

COLORADO COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

November 2, 2000
Arapahoe Community College
Littleton, Colorado

MINUTES

Commissioners Present:
Raymond Baker; Terrance Farina; Marion Gottesfeld; David Greenberg; Robert Hessler; Peggy Lamm, Vice Chair; R Nagel, Chair; Dean Quamme; James Stewart; and William Vollbracht.

Advisory Committee Present: Senator James Dyer, Representative Keith King, Richard Blade (substitute for Wayne Artis), Tiffany Eberle, and Sandy Hume.

Commission Staff Present: Timothy E. Foster, Executive Director; Jeanne Adkins; Andrew Beckel; JoAnn Evans; Hoffman; Jim Jacobs; Ray Kieft; Sharon Samson; and Kathi Williams.

I. Call to Order

The regular meeting of the Colorado Commission on Higher Education was called to order at 9:20 a.m. in the Half Moon Room at Arapahoe Community College in Littleton, Colorado.

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

II. Reports

A. Chair's Report

The Chair, Commissioner Ralph Nagel, outlined the procedures for this meeting. The meeting began with a presentation to the Commission by Dr. William Chance followed by an opportunity for dialogue between the Commission and Dr. Chance. Two additional meetings were held during the day with Dr. Chance to allow governing board members, representatives of the higher education community and the media an opportunity to discuss the governance report.

Dr. James Williams, President of Arapahoe Community College, welcomed the Commission to the college.

B. Commissioners' Reports

No reports.

C. Advisory Committee Reports

No reports.

D. Public Comment

No comments.

III. Special Presentation

A. Governance Study Conducted by NORED

Dr. William Chance, executive director of the Northwest Regional Education Center (NORED) of Olympia, Washi presented the final Higher Education Governance in Colorado Report. The final report is a culmination of statewide meetings with the public, legislators, governing board members, institutional representatives, and students to receive the input on Colorado public higher education . The team held more than sixty meetings around the state, including ten regional public meetings. The final report is available on the NORED web page as well as on the CCHS web page.

regional public meetings. The final report is available on the NORED web page as well as on the CCHE web page.

The consultant team was asked to:

- Examine the existing higher education governance structure, including costs of governance
- Examine the higher education governance arrangements of other states

The major findings of the report indicate:

- Need to increase capacity for change and adaptation
- Need to improve access and service, and
- Need to improve trust and confidence

The NORED report included the following recommendations:

1. Establish the Colorado Compact Colleges and Universities program
 - a. Start with six compact institutions, monitor and assess success
 - b. Separate compact oversight boards
 - c. CCHE review of state procedural requirements
2. Increased responsiveness through structural realignments
 - a. CCHE review of statutory missions
 - b. Emphasis on "higher education providers"
 - c. Adams State College, Mesa State College and Western State College become CSU system partners
 - d. University of Southern Colorado renamed CSU-Southern
 - e. Metropolitan State College of Denver governed by an independent board and renamed "Metropolitan State University of Denver"
 - f. Fort Lewis College governed by an independent board
 - g. University of Colorado at Colorado Springs emphasis on Colorado Springs and Southern Colorado and serve as an alternative residential university.
 - h. Phase out the State College trustees
 - i. Change the name of the State Board of Agriculture and divide the CEO position
 - j. Provide upper-division programs through some regional community colleges
 - k. Rename junior colleges as community colleges
3. Take actions to improve collaboration and build confidence
 - a. Clarify the mission of institutions of the Auraria Higher Education Center
 - b. Study area vocational schools
 - c. Establish an Inter-Institutional Council
 - d. Study common course numbering
 - e. conduct higher education meetings and forums to build trust
 - f. Conduct a comprehensive cost and expenditures study
 - g. Consider TABOR amendment adjustments
 - h. Reconsider elected Board of Regents

The Commission accepted the report as presented, however, the Chair clarified that the report was not presented Commission to approve. Rather it is a basis to react to. Out of it will come items for additional studies. The report is accepted as a conversation piece for the Colorado higher education community.

