

COLORADO COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

October 5, 2000
Higher Education Advanced Technology Center
Denver, Colorado

MINUTES

Commissioners Present: Raymond T. Baker; Terrance L. Farina; David Greenberg; Robert A. Hessler; Peggy Lamm; Ralph Nagel, Chair; James Stewart; and William B. Vollbracht.

Advisory Committee Present: Wayne Artis, Tiffany Eberle, Representative Keith King, and Sandy Hume.

Commission Staff Present: Timothy E. Foster, Executive Director; Jeanne Adkins; JoAnn Evans; Laureen Farris; Gary Hoffman; James Jacobs; Raymond Keith; and Sharon Samson.

I. Call to Order

The regular meeting of the Colorado Commission on Higher Education was called to order at 9:18 a.m. in the Higher Education Advanced Technology Center at Lowry in Denver, Colorado.

Action: Commissioner Lamm made a correction to the minutes of August 17, 2000, page 30. The motion was amended, then adopted. Commissioner Baker moved approval of the minutes of the August 9, 2000, teleconference meeting and August 17, 2000, special Commission meeting, as amended. Commissioner Vollbracht seconded the motion, and the motion carried unanimously.

II. Reports

A. Chair's Report

The Chair, Commissioner Ralph Nagel, reported that Commissioner Marion Gottesfeld was excused absent.

Chair Nagel outlined the format of the agenda for this meeting. "Written Report for Possible Discussion," VI, A. G Opportunity Scholarship Report and B. Statewide Diversity Report were presentations and were presented following the Action Items IV, A and B. "Items for Discussion and Possible Action," V, A (1). University of Southern Colorado Facility Master Plan and 2. University of Colorado at Boulder Facility Master Plan were discussed after all other agenda items addressed.

Regarding the "Consent Items" Commissioner Hessler reported that he received complaints that some institutions didn't have an opportunity to review item III, A, New Policy on Review of Leases for Any Purpose. Commissioner Hessler wanted to know if the Commission should delay action on the lease policy to allow institutions additional time to review the policy. Jeanne Adkins responded that the lease policy had been discussed with institutional representatives in April and the policy was available on the CCHE web page a week ago. However, the policy was not mailed to institutions. The threshold is to be revised to adhere to statute and statute requires a policy. The implementation date of the policy is November 15 and if action is delayed until November, the Commission must change the implementation date.

Action:

Commissioner Hessler made a motion to move Consent Item III, A from consent to an Action Item and Commissioner Far asked to move Consent Item III, F to an Action Item to allow institutions to comment on these two items. It was the consensus of the Commission to make the above changes to the agenda format.

B. Commissioners' Reports

No reports (see Commissioner Hessler's comments above).

C. Advisory Committee Reports

Wayne Artis wanted to clarify the date of the Faculty-to-Faculty Conference. Executive Director Foster reported that the 14th

Annual Faculty-to-Faculty Conference will be held November 17, 2000, at the Denver Hilton South Hotel located in Greenwood Village.

D. Public Comment

No comments at this time.

III. Consent Items

B. Advanced Technology Fund Policy, Priorities and Selection Criteria

C. Auraria Tivoli Theater Project

D. Auraria Higher Education Center, Regional Transportation District and City and County of Denver Land Exchanges, Easements, Light Rail Station Construction, Parking Lot and Street Improvements, Reprographics Demolition and Reconstruction and Land Purchase

E. Adams State College – School of Business Addition and Remodel

G. University of Colorado Health Sciences Center Fitzsimons Land Conveyance

Action: Commissioner Hessler made a motion to approve Consent Items B, C, D, E, and G as presented. Commissioner Greenberg seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

