 percent of the academic resources students bring to higher education; test scores, 30 percent; and class rank/academic GPA, 29 percent. No matter how one divides the universe of students, the high school curriculum produces a higher percent earning bachelor's degrees than either of the other measures. The correlation of curriculum with bachelor's degree attainment (.54) is higher than test scores (.48) or class rank (.44).
- The impact of a high school curriculum of high academic intensity and quality on degree completion is far more pronounced—and positive—than any other pre-college indicator. The impact for African-American and Latino students is also much greater than it is for white students.

Table 9: Bachelor's Degree Completion Rates for Students in the Top Two Academic Quintiles Who Entered Four-Year Colleges Directly After High School Graduation.

While all students who have solid high school credentials outperform their counterparts, the difference is most evident for black and Hispanic (Latino) students. Eighty-five percent of the students who completed mathematics beyond Algebra 2 complete college compared to 72 percent of the total undergraduate population. This graduation rate is defined as completing undergraduate requirements by the age of 30.

	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Latino</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>All</u>
ALL	75%	45%	61%	87%	72%
<u>Curriculum</u> Highest 40% and math beyond Algebra 2	86%	73%	79%	89%	85%
<u>Test Scores</u> Highest 40%	81%	67%	67%	95%	80%

SOURCE: National Center for Education Statistics: High School & Beyond/Sophomore cohort, NCES CD#98-135.

- Of all pre-college curricula, the level of mathematics one studies in high school has the strongest influence on bachelor's degree completion. Finishing a course beyond the level of Algebra 2 (e.g., trigonometry) more than doubles the odds that a student who enters postsecondary education will complete a bachelor's degree.
- Academic resources (the composite of high school curriculum, test scores, and class rank) produce a much steeper curve toward bachelor's degree completion than does socioeconomic status. Students from the *lowest* two SES quintiles who are also in the *highest* Academic Resources quintile earn bachelor's degrees at a higher rate than a majority of students from the top SES quintile.

Table 10: Percent of students completing bachelor's degrees, by quintile of performance on three component variables of "academic resources."

QUINTILES

	<u>High</u>	<u>2nd</u>	<u>3rd</u>	<u>4th</u>	<u>Low</u>
1) Base Group; N=10470					
H.S. Curriculum	70	44	19	5*	3*
12 th Grade Test	64	37	16	8	3
Rank/GPA	59	36	19	7*	4*
2) On-Time HS Grads Only; N=9635					
H.S. Curriculum	70	45	19	5*	3*
12 th Grade Test	64	38	17	8	3
Rank/GPA	59	37	20	8*	4*
3) On-Time HS Grads with SES Data; N=8819					
H.S. Curriculum	69	45	19	6*	3*
12 th Grade Test	64	38	17	9	3
Rank/GPA	59	37	21	9	5
4) On-Time HS Grads with SES Data Who Attended College at Any Time N=6868					
H.S. Curriculum	72	49	25	10*	6*
12 th Grade Test	67	43	23	14	7
Rank/GPA	64	42	28	14	9

NOTES: (1) The difference between any pair of estimates in a row is statistically significant at $p \leq .05$ except for those indicated by asterisks.

SOURCE: National Center for Education Statistics: High School & Beyond/Sophomore cohort restricted file, N CD#98-135.

Table 11: Comparison of Academic Preparation to Socioeconomic Status in Relation to Bachelor's Degree Completion

**Percent Completing Bachelor's Degrees
Within Each Quintile**

High	2nd	3rd	4th	Low
------	-----	-----	-----	-----

All High School Graduates

Academic Preparation	73	45	17	5	2
Socioeconomic Status	55	33	23	15	7

All Who Attended a 4-Year College

Academic Preparation	80	64*	40	25	17
Socioeconomic Status	72	60*	56*	46	35

NOTES: (1) All row and column pair comparisons are significant at $p \leq .05$ except those indicated by asterisks.

SOURCE: National Center for Education Statistics: High School & Beyond/Sophomore cohort, NCES CD#98-135.

- Graduating from high school "late" does not influence bachelor's degree completion provided that one enrolls in higher education directly after receiving a high school diploma.