Commissioner Farina asked Dr. Chance to elaborate on the recommendation that Fort Lewis College be moved from the CSU System and operate under an independent governing board. Since Fort Lewis is located in a remote rural area, that may be a good recommendation for that institution, then why not apply that same principle to the other rural four institutions? Dr. Chance responded that there currently are service inequities around the state in providing access to education in rural communities. Higher education is a crucial element of economic development and the issues are n complex than just an access issue. Dr. Chance suggested that Fort Lewis might be able to operate as a compact campus

with an independent board.

The Commission wanted to know how the consultants arrived at the recommendation for six charter colleges. Dr. Chance responded that six is a reasonable and manageable number to begin with. If the charter colleges are successful, then try more. He said that the issues of compact campuses within multi-campus governing boards would be difficult. The charter college concept is new in higher education and few states have tried them. The state of Virginia started with five and is using the incremental approach. He recommended that Colorado not start with a flagship institution as a compact college. The compact idea can also work with the enterprise link.

Continuing with the discussion about Fort Lewis College's governance structure, Commissioner Hessler asked why the study group did not also recommend removing the University of Southern Colorado (USC) from the CSU system. Dr. Chance replied that USC is more comfortable in the CSU system than Fort Lewis is, however, the USC name does not identify it well within the system.

Advisory Committee member Representative Jim Dyer said that the Fort Lewis Foundation voted to separate Fort Lewis from the CSU System. Representatives Dyer and Mark Larson are in the process of drafting legislation to give Fort Lewis an independent board. The draft legislation will be made available to the Commission.

Advisory Committee member Representative Keith King is very interested in the recommendation to establish an inter-institutional transfer advisory council. Dr. Chance suggested that the transfer advisory council be patterned after those in other states and consist of institutional registrars, meet on a regular basis, monitor articulation, and make recommendations to the state. Dr. Chance also suggests that Colorado look into common course numbering. He said colleges and faculty will not be comfortable discussing this and it will create a great deal of tension and pressure. Florida took the lead in common course numbering and it has solved transfer issues. He encouraged the Commission to pursue it.

III. Consent Items

A. Proposal to Offer a Master of Science and a Doctor of Philosophy in Environmental Studies at the University of Colorado at Boulder

The Regents of the University of Colorado requested Commission approval to offer Master of Science (M.S.) and Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) degrees in Environmental Studies at the University of Colorado at Boulder (UCB). These graduate programs are designed to "educate students at the professional level" in Environmental Studies, and to complement UCB's large undergraduate program in that field.

Staff Recommendation

That the Commission approve the request of the Regents of the University of Colorado to offer a Master of Science and Doctor of Philosophy in Environmental Studies at the University of Colorado at Boulder.

B. Approval of New Teacher Education Proposals

1. Proposal for Early Childhood Teacher Education Authorization – Colorado State University

The State Board of Agriculture requested the Commission's approval of Early Childhood teacher education authorization for Colorado State University's *Human Development* degree program.

Staff Recommendation

That the Commission grant Early Childhood Education authorization to Colorado State University for its Human Development B.S. degree program. Authorization is effective immediately with the understanding that Colorado State University will adopt and implement a liberal arts assessment test to measure the general education and content knowledge of students seeking Early Childhood licensure.

2. Proposal for Early Childhood Teacher Education Authorization – University of Northern Colorado

The UNC Trustees requested the Commission's approval of Early Childhood teacher education authorization for University

of Northern Colorado's Interdisciplinary Studies, B.A. degree program. The proposed program meets CCHE standards in content, assessment and field experience. A notable component is the assessment plan for this program. Supporting its commitment to student assessment, the Trustees of the University of Northern Colorado have adopted the ETS Profile as its sophomore exam and will be testing the liberal arts knowledge of all students.

Staff Recommendation

That the Commission grant Early Childhood Education authorization to the University of Northern Colorado Interdisciplinary Studies, B.A. degree program. Authorization is effective immediately.

3. Proposal to Offer a Bachelor of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies/Liberal Arts at Western State College

The Trustees of The State Colleges in Colorado requested Commission approval to offer a Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) degree in Interdisciplinary Studies/Liberal Arts at Western State College (WSC) and teacher education authorization in elementary education and special education for this program.

Staff Recommendation

That the Commission approve the request of the Trustees of The State Colleges of Colorado to offer a Bachelor of Arts in *Interdisciplinary Studies/Liberal Arts* at Western State College.