A. New Policy on Review of Leases for any Purpose (Moved to Action Item)

Ms. Gail Hoffman reported that Commission staff recommended approval of a new policy developed in accordance with Colorado statute, C.R.S. 23-1-106 (8), which requires Commission approval of any acquisition of real property conditional upon or requiring expenditures of state-controlled funds or federal funds, whether acquisition is by lease, lease-purchase, purchase, gift, or otherwise, and C.R.S. 23-31-136, requiring review and approval of leases for the State Board of Agriculture. The proposed lease policy was discussed with the Capital Construction Advisory Council which is made up of its representatives in April 2000. The primary staff concern is that statute requires the review of all leases and not hold institutions in leasing space. Policy suggests that all leases be approved by CCHE. The proposed policy would require institutions to submit reports on all leases twice a year to the Commission. The reports, submitted electronically, would be due May 15 and December 15. (Most leases are typically entered into July 1, the beginning of the fiscal year, or January 1 beginning of the calendar year.) She reported that Colorado State University (CSU) requested that reports be submitted in a few weeks, perhaps as early as November 15.

Ms. Adkins reported that CCHE staff met with facilities representatives in April. At that time the representatives were informed that a revised policy needed to be in place in November 2000. At that time it was determined the CCHE must review lease elements in electronic form, and provide biannual reports. If the lease exceeds the threshold amount, the governing board will submit an electronic program plan differentiating the elements that are required in the program plan. The lease form may be electronically submitted to CCHE biannually.

Jim Topping, University of Colorado System representative, reported that this process is a change in policy. The university doesn't have a centralized lease tracking system in place but will set one up. He suggested that institutions be permitted to track leases for one year before officially setting the threshold. Previously, program plans were tracked for instructional off-campus program, but not auxiliary function. The electronic transfer will save paper work but someone still needs to collect the data. He suggested that there be a one-year study to allow campuses to study the frequency and volume of leases.

Executive Director Foster clarified that in terms of capping at \$75,000 equates to the \$500,000 level. Statute requires CCHE to pre-approve all leases. Delaying action on the policy is contrary to the advice from the Attorney General's Office and is not a viable option. He also reported that the policy has been discussed with the Chief Executive Officers.

Commissioner Farina stated if the Commission adopts the policy it could enforce it in a liberal and flexible way and burdensome to the institutions due to the relatively quick adoption.

Staff Recommendation

That the Commission approve the attached policy to replace the section on rental of off-campus spaces that was earlier deleted

from Policy E – Guidelines for Facilities Program Planning. This policy will be in effect for the December 15 reports on leases that will need to be submitted to CCHE.

Action:

Commissioner Farina moved adoption of the staff recommendation per the requirement of the statute with the understanding that if the Commission adopts the policy it could enforce it in a liberal and flexible way and not be burdensome to the institutions due to the relatively quick adoption. Commissioner Vollbracht seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

F. University of Colorado Center for Visualization and Visual Simulation (Moved to Action)

Ms. Adkins reported that the Center for Visualization and Visual Simulation is a cash-funded capital project that is a cooperative arrangement between the University of Colorado at Boulder (UCB) and BP Amoco/Arco. It moves a petro-chemical research from Plano, Texas to the Boulder campus. Since the Boulder master plan indicates a deficit in research lab space and faculty offices, CCHE staff asked for additional information. Subsequently Regent Robb provided additional information. After reviewing the information staff concluded there was no issue with the building and recommended approval of the project. The secondary reason the issue came before the Commission, is that Boulder and CCHE staff had discussed a facility audit. In June 2001, the staffs will make a joint presentation to the Regents and Commission on the issue.

Norwood Robb, Regent of the University of Colorado, stated that this is an extremely important project for the University shares the Commission's concern for the space utilization. An audit of the space utilization of the Boulder campus is appropriate and the University supports the staff recommendations.

Commissioner Lamm asked how this project ranked in the institution's overall importance for total space needs for the campus. Regent Robb responded that after studying this information it was determined that this project was the best utilization for the space. Since the building is ranked as classroom space and since there's a shortage of classroom space, Commissioner Nagel asked if the building should be designated as research space. Regent Robb stated that the location of the building creates a challenge for classroom use. In addition, UCB has a working relationships with CSM and CSU along with corporations for the use of the cave.

Commissioners commended the Regents for their support on the facilities audit.