College Attendance Patterns

- The proportion of undergraduate students attending more than one institution swelled from 40 percent to 54 percent (and among bachelor's degree recipients, from 49 to 58 percent) during the 1970s and 1980s, with even more dramatic increases in the proportion of students attending more than two institutions. Early data from the 1990s suggest that we will easily surpass a 60 percent multi-institutional attendance rate by the year 2000.
- Students beginning in highly selective four-year colleges and those starting out in open door institutions have the highest rates of multi-institutional attendance, though for very different reasons.
- The number of institutions attended by students has no effect on degree completion.
- The fewer schools attended, the more likely the student was enrolled continuously, and the less likely a four-year college was part of the attendance pattern. Yet 70 percent of the students who attended a four-year college at any time were continuously enrolled.
- Sixteen percent of postsecondary students (and 18 percent of bachelor's degree completers) engaged in alternating or simultaneous enrollment patterns. Some 70 percent of this group attended three or more institutions.
- Some 40 percent of students who attended more than one institution crossed state lines in the process, and their bachelor's degree completion rate was higher than that for multi-institutional students who remained within state borders.
- Students who expected to earn a bachelor's degree, started in a two-year institution, but never attended a four-year college have a lower SES profile and a considerably lower academic resources profile than students with the same expectations and starting point but who did attend a four-year school. Family income, however, plays no role in the different attendance patterns of these students.

Degree Completion

- For students who attend four-year colleges, the only form of financial aid that bears a positive relationship to degree completion after a student's first year of college attendance is employment (principally work-study and campus-related employment) undertaken (a) while the student is enrolled, and (b) for purposes of covering the costs of education.
- The national bachelor's degree completion rate by age 30 for all *students* who attend four-year colleges is 63 percent. For all those who earn more than 30 credits prior to transfer, the rate exceeds 70 percent. For those who start in highly selective colleges, the rate exceeds 90 percent.
- While only 26 percent of students who began their undergraduate careers in community colleges formally transferred to four-year institutions, their bachelor's degree completion rate was over 70 percent. The classic form of transfer, in which the student earns at least two semesters' worth of credits before moving to the four-year college, produces high bachelor's degree completion rates.
- The mean elapsed time to complete a bachelor's degree for this cohort was 4.72 *calendar* years, or 5 full academic years. For students with strong pre-college academic resources, the mean time was 4.5 calendar years. For students who were continuously enrolled it was 4.33 calendar years.

who were continuously enrolled, it was 4.55 calendar years.

- Thirty-nine percent of four-year college students who were assigned to remedial reading courses completed bachelor's degrees, compared with 60 percent of students who took only one or two mathematics remedial courses, and 69 percent of those who were not subject to remediation at all.

Table 12: Persistence: Percent of College Entrants who "Persisted" by Credits Earned in the First Year, Number of Remedial Courses, and Degree Completion.

Credits Earned:	<u>0-12</u>	<u>13-19</u>	<u>20-28</u>	<u>>28</u>	<u>% of All:</u>
<u>ALL</u>	8%	9%	31%	52%	
By Number of Remedial Courses					
None		5	29	62	49
One	8	8	31	53	22
Two	12	13	34	41	12
Three or More	14	19	37	30	18
By Highest Degree Earned					
None	19	20	36	24	30
Associate		10	26	56	11
Bachelor's or Higher	2*	4	29	65	60

SOURCE: National Center for Education Statistics: High School & Beyond/Sophomore cohort, CD #98-135.

Three out of ten "persisters" arrived at "year 2" of their college careers with a good deal less than what one would "sophomore standing": either less than 20 credits and/or three or more remedial courses. They may have "persisted," but their chances of completing a degree (associate or bachelor) are rather low.

- Students who attend four-year colleges and who earned fewer than 20 credits in their first calendar year of postsecondary experience severely affect their chances of completing a bachelor's degree.
- Of the nearly 60 percent of undergraduates who attend more than one institution, 40 percent do not complete degrees.

Table 13: A Profile of Transfer Students Attending More Than One College by Institutional Characteristics.

	Number of Undergraduate Institutions			% Earning Bachelor's
	<u>One</u>	<u>Two</u>	<u>Three+</u>	
All who earned >10 credits	47	35	18	45
Type of First Institution				

Research	44	36	20	74
Comprehensive	49	32	19	59
Liberal Arts	43	38	19	73
Community College	46	34	20	20

Selectivity of First Institution

Highly Selective	51	31	18	92
Selective	44	36	20	85
Non-Selective	44	36	20	65
Open Door	56	28	16	7

Institutional Combinations

4-year only	56	31	13	75
4-year to 2-year	--	71	29	--
2-year to 4-year	--	63	37	66
Alternating/Simultaneous	--	30	70	52
2-year only	75	18	7	--

SOURCE: National Center for Education Statistics: High School & Beyond/Sophomore cohort, NCES CD#98-135.