C. Application for Participation in State-Funded Student Assistance Program

The Commission is directed by statute to establish the eligibility guidelines and determine the institutions eligible for participation in the Colorado student aid program. After reviewing the application and supporting material, the *Institute of Business and Medical Careers, Inc.* met CCHE's guidelines for initial participation.

Staff Recommendation

That the Commission accepts the Institute of Business & Medical Careers as an eligible institution for participation Colorado's state-funded financial aid programs beginning fiscal year 2001-02.

D. Bishop-Lehr Program Plan Review

The University of Northern Colorado (UNC) in 1999 submitted a request to remodel Michener Library and in conjunction construct a new academic building to house the programs currently operating in the basement of the library. That proposal was not approved by the Commission for full funding, but recommended as a pilot project. This proposal is the replacement proposal following the pilot project program review.

Staff Recommendation

CCHE staff recommends the Commission approve the Program Plan for the Bishop-Lehr renovation and forward the approval to the Joint Budget Committee and the Capital Development Committee as a continuation project replacing the New Academic Building at UNC. The program plan submission is consistent with:

1. The statutory role and mission for University of Northern Colorado as stated in C.R.S. 23-40-101;
2. The University of Northern Colorado Master Plan – that CCHE approved 6/6/82;
3. The applicable CCHE space utilization policies and criteria, as adopted in 1999;
4. The approval of the board of review (6/99); and
5. The Institutional 5-Year Capital Improvements Program Schedule for 1999-00 through 2004-2005.

Action

Commissioner Greenberg moved approval of the staff recommendation for above five consent items. Commissioner seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

V. Action Items

- A. Capital Construction Program: Director of Funding for FY 2001-2002 Capital Construction Requests

A. Capital Construction Program Priority of Funding for FY 2001-2002 Capital Construction Requests

Ms. Jeanne Adkins reported that on Friday, October 20, 2000, the Capital Assets Subcommittee met with institutional representatives to review the preliminary project list and discuss staff recommendations. The subcommittee and CCHE staff have reviewed 19 state-funded project requests for FY 2001-2002. Three additional projects related to the relocation of the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center and the annual allocation of capital funding to the Fitzsimons Trust Fund have been reviewed but action on those projects awaits completion of the December Urban Land Institute project review. Review steps included staff review of program plans, some site visits to campuses and staff questions submitted to institutions address any outstanding issues.

The first priority for funding in the FY01-02 budget year is projects that received either architectural and engineering funding in the FY00-01 budget year or funding for a construction phase in the current fiscal year.

A second group of projects continues the pilot program and recommends the general assembly consider funding a restricted architectural and engineering appropriation for the Ute Indian Museum project. Remaining projects reflect program changes and new facility needs and technology integration and upgrades for various institutions.

The staff recommendation reflects the subcommittee's recommendation. The project list approved by the Commission will be referred to the General Assembly's Capital Development Committee. The Urban Land Institute will review the Fitzsimons project at a meeting to be held December 4, 2000.

Commissioner Baker, chair of the Capital Assets Subcommittee, asked that the full Commission be advised of any substantial change in funding for any of the projects.

Chair Nagel asked if the technology projects were on hold. Ms. Adkins said staff addressed the technology issue in terms of the technology master plans. Updated technology plans are not on file for the institutions and the statute is vague requirement. CCHE policy does not require a technology plan. Staff recommended a hold on the Arapahoe Community College project because it did not include a technology plan.

Chair Nagel asked the Commission if it wants to consider a resolution requiring a technology master plan for capital construction projects. Commissioner Farina suggested that the technology plan be allowed to develop. Staff will begin with the technology plan then provide a recommendation in that area.

Representative Keith King asked if the Commission was aware of the implication of the passage of proposed Amendments 23 and 24 would have on higher education capital construction projects. Ms. Adkins responded that OSPB has provided information on the potential impact on capital projects would be limited. Continuation projects are not affected except for those that have not begun construction. The passage of one or both initiatives would significantly restrict or eliminate funding for capital construction new projects.