Chair Nagel invited Dr. Byyny, President of UCB, to comment on the joint review of the facilities. Dr. Byyny stated that the cave project is an outstanding joint project to study visualization and the institution supports the joint facilities review.

Staff Recommendation

1. That the Commission approve the Center for Visualization and Visual Simulation on the Boulder East Campus to accommodate a virtual reality research "cave" jointly operated by UCB and BP Amoco/ARCO. BP Amoco/Arco will provide the \$1,495,000 to renovate the existing building to house the equipment it will also donate and move from Plano, TX.
2. That the Commission endorse Regent Robb's proposal for a joint assessment of reported facility/space usage and actual functions at UCB and staff be directed to work jointly with UCB officials to accomplish this review with a report jointly presented to the Regents and to the Commission in June 2001.

Action:

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

IV. Action Items

A. Performance Funding System for FY 2001-02

Dr. Ray Kieft reported that the performance funding system was initially developed and implemented in 1999. Based upon last year's experiences and drawing upon the suggestions of the various groups and individuals that have assisted CCHE staff during the past several months, a revised and improved performance funding system has been developed. The governing board CEOs, CFOs, and the Quality Indicator Advisory Committee – comprised of both governing board academic officer: institutional research/data staff a faculty representative of the Colorado Faculty Advisory Council and a student

institutional research/data staff, a faculty representative of the Colorado Faculty Advisory Council, and a student representative of the Colorado Student Association – all contributed to the development of the system. The system has the unanimous support of these groups. The performance funding system complies with the statutory directives regarding allocation of general fund based on institutional performance related to statewide expectations and goals as measured by quality indicator system.

Jim Jacobs reported that the Commission approved the budget two months ago. The budget request included the priority decision items and performance funding which includes enrollment increases, inflation for the vet med school and other agencies health sciences center. Of that budget, \$16.8 million is for performance funding. The scoring portion of the performance funding amounts to \$17 million. The overall budget request for higher education governing boards is \$780 million.

Dr. Kieft reported that two major areas of modifications are benchmarks and standards. This year the benchmarks are benchmarked national in scope and are targeted for each individual institution. Recognize and reward performance that exceeds the benchmarks in a phased-in process with bonus points. The governing board CEOs, governing board CFOs, Quality Improvement Advisory Committee, and CCHE staff have agreed on a set of ten performance measures/quality indicators to be used in the performance funding system for FY 2001-02 as outlined in TEN QUALITY INDICATORS, BASE POINTS, AND BENCHMARK POINTS FOR USE IN THE PERFORMANCE FUNDING PROCESS FOR FY 2001-02:

- 1A) four-, five-, and six-year baccalaureate graduation rates (four-year institutions only).
- 1B) three-year graduation rate (two-year institutions only).
- 2) faculty teaching workload.
- 3) freshmen retention in the same institution rate.
- 4A) achievement scores on licensure, professional, graduate school admission, and other examinations taken by baccalaureate seniors and graduates.
- 4B) career and technical graduates employed or continuing their education (two-year institutions only).
- 5) institutional support expenditures per FTE student.
- 6) availability of general education program lower division core courses required of freshmen.

The indicators allow comparison measurements from year to year. The system was developed in cooperation with all institutions, CFAC, and CEOs and expresses the support for the system. Staff recommends approval.

Christine Johnson, representative of the Community College System, commended CCHE for providing an open and helpful process. It is a quality system of accountability.

Wayne Artis, said that the faculty representatives were fully involved in the process which sets a model of how faculty can be involved in decision making.

Staff Recommendation

That the Commission adopt the performance measures and the performance funding process for 2001-02.

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

B. Election of Officers

Commission Bylaws require that the Commission elect a chair and vice-chair to serve for the next year through October 2001.

Staff Recommendation

That the Commission elect a chair and vice-chair to serve through its October 2001 meeting.