- Because the academic intensity and quality of one's high school curriculum is a dominant determinant of degree completion and test scores, high school grade point average, or class rank are weaker contributors, college admissions formulas that emphasize test scores and (especially) high school grade point average or class rank are less predictive of college graduation success.
- The type and amount of remediation matters in relation to degree completion. State and local policy that does not reinforce early remediation, or eliminates the amount of remedial work can damage degree completion rates.
- "Persistence" defined in temporal terms, e.g. from the 1st to 2nd year of college, is not a significant predictor of college graduation. Transcripts reveal an enormous range in the *quality* of arrival at the 2nd year. Approximately 30 percent of those who were "retained" or "persisted" arrived with either less than 20 credits or 3 or more remedial courses.
- "Part-time" enrollment needs re-examination when measuring college graduation. Students change enrollment status within a given term, by dropping, withdrawing from, or leaving incomplete large portions of their credit loads. The "DWI Index" (ratio of drops/withdrawals/incompletes to total courses attempted) derived from transcript records is far more important than registration status.

Table 14: Percent of Students who Dropped, Withdrew, or Left Incomplete Attempted Undergraduate Courses, by Highest Degree Earned (DWI=Drops, Withdrawals & Incompletes)

Proportion of All Attempted Courses that Became DWIs:	<u><10%</u>	<u>10-20%</u>	<u>>20%</u>
---	----------------	---------------	----------------

For ALL Students:	62	15	23
--------------------------	----	----	----

Highest Degree Earned:

None	48	14	38
Associate's	64	20	16
Bachelor's	78	15	7
Graduate	88	10	3

SOURCE: National Center for Education Statistics: High School & Beyond/Sophomore cohort, NCES CD#98-135.

- The definition of academic intensity and quality of high school curriculum includes coursework in six academic areas; highest level of mathematics studied, remedial work in English and math, and advanced placement.
- The classic form of community college to four-year college transfer only partially describes a larger multi-institutional attendance pattern. Transfer has been replaced by what one might call "portfolio building," accruing credits that are applied to graduation requirements. This pattern potentially will increase as on-line courses become available. The classic form of transfer, however, continues to exhibit an extremely effective route to bachelor's degree completion.

Conclusion

The most useful data lie in the relationships between admission standards and college graduation, not descriptive statistics of institutions. The Academic Council are interested in studying the relationships identified in the Adelman national study during the upcoming summer and fall. The proposed study differs slightly from previous CCHE studies in that it will examine and track students. Institutional comparisons will be introduced only after the student college success factors are identified. While institutions may "retain" students, it's *students* who complete degrees, no matter which or how many institutions they attend. The study will examine high school participation patterns as well.

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE)
May 4, 2000
Agenda Item VI, A

TOPIC: REPORT ON OUT-OF-STATE INSTRUCTION

PREPARED BY: ANDREW BRECKEL III

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 Extended 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.

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

ED 589, *Time to Teach* to be delivered in Washington June 9, 2000;

ED 589, *Dysfunctional Behavior Intervention Skills* to be delivered in Montana March 6-8, 2000 and in North Carolina March 29-31, 2000.

ED 589, *Learning Styles: You and Your Students* to be delivered in Hawaii June 28-July 9, 2000;

ED 589, *Costa Rican Journey* to be delivered in Costa Rica June 26-July 7, 2000;

ED 589, *Teaching for the 21st Century* to be delivered in Belize June 19-23, 2000.

ED 559, *Excellence in Teaching* to be delivered in New York April 6-9, 2000.

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

ENG 3900, *London Literature* to be delivered in England July 10-July 22, 2000.

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

College:

EDUC 497, *Teaching for the 21st Century* to be taught in Placencia, Belize June 19-23,2000.

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

Prostate Cancer: Current Strategies and Advancements in Hormonal Treatments to be delivered in Georgia April 28, 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.

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE)
May 4, 2000
Agenda Item VI, B

TOPIC: 2000-2001 COMMISSION MEETING SCHEDULE

PREPARED BY: TIM FOSTER

I. SUMMARY

At the February 3, 2000, meeting the Commission reviewed a proposed meeting schedule for 2000-2001. In scheduling conflicts, the 2000-2001 Commission meeting schedule has been revised.

The Commission will meet eight times during the year for regular meetings and teleconference meetings will be scheduled based upon need. Following is the 2000-2001 meeting schedule for the Colorado Commission on Higher Education.

DATE	LOCATION
July 2000	No meeting
August 17-18, 2000	Retreat
October 5, 2000	campus
November 2, 2000	campus
January 9, 2001 (Tuesday)	Metro area
February 1, 2001	Metro area
March 1, 2001	Metro area
April 5, 2001	Metro area
June 7, 2001	campus
August 2 – 3, 2001	Retreat
October 4, 2001	campus
November 1, 2001	campus
(No meeting in December)	

The locations for the above meetings will be announced after consultation with higher education institutions.

STATUTORY AUTHORITY

C.R.S. 23-1-102(6). The commission shall meet as often as necessary to carry out its duties as defined in this article.