Action on this item was postponed until after the facility master plans discussion since master plans are required to be in place in order to approve capital construction projects. Ms. Adkins stated that all higher education institutions had opportunity to respond with staff to the prioritization recommendations. The institutions understand the reasons recommendations did not go forward on the plans. The Commission asked whether the postponement of the UCB master plan impacted any items in the prioritization list and Ms. Adkins responded that since the plan will move forward in January 2001. If the plan does not move forward in January, the UCB technology plan will not have an approved master plan. However, the Commission has the option to recommend it to the legislature.

Staff Recommendation

1. Commission staff recommend the approval of the attached draft prioritization list (Agenda Attachment 1) and referral of the prioritized list to the legislative Capital Development Committee, Joint Budget Committee and the Office of State Planning and Budgeting as required in C.R.S. 23-1-107 (7) (a).
2. Commission staff in conjunction with the Capital Subcommittee recommends the legislature consider allocating 8% of the anticipated project architectural and design fees toward the Ute Museum project and restricting the remainder of the funding until the Colorado History Museum completes the relevant conceptual design and program planning for the project.
3. Commission staff recommends that the Goodenough Hall project concept paper be denied for the Colorado School of

3. Commission staff recommends that the Colbaugh Hall project concept paper be denied for the Colorado School of Mines.
4. Commission staff recommends the Aurora Community College technology plan and the Green Center Basement Renovation (CSM) remain on hold until further information is provided and suggests the Commission delegate authority to remove the project from the hold list and submit them within the priority list to the Commission Capital Assets Subcommittee.

Action:

Commissioner Stewart moved the approval of the staff recommendation. Commissioner Farina seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

B. Cash-Funded Capital Project Requests for FY 2001-2002

Ms. Adkins reported that the Commission is charged by the General Assembly in C.R.S. 23-1-106 and 107 with review and approval of cash-projects. The Commission, however, is not asked to prioritize cash-funded capital projects. Some cash-funded project reviews for the current funding cycle have not been completed and further information has been requested of several institutions. To avoid delaying the submission of the cash-funded project list, staff suggest that the Subcommittee on Capital Assets be delegated authority to act on the Commission's behalf as the project reviews are completed to ensure immediate referral of the projects to the Capital Development Committee for consideration.

The Capital Assets Subcommittee is made up of five commissioners however, all commissioners are invited to sit in on the subcommittee. Commissioner Baker stated that it is important to quantify the percentage of the cash-funded projects. I agree with the staff recommendation with the specification that governing boards are made aware of the final decisions.

Staff Recommendation

That the Commission delegate approval of the cash-funded capital construction projects to the Capital Assets Subcommittee for referral to the legislative Capital Development Committee, Joint Budget Committee, and the Office of State Planning and Budgeting as required in C.R.S. 23-1-106 and 107.

Action:

Commissioner Hessler moved approval of the staff recommendation with the reservation that the information be made available to the full Commission. Commissioner Quamme seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

C. Facilities Master Plans:

1. University of Colorado at Boulder Facilities Master Plan

The University of Colorado at Boulder Facility Master Plan was presented for Commission review by Chancellor Riel Byyny at the October 5, 2000, Commission meeting. By statute, the Commission must determine whether the master plan as submitted is adequate and should be the basis for future expansion and renovation of the Boulder campus. The institution was asked to address several broad questions raised by Commissioners at the October meeting in writing for review prior to the November meeting. The responses to those questions were included in the agenda.

Ms. Adkins presented the historical background for the University of Colorado at Boulder facilities master plan. General master plans are required to be reviewed by the CCHE staff to determine if the academic and the facilities master plans are going down the same track, assure that student based needs are met, assure that the capital investment addresses the academic, faculty, staff and student needs, as well as address the role and mission, student demographics, UCB acreage land mass demographics, employee and revenues demographics.

The staff analysis took the 1990 master plan and looked at how the plan was met and how the 2000 plan updates and builds on those goals. CCHE staff raised the following concerns with the proposed master plan:

- The 1990 building program was significantly greater than what actually achieved.
- The 2000 plan did not include an updated campus inventory.