Action:

Commissioner Hessler moved for the continuation of Commissioner Ralph Nagel as Chair and nominated Commissioner Peggy Lamm as Vice Chair. Commissioner Greenberg seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

V. Items for Discussion and Possible Action

A. Facilities Master Plans

(1) University of Southern Colorado 2000 Facilities Master Plan

Ms. Jeanne Adkins reported that the University of Southern Colorado (USC) Facilities Master Plan 2000, submitted to CCH this spring, replaces the last master plan approved in 1975. The new master plan was developed with the assumption that full-time equivalent enrollment at the university will grow 1.85 percent from the 1997-1998 FTE enrollment of 3,653 to 4,344 for Phase I (2005-2006). For Phase II (2017-2018), the master plan projects the average annual FTE enrollment growth from Phase I to Phase II of 1.7 percent to reach 5,260. By Phase III (2026-27), the university anticipates FTE enrollment growth will be 6,000 for an average annual growth of 1.23 percent.

Ms. Gail Hoffman made a presentation on the USC Master Plan. She reported that USC student population generally come from southeastern Colorado. The role and mission of USC is polytechnic with moderate admission criteria. CCHE's figures for FTE enrollment show that the university experienced an average enrollment decline of -0.88 from 1990-91 through 1999-2000. Despite this enrollment decline, the institution outlines a need for more than 166,152 square feet of new construction for projected enrollment levels.

It is not clear from the data presented in the master plan if existing space is being used as efficiently as it could be. Classes are often scheduled in rooms too large for the class numbers, a situation the master plan states will be alleviated when enrollments increase. In a student feedback report included in the appendices, more than one student complained that it's difficult to find classes scheduled outside the usual 9 a.m. to 1 p.m. Monday through Thursday window. Overall, the university shows a higher percentage of compliance with CCHE space utilization standards on hours of scheduling than with student stations occupied and, in fact, shows overall classroom space surpluses. The space deficits for the few academic programs needing space might not be as great if classes were offered more hours and more days, or underused buildings were available for programs not usually taught in them.

The focus of the USC master plan is the use of existing facilities and upgrading others with the latest technology and space design (Phase I). Phase II includes additional student housing. Academic programs were divided into three tiers: Tier one - biology, chemistry, computers, information systems, engineering, etc.; Tier two - are considered essential for a baccalaureate e.g., history, math, and technology; Tier three - have low or significantly declining enrollments, e.g., parts and service management, mechanical engineering, and technology.

It appears that the classes are scheduled during prime hours only 9-2. Need better utilization of space. Although student enrollment has been declining, administrative space needs have increased by 17 percent. There was no assessment of information technology impact on teaching. The outdoor facilities issues include the possibility of introducing intercollegiate football at the institution. Staff recommend to defer approval until USC provides the information requested in the recommendation below.

Commissioner Nagel invited testimony from the institution. Dr. David Clark, representative of the Colorado State University System, stated that the CCHE staff have outlined legitimate questions and the CSU System and USC will work with Commission staff to respond to staff concerns. He reported that President Guerrero has been in the process of updating the USC master plan for several years.

Ms. Adkins reported that the master plan process started three years ago. She recommended that action be deferred on the master plan, but allow approval of the HPER project to be considered in this year's priority list. In the future the Commission will not be able to approve facility projects without a valid master plan.

Commissioners expressed their concerns regarding the limited use of classroom space by scheduling classes in the 9-2 tier frame. The Commission also inquired about the extent of the State Board of Agriculture's involvement in reviewing the master plan. Dr. Clark reported that the Board approved the master plan at the May meeting. There was discussion about USC's admissions index and the possibility of integrating USC with UCCS since the state has limited resources and institutions are within 40 minutes of each other. The Commission will be cautious when an institution has declining enrollment, increased student fees and increased facility requests. Perhaps the Commission made a mistake in approving housing at USC. There was also a concern about selling land to an outside developer.

Representative Keith King echoed the Commission's concern of driving student fees up by adding athletic events. There are other avenues to increase enrollment other than by offering athletics.

The Commission expressed its concern that no one from the institution was present to respond to questions about development of the master plan. The enrollment projections do not support the plan. The Commissioners encouraged

development of the master plan. The enrollment projections do not support the plan. The Commissioners encouraged education leaders to develop a vigorous and rigorous plan.