- The capital project list needs to show the status of projects authorized, in construction, and those nearing completion.
- Of the projects not yet authorized (55%) new space equates to 28 percent and renovated space equates to 27 percent (academic space).
- East campus is significant undeveloped space.
- The plan does not fully evaluate east campus space use to accommodate variety of uses.
- The basic plan premise is that existing academic and service facilities is inadequate to meet needs but does not provide sufficient evidence.
- The enrollment issue is that the University anticipates a 7.2 percent growth in line with historic trends but assumes all programs grow equally and does not relate growth to specific programs.
- Housing issues indicate there is insufficient space on campus for current freshmen. Three years of the housing plan have gone by and there is nothing in the pipeline to meet the plan. The plan indicates that freshman class must grow but with current lack of freshman housing unclear how UCB will meet the need for student housing.
- The plan does not integrate technology planning with facility needs. Will all central scheduled classrooms be smart classrooms?
- External community raised concerns on the development of south campus. The master plan proposes that the south campus will be fully developed, but the plan does not delineate. That development should be put on hold to the due diligence in terms of addressing the hazard.
- There was an investment in athletic facilities in 1990 and are now to be redone in the new facilities.

Dr. Elizabeth Hoffman, President of the University of Colorado System and Dr. Richard Byyny, Chancellor of the University of Colorado at Boulder addressed the Commission. Dr. Hoffman thanked the Commission for its support development of the campus master plans. The conditions upon which the approvals are placed are reasonable.

She responded to the staff concerns. Regarding size, the enrollment projections are very modest at 7 percent per year growth. The enrollment projections are below their peer institutions. In 1996 the UCB acquired the south campus property to serve the needs of future students at UCB. The institution and the Regents have developed short-term uses for the property, which includes athletics, pedestrian bike, and cross-country trails. The costs of those activities will be borne private funds. All references to the long-term development of the property could be deleted from the master plan at this time and addressed in the future. She said that through the life of this master plan UCB would only put in recreational fields and will address the flood issue. The intent of the University is not to develop permanent structures on the south campus. In addition, the University is very close to finalizing an agreement with the city of Boulder on the Grandview property. Once the agreement is complete the University will bring back to the Commission any future projects consistent with the agreement.

Chancellor Byyny discussed the Williams Village housing issue. The Regents and the city of Boulder have all agreed develop student housing. To advance the freshman housing will be done at the expense of upper division and graduate student housing. It is a cash-funded project and the University is working on the financing plan. The current timetable provide an additional 500 beds by 2003. The mediation between the University, the city of Boulder, and the principal Grandview has reached agreement, with details to be worked out. The agreement must be reviewed by governing bodies. The University will submit an amendment to the master plan as it relates to Grandview.

Commissioner Greenberg asked for a clarification on the anticipated enrollment growth and Dr. Byyny explained that anticipated growth is 1,800 students. Commissioner Lamm wanted to know if the National Preservation Act for demolition of Grandview property would penalize the University in any way. Dr. Byyny responded that their legal opinion is that since no federal funds are being used in the building there would not be a penalty.

The Commissioners raised questions about enrollment management at UCB. Dr. Hoffman responded that students would be encouraged to attend UCCS. UCCS has been designated by the Regents as the growth campus. Both institutions are enrollment management and both looking at different projected growth rate. Dr. Byyny stated that enrollment management is difficult to project, however the university has a system. It is possible that Boulder could increase its admission criteria as an enrollment management tool.

Commissioner Hessler asked how much money the University Foundation raised in the last year and how many years does it take to raise the amount necessary to fulfill the commitments in the master plan and the Health Science Center projects. Dr. Hoffman responded that the Foundation raised \$113 million this year and is 60 percent above its goal in fund raising this time to meet the planning for the next five years. In addition, the University Foundation is ahead of schedule in the fund raising timeline for Etzheim.

FUND RAISING TIMELINE FOR FIZSIMMONS.

Commissioner Hessler raised the issues of balance between graduate and undergraduate enrollment. Dr. Byyny responde that it is too low and a task force is working on issues of graduate student enrollment. That task force has recomm enrollment management of all graduate programs, dedicated graduate admissions officers, performance measures, ar attention to financial assistance.

Commissioner Vollbracht requested an overview of all capital and fund raising needs of all the University campuses Hoffman will provide additional information on the overall requirements and how they plan to meet them.