Dr. Clark apologized for not having someone from the institution at this meeting and reported that the State Board of Agriculture will address all of the Commission's concerns at its February meeting.

Staff Recommendation

After analysis of the master plan submitted by the University of Southern Colorado, staff recommends the Commission approval of the master plan and request the institution and the State Board of Agriculture accomplish the following prior further assessment of the plan by the Commission:

1. USC reevaluate its enrollment projections in light of the historic enrollment patterns for the institution in the first phase of the plan.
2. Incorporate the vision of the State Board of Agriculture for the institution within the master plan document and outline its relationship to CSU as the board envisions the partnerships outlined in the plan.
3. USC present an assessment of its technology plan and its impact on its facility plans.
4. USC reevaluate its proposed administrative space needs and reassess the growth of its administrative resources in light of its inability to achieve expected enrollment growth.
5. That given historic performance USC reevaluate its graduate/undergraduate projections, its freshman retention rates and retention projections and its enrollment projections in a 10-year window — not the 20-year window outlined in the two-phase plan — using academic year 99-00 as the base year.
6. That the institution provide the "next step" of the *USC in Transition* assessment, providing CCHE with its vision of how it might re-design its curriculum to meet the needs outlined in that intra-institutional assessment.

Action:

Commissioner Hessler moved to accept the staff recommendation to defer action on the USC Master Plan after the State Board of Agriculture has an opportunity to respond to Commission concerns. Commissioner Baker seconded the motion and noted the legislative intent. Commissioner Farina amended the above motion to specify a time frame that the SBA will respond to the CCHE concerns in time for Commission action at the March 2001 meeting. The motion as amended unanimously.

(2) University of Colorado at Boulder Facility Master Plan

Ms. Jeanne Adkins reported that the Regents of the University of Colorado have submitted the facilities master plan for the University of Colorado at Boulder. The master plan document has been submitted to the Colorado Commission on Higher Education for review and approval. Staff recommendations and review of the master plan will be presented when the University of Colorado-Cororado Springs (UCCS) Master Plan also is submitted as an action item in November 2000. As requested by the Commission, both master plan recommendations will be reviewed simultaneously to allow the Commission to establish a system-wide picture of planning goals for the CU-System, rather than simply focusing on a single institution.

Dr. Richard Byyny, Regent Robert Sievers, Jim Topping, and Paul Tabolt, represented the University of Colorado at Boulder (UCB). Dr. Byyny, Chancellor of the University of Colorado at Boulder outlined the UCB master plan. He said the University's Board of Regents has approved the plan. The master plan process included input from citizens, elected officials, students, and campus forums. The University's strategy for the master plan began in 1998, with several concomitant processes which have all informed constituents, i.e., information technology strategic plan, diversity plan and fund-raising plan. The goals of the institution were to enhance learning and education of students, promote excellence in research and graduate education, nurture diversity, and lead in the use of technology.

Dr. Paul Tabolt, Vice Chancellor for Administration at UCB, outlined the specifics of the proposed UCB master plan. The development of the master plan has been going on for three years and during that time 39% of the proposed master plan projects have been initiated and are in various stages of design. The master plan is made up of four components: academic, housing, athletics and service components. Twenty-seven percent of the academic plan is for renovation of buildings, 28% of the academic plan is for new facilities to meet current and projected enrollment growth. The University currently accommodates 23% of their housing needs. The city of Boulder has also experienced growth which has resulted in limited housing.

Dr. Paul Tabolt outlined the University's major issues to facilitate the approval of the master plan:

1. UCB continues to negotiate in good faith with the city of Boulder on the Grandview Terrace property.
2. CU Boulder south campus for athletic and recreation facilities.
3. Enrollment growth.
4. Housing for students as well as faculty and staff transitions housing.

Dr. Byyny stated that the proposed master plan addresses the needs of existing enrollment and programs. The majority of projects in the plan are auxiliary or cash-funded and only about one-fourth of the funds are anticipated to come from appropriations. The projects support the role and mission of the institution.

Dr. Jim Topping, Associate Vice President at the University of Colorado, outlined the financing aspects of the master plan. He pointed out that in the development of the plans the institutional chancellors, Regents, faculty and staff have been intricately involved. Over the last three years, Regents have reviewed the Boulder plan 6-8 times. All four of the university campuses are integrated in each campus master planning process.

Commissioner Greenberg asked if the institution has considered limiting undergraduate admission at Boulder. He also suggested that UCB consider raising the admission index and continue to maintain its current capacity. Dr. Topping responded that in the past when the institution tried to slow down the growth at UCB and increase enrollment at Colorado Springs and Denver campus they received immense pressure from the legislature and Colorado citizens who complained that students weren't able to get into UCB.

Commissioner Nagel raised questions about admission window. Dr. Byyny responded that all the window provides access to students with strong potential to succeed at UCB and who have other strong attributes, e.g., wonderful musicians. Commissioner Nagel expressed his concern that 47 percent of UCB freshmen are admitted through the window which lowers the admissions index. UCB will verify that admission number.

Regent Sievers added a different perspective to capping the Boulder campus admission. Academic reasons, there are high demands for new fields of study plus a comprehensive array of traditional programs.

Commissioner Hessler strongly supports public-private partnerships for providing student housing. He asked if the University had considered that option. Dr. Byyny responded that he would prefer to provide public housing for students. However, the university can borrow money at a lower rate than private development. In addition, when public land is leased to a private investor, there are extensive zoning restrictions. CU is conducting an analysis of the pros and cons of public/private options.

Commissioner Nagel asked the university system to continue to consider an optimum size for the institution. Location specific campuses may not be quite so necessary as institutions move toward distance learning. Commissioner Nagel asked if the institution would support a study on the impact of linking graduate and undergraduate funding. Dr. Byyny responded that the institution is trying to figure out what the issues are.

Executive Director Foster raised the concern about declining graduate enrollment. Dr. Byyny responded that UCB is in a competitive market for graduate students. The institution is working with all the departments and is continuing to work to find ways to better serve graduate students. Mr. Foster asked if the institution would seek higher general fund for graduate students.

Commissioner Quamme congratulated the institution in its efforts to build consensus in respect to the master plan.

Representative Keith King was curious what the institution is doing in regard to Amendment 23, because if the amendment passes it will restrict the general fund dollars available for higher education capital construction. Higher education leaders are restricted from comment on legislative issues.

Commissioner Lamm suggested that the institution analyze where students live and the impact on Boulder County.

Public Testimony:

Earl McLaughlin, president of Boulder Tomorrow, testified in support of UCB. He said that all of Boulder is not hostile toward the University. The business community supports the efforts of the University to maintain its efforts to be a top research university. He encouraged the Commission to support the University and the UCB master plan. He stated that in general the organization supports the South Boulder campus plan because of the need for additional space for growth.

Ralph Brown, representative of Citizens of Boulder County, testified that the South Boulder campus property is located in

flood plain. In dispute is how significant the flood plan will affect Boulder County. He and his group is opposed to development of the south Boulder campus, recommended that the property be removed from the UCB master plan and insisted that the University take action against building dams in the south Boulder campus.

Dr. Tabolt responded that the flood study is not complete. At this time it is not to the institutions best interest to take a position until the flood study is complete. It is premature to make a decision until due diligence on the environmental, habitat studies are complete.

Commissioner Farina said that it is difficult to respond to hypothetical questions in the middle of the study. The Commission is attempting to gather as many facts as possible to make a decision on the UCB master plan. The Commission wants institution to have as much flexibility as possible while the Commission allocates resources wisely.

Betty Cronic and representatives of the preservation community, combined their comments. The representatives requested that UCB remove the Grandview Terrace project from the UCB master plan. Montley Daken, executive director of Col Preservation Inc., endorsed the recommendation to remove Grandview Terrace from the UCB master plan. Cynthia McLaughlin, representative of Colorado Arts and Crafts Society, supports removing the Grandview Terrace from the UC master plan to respect Colorado's historic preservation interest in the arts and crafts style bungalows.