Dr. Hoffman stated that in light of all the questions raised by the Commission on behalf of the University she requested delay in Commission action on the UCB master plan until the next meeting to provide the University adequate time t respond to Commission and staff concerns. Commissioner Greenberg requested that when the University responds it includes a strategy articulating how the master plan will make this the greatest university in the universe. Provide the motives and assumptions of the University.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends conditional approval of the UCB Campus Master Plan 2000 based on the following conditions:

1. That UCB provide a class utilization review based on actual classroom/lab space available and used for that purpose both within its centrally-scheduled classroom system and its departmentally scheduled academic/lab system within a six-month timeframe to CCHE. This project should be done in conjunction with the building inventory directed jointly by the Regents and the Commission at the October 2000 meeting as a condition of approval for the Center for Visualization.
2. That UCB provide the previously requested assessment of the centrally scheduled classroom pool and its reduction and growth over no less than the past five-year period within 60 days.
3. That UCB resubmit its project list in a prioritized format and by function to indicate how the top priorities in each category would be integrated if the decisions were made today and to reflect the deletion of the Science Library agreed to in the Law School approval and the center renovations also to be incorporated in the Fleming remodel.
4. That UCB be allowed to proceed with planning and construction on the Grandview property, but that no projects be approved for the property until a more detailed assessment of density issues and corresponding traffic and parking solutions is presented.
5. That the Commission deny approval of the UCB intention to fully develop the South Campus and that no projects be approved in this area. Staff recommends the Commission maintain flexibility and be open to future re-evaluation of this option, but does not want plan approval to de facto imply all possible uses are appropriate for the property or that any uses are appropriate. Information provided in the plan is insufficient to substantiate development for any purpose.
6. That the institution provide an updated examination of its building inventory condition, incorporating projects completed since it was implemented in 1985 and the impact on the backlog, the institutional investment (historic and projected), the annual controlled maintenance investment and future projections for allocations, and alternate solutions to safeguard the historic and non-historic facilities.
7. That no new projects be approved until the institution addresses the housing issues it raises in the plan and provides a timetable for resolution. Continued deferment is not an option in staff's view.
8. That cash-funded projects, including athletic facilities, be prioritized by the institution and evaluated in some context within a plan amendment.

Action:

The University of Colorado System represented by Dr. Elizabeth Hoffman withdrew the University of Colorado at F facilities master plan until the January 2001 meeting. No action was taken at this meeting.

2. University of Colorado at Colorado Springs Master Plan

The University of Colorado at Colorado Springs Master Plan 2000, submitted to CCHE this spring, replaces the last mas plan approved in 1994. This new master plan assumes student headcount will grow from a 1999-2000 headcount of 6,615 to 10,000. The master plan does not project when the headcount will reach 10,000. The master plan states that if th

headcount grows by 2.16% compounded annually, the campus will have that headcount enrollment by 2016. Ms. Jean Adkins presented an overview of the master plan and outlined the key issue and Gail Hoffman outlined the staff analysis of the UCCS master plan.

In the past five years, the University has nearly doubled its facility gross square footage, from 440,000 GSF to 770,000 GSF. The master plan includes a preliminary Five-Year Capital Construction and Financing Plan for the campus for Fiscal Year 2001-2002 through Fiscal Year 2004-2005 to meet enrollment and program needs. That capital construction plan outlines a building program that would add more than 107,368 assignable square feet of new space at a cost of \$63,846,109 and renovate an additional 210,145 assignable square feet at a cost of \$53,901,000.

Dr. Elizabeth Hoffman, President of the University of Colorado System, presented an overview of the UCCS facility master plan. She stated that she is pleased that the NORED Report recommendation that UCCS should remain a full-fledged branch of the University of Colorado System. The master plan will allow UCCS to continue to meet the needs of the Colorado Springs area and continue to serve the needs of southern Colorado. UCCS is committed to collaborative efforts on research as recommended by CCHE staff.

Chancellor Bunnell Shade, Chancellor of UCCS, stated she expects an increased demand from students at UCCS. She explained that the institution based the proposed master plan on an enrollment growth to 10,000 students. In 1998-99 UCCS turned away students because of lack of financial aid. She thanked executive director Foster for redirecting financial aid to the institution to help meet the demand. Headcount enrollment has increased by 15% headcount, and retention continues to improve. Future demand is optimistic because Colorado Springs is the 17th fastest growing city in the U.S. Student centered and community focused is their goal. Student housing will be a partnership with the private sector. UCCS has no aspirations to become a comprehensive research institution such as UC Boulder. The land and topography do not lend themselves to providing parking. As the campus moves west and the internal road structure is developed, parking issues will be addressed. The shuttle service will also assist the parking issues.