Allen Bowles, attorney for the City and County of Boulder, reported that there is conflicting information between the University and the city of Boulder. The city did not discourage expansion of Williams Village. There has been an increase 1800 students in two years with no additional housing provided by the university. The riots on the University Hill are problems for the city of Boulder. The city has taken steps to provide additional housing in the city but is concerned the university has not taken sufficient steps toward providing student housing. The city of Boulder has concerns about the Grandview Terrace and South campus plans resulting in transportation, parking and environmental issues. The city welcome the opportunity to discuss these properties further with the university and requested that the Grandview Terrace be remove from the master plan.

Chancellor Byyny reported that the city of Boulder and the university are still in mediation on the Grandview Terrace proje The Commission encourages the parties reach an agreement and report that agreement at the November 2, 2000, Comm meeting.

Regent Sievers asked "should UCB spend tax dollars to invest in historic preservation for property that cannot be use educational purposes?" Executive Director Foster responded that negotiation was recommended. The Commission has directed the university to remove or demolish or to save the bungalows but to negotiate between the city of Boulder a university.

VI. Written Reports for Possible Discussion

A. Governor's Opportunity Scholarship

Mr. Jake Zambrano made an oral presented the Governor's Opportunity Scholarship Report. The Governor's Oppor Scholarship (GOS) was first created in 1999 by Governor Owens and the Colorado Commission on Higher Education to provide access to more of Colorado's low-income students to a postsecondary institution. Students meeting specific criteria were eligible to apply for the GOS along with other means of financial aid. The scholarship provides financial and acad support to low-income students by giving them an opportunity to attend institutions of higher learning. From a polic perspective, the program is designed to change enrollment and graduation patterns and at the same time extend greater economic stability to low-income Coloradans.

All higher education institutions were invited to participate in the GOS program. In fall 1999, 287 students participated program. GOS is a race neutral program. The report indicates that the majority of the GOS recipients were female, ethn diverse, and 97 percent were enrolled at public institutions. A highest percentage of GOS students were enrolled in community colleges, then UNC, State Board of Agriculture institutions, state colleges, and the University of Colorado system.

Retention rates and grade point averages are important indicators in measuring student success and will be tracked | Commission. First semester statistics suggest that GOS students need assistance in maintaining a 2.0 grade point and completing 12 hours. An important goal of the GOS program is to provide assistance for students to not only enroll in institution of higher education but also to provide counseling so that these students complete their program.

The Commissioners were curious why some GOS recipients chose not to return to college. Mr. Zambrano explained that th

were a variety of reasons for the non-returns, and some students did not comply with the program stipulations although institutions provided support systems to help the students succeed especially during their first year on campus. The Commission suggested that the GOS guidelines permit students to choose employment as well as the campus work-study program.

B. Statewide Diversity Report

Dr. Samson reported that under CCHE's Diversity Policy, the Commission annually monitors the state's progress toward access for all its citizens and the governing boards' progress in achieving the institutional access and diversity goals. In October 1999, the Commission accepted the Diversity Plans submitted by the Regents of the University of Colorado, the State Board of Agriculture, the Trustees for The State Colleges of Colorado, the State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education, the Trustees of the University of Northern Colorado, and the Trustees of the Colorado School of Mines. This report summarizes the progress on the statewide diversity agenda, identifies institutions that potentially may be lagging in implementing goals, and highlights achievements. Statute recognizes that the governing boards are responsible for implementing the affirmative action policies. Colorado has made the largest progress in terms of student recruitment.

The 2000 Diversity Report identified the following trends or conditions:

- Of the students graduating from Colorado high schools, 20.7 percent have Hispanic, Asian, Black or Native American parentage. The high school graduation numbers are higher than the total state demographics for this particular group.
- Of the in-state students entering Colorado colleges and universities, the data show positive enrollment growth with minority students representing 20.4 percent of the undergraduate enrollment and 12.5 percent of the graduate in-state enrollment, an increase from 10.9 percent in 1998-99.
- The retention rate of in-state minority freshman students rose from 57 percent in 1998 to 59.3 percent in 1999 compared to a 64 percent retention rate among all freshman students.
- The participation rates of minority students in undergraduate and graduate degree programs have continuously improved. From fall 1995 to fall 1999, the minority representation at the undergraduate level has steadily increased from 19 to 20.4 percent. From fall 1995 to fall 1999, the minority representation at the graduate level has steadily increased from 10.9 to 12.5 percent.
- Minority students are well represented among the vocational certificates, two-year degree and first-professional degree recipients (exceeding Colorado's general demographics by race). Minority students are under-represented among baccalaureate and graduate degree recipients.
- The total number and percentage of minority faculty have steadily increased since 1995 with 1,048 minority faculty members in the system, accounting for 11.7 percent of the full-time faculty members.
- Executive and management higher education staff positions are less likely to represent Colorado's demographics by race, showing that minorities compose 13.5 percent of these positions.

Commissioner Greenberg asked if the data indicated that Asian students are under-represented and should Asian students still be considered a minority since there does not appear to be data showing an income disparity. Dr. Samson responded that they have been included in the study since 1988 and are considered a minority in national data reporting. The purpose of the diversity program is to move people into the mainstream. Commissioner Greenberg raised the question whether there was reason to include the Asian American population in the discriminated group because many have moved into the mainstream. Students in each group are discriminated. Dr. Samson responded that for purposes of national comparison, CCHE must report Asian students, however, Asian Americans could be removed for statewide reporting if the Commission decides to make that decision. The goal of the Commission is to provide access to public higher education.

Commissioner Lamm requested that staff research the Asian American student issue on a national level to help the Commission make a decision whether to break down the diversity number down further. In future diversity reports, the numbers will be broken down both ways.

Commissioner Vollbracht wanted to know if there is an ongoing effort to review and to improve the Diversity Policy. Dr. Samson responded that there is a collaborative effort with the governing boards and the boards are responsible to implement the policy. Governing boards will be asked to identify programs that are successful and ask the boards if they are willing to discontinue those which are not as successful. Last year the Commission accepted the governing boards strategy and this year's report is the result of the planning.

George Walker, private citizen, made comments on the Diversity Report.

C. Concept Paper

1. Bachelor of Arts in Human Development at Metropolitan State College of Denver (MSCD)

The Commission accepted the concept paper for a Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) at Metropolitan State College of Denver.

D. Report on Out-of-State Instruction

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

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

ED 582: Spanish/Lozanov Method/ Beginning I to be offered July 10-15, 2000, in Milwaukee, WI.

ED 582: Spanish/Lozanov Method/ Intermediate to be offered July 16-20, 2000, in Milwaukee, WI.

ED 582: Spanish/Lozanov/Advanced to be offered July 21-25, 2000, in Milwaukee, WI.

ED 589: Cognitive Coaching Leadership Seminar to be offered June 26- July 1, 2000, at Lake Tahoe, CA.

ED 589: Enhance Your Memory to be offered August 5-10, 2000, in Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii.

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

Managing HIV-1 Infection Over the Long-Term: Progress and Challenges to be delivered as an out-of-state instructional program in Toronto, Canada on September 17, 2000.

Issues and Advances in Pulmonary Hypertension Management to be delivered on the internet on various dates beginning September 2000.

The Board of Regents of the University of Colorado has submitted a request for approval of courses to be delivered by University of Colorado at Colorado Springs.

Special Education Professional Development Courses with Sopris West, consisting of SPED 591-3 and SPED 591-2, described as a one-year out-of-state instructional program to be offered throughout the United States beginning September 1, 2000, and ending June 30, 2001.

Middle School Transition Program, consisting of CURR 570-3, CURR 571-3, VUTT 572-3, CURR 575-3 and CURR 576-3, described as a one-year out-of-state instructional program to be offered in Nevada beginning September 8, 2000.

Action: Commissioner Greenberg moved adjournment of the meeting. Commissioner Hessler seconded the motion, and motion carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 1:00 p.m.



(Acrobat Reader Required)