She stated that the local community has been involved in the development of the master plan. The academic master plan is integral to the facility master planning. It focuses on the educational needs of southern Colorado. She does not anticipate adding new academic programs and the institution will focus on the comprehensive programs it currently offers and will not build facilities for programs that are not currently offered.

The Colorado Springs Chamber of Commerce presented a resolution from the Colorado Springs City Council in support of the UCCS academic master plan.

Carolyn Hyme, president of Eagle Rock residential community, reported that the community was involved in the UCCS master planning process and would like to continue to be involved. She requested an addendum to the UCCS master plan to state that "UCCS will make its best efforts to meet or exceed county codes for building heights and boundary setbacks. The institution will also try to minimize the impact to that neighborhood in terms of noise, views, lighting, traffic and dust."

Commissioner Lamm appreciated the way the UCCS put together the master plan. She asked Chancellor Bunnell Shade when the institution reached the 10,000-student point, will the institution limit enrollment by increasing admission requirements. Dr. Bunnell Shade responded that the institution has an obligation to guarantee access to Colorado Springs residents. If standards are raised too high, that may limit access. The average admission index at UCCS is 104. Students who don't meet the admission standard are referred to Pikes Peak Community College or other institutions in the area.

Commissioner Gottesfeld inquired about the transfer rate of students into UCCS. Vice Chancellor Schockly reported that Pikes Peak Community College is the largest feeder institution to UCCS, with 165 students in fall 2000 of which 45 percent holding an AAS degree. The transfer program included students from all other community colleges and the transfer students are doing very well. One half of UCCS transfer students are military related and come from other states, and do not do as well as Colorado transfer students.

Chancellor Bunnell Shade said that a peer institution of UCCS would be the University of California at Irvine with its focus of serving the high tech corridor or perhaps the University of Central Florida in Orlando.

Commissioner Nagel suggested that the best long-term solution for parking at UCCS may be to build a parking structure because of the limited amount of space and it would be the lowest cost with respect to the cost of land. This would require the system to make an investment for the campus to work. Chancellor Bunnell Shade responded that the system is v

sensitive to keep it affordable for students. The CU system will study the issue further. Dr. Hoffman said that the CU system has taken steps to advance the UCCS campus.

Commissioner Hessler congratulated UCCS for the great effort of merging community and institutional needs into the master plan. Commissioner Hessler moved to approve the master plan, Gottesfeld seconded.

Staff Recommendation

After analysis of the master plan submitted by the University of Southern Colorado, staff recommends the Commission approve the master plan with the following conditions:

1. That the institution file with CCHE upon completion of the significant construction projects and renovation projects already under way on the campus an updated inventory list and facility report.
2. That UCCS reassess its space use and needs beginning with its existing usage figures and average classroom occupancy rather than the model included in the master plan.
3. That the CU System should reassess the research funding projected at all of its institutions to reflect a system-wide approach to planning and constructing research space.
4. That the institution pursue one or more of its proposed parking strategies prior to additional construction requests.

Action:

Commissioner Stewart moved approval of the staff recommendation and the Eagle Rock Community that "UCCS will make its best efforts to meet or exceed county codes for building heights and boundary setbacks. The institution will also try to minimize the impact to that neighborhood in terms of noise, views, lighting, traffic and dust." Commissioner seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

VI. Items for Discussion and Possible Action

None

VII. Written Reports for Possible Discussion

A. FTE 2001 Tuition and Fee Survey

The Commission accepted the *FTE 2001 Tuition and Fee Survey report*.

B. Tuition Pricing and Participation Study

The Commission accepted the *Tuition Pricing and Participation Study*.

C. Final FTE Student Enrollment Report, FY 2000

The Commission accepted the *Final FTE Student Enrollment Report, FY 2000*

D. Distance Education Taskforce Report

The Commission accepted the *Distance Education Taskforce Report*.

Action:

Commissioner Greenberg moved adjournment of the meeting. Commissioner Hessler seconded the motion and the adjourned at 12:35 pm.