

CCHE Agenda
February 1, 2002
Denver Public Library
Denver, Colorado
10:00 a.m.

- I. Approval of Minutes
- II. Reports
 - A. Chair's Report - Lamm
 - B. Commissioners' Reports
 - C. Advisory Committee Reports
 - D. Public Comment
- III. Consent Items
 - A. Proposals for New Academic Degree Programs
 - 1. University of Colorado at Boulder Neuroscience Ph.D. – Kuepper
- IV. Action Items
 - A. 2002-2003 Student Financial Aid Budget Parameters - Lindner (15 minutes)
- V. Items for Discussion and Possible Action
 - A. Performance Contract for Colorado School of Mines, Implementation of SB 01-229 - Kieft (10 minutes)
- VI. Written Reports for Possible Discussion
 - A. ColoradoMentor Program Presentation – Adkins (30 minutes)
 - B. Review of Financial Audit Findings Directed Toward Colorado’s Higher Education Institutions in Fy 2000-2001 - Adkins/Haddock/VonAchen
 - C. Report on Distance Education Coordinating Council - Richardson
 - D. Legislative Report: Remedial Education – Samson/Derbenwick
 - E. Concept Papers - Kuepper
 - 1. Bachelor of Arts in Criminal Justice at the University of Northern Colorado –Kuepper
 - 2. Bachelor of Arts in Special Education at the University of Northern Colorado – Kuepper
 - F. Program Name Changes: University of Southern Colorado – Automotive Industry Management - Evans

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE)
February 1, 2002
Agenda Item II, A

TOPIC: CHAIR'S REPORT

PREPARED BY: PEGGY LAMM

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)
February 1, 2002
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)
February 1, 2002
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)
February 1, 2002
Agenda Item II, D

TOPIC: PUBLIC COMMENT

PREPARED BY: TIM FOSTER

This item provides an opportunity for public comment on any item unrelated to the meeting agenda. A sign-up sheet is provided on the day of the meeting for all persons wishing to address the Commission on issues not on the agenda. Speakers are called in the order in which they sign up. Each participant begins by stating his/her name, address and organization. Participants are asked to keep their comments brief and not repeat what others have said.

**TOPIC: PROPOSAL: DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN NEUROSCIENCE
 AT THE UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT BOULDER**

PREPARED BY: WILLIAM G. KUEPPER

I. SUMMARY

The Regents of the University of Colorado request Commission approval to offer of a Ph.D. in Neuroscience at the University of Colorado at Boulder. The proposed program is intended to offer “high quality education and advanced training in neuroscience...” Through a combination of “core” and “specialty” coursework, and research experience, a student will become broadly knowledgeable in neuroscience plus expert in one of its sub-fields. Faculty from 13 departments or institutes at UC-Boulder will be participating in the program. The program will be administered by the institution’s Center for Neuroscience. The participating departments are providing most of the resources and the Dean of the Graduate School has assured the necessary reallocation of the additional funds needed to implement the program.

Students will be admitted into one of the participating departments and, following a subsequent review of the students credential by a neuroscience admissions committee, to the neuroscience program. To complete the degree, a student will be required to take a 10-credit core, a minimum of 20 additional credits in depth and related discipline courses, and 30 credits of dissertation work, producing and successfully defending a thesis. It is expected that the average time to degree will be five years.

The proposed degree clearly is within the university’s mission as a comprehensive research institution. Currently, the University of Colorado Health Science Center is the only institution in Colorado offering a doctorate in neuroscience. Its program is more focused than the proposed degree program, with emphases closely associated with disciplines represented at the Health Sciences Center.

Other universities are unable to accept all qualified applicants into existing Neuroscience Ph.D. programs. On the Boulder campus, a significant number of doctoral students in several departments are specializing in neuroscience. Many of these would seek admission to the new program. An initial enrollment of 6-8 students is projected with the number increasing to 20 at full implementation.

In summary, the proposed degree is within the institution’s role and mission, student interest in pursuing an advanced degree in this field exists, UCB has considerable research dollars to support a doctoral degree, and the lack of a degree places UCB in a competitive disadvantage. The staff recommend that the Commission approve the request of the Regents of the University of Colorado to offer a Doctor of Philosophy in Neuroscience at the University of Colorado at Boulder.

II. BACKGROUND

A concept paper for the proposed program was on the Commission agenda at its meeting of April 5, 2001. The full proposal was developed by faculty widely representative of the participating departments. It was approved by the Regents on December 19, 2001 and subsequently submitted to the Commission. Prior to the full proposal's being on the Commission agenda, discussions were held between CCHE staff and representatives of the CU System and the program. Dr. George Rebec, Director of the Program in Neural Science at Indiana University has served as the external reviewer. His report is appended as Attachment A and the university's response as Attachment B. The material provided in this background section is drawn from the proposal and from discussions with representatives from the institution and the system.

Neuroscience is the study of the nervous system. While a relatively new field, it has developed rapidly and is well established. Neuroscience is an interdisciplinary field and is represented in a large number of departments at Boulder. Boulder remains one of the few Research I institutions in the country that does not have a Ph.D. in the field.

The proposed degree reflects the breadth of the field in its structure, curriculum, admission procedures, and faculty. The program initially will have seven emphases or specializations. Due to different faculty expertise and interests, the proposed program at CU-Boulder will have a different focus than the existing program at the Health Sciences Center. It will emphasize how the brain produces behavior and thought, i.e., on behavioral and cognitive neuroscience. Extensive discussions were held between faculty and administration of the Boulder campus and the Health Sciences Center to see if a joint degree would be appropriate. It was agreed that it was desirable for Boulder to develop its own program.

Over a decade ago, the CU-Boulder considered the development of a doctoral program in neuroscience but determined that it would require too many additional resources. In the intervening years, with the growth in the field, several departments at Boulder have added faculty with training and research interests in neuroscience, and facilities for their use. Thus, a Ph.D. can now be implemented with no additional faculty or facilities.

Program goals include: 1. Create a labor pool of students trained in the neurosciences who are qualified for academic and non-academic employment. 2. Meet student demand for training in neuroscience. 3. Create a formal mechanism that increases the exposure of graduate students to the neuroscience techniques and research approaches used both within and outside the home department of the student's faculty advisor. 4. Train future researchers who will successfully compete for neuroscience jobs in academia and the private sector.

To gain admission to the Neuroscience program, a student must first be admitted to the graduate program in one of the participating departments, e.g. Psychology. The student is assigned an advisor in the home department who is also a member of the Neuroscience program. To graduate, a student must complete the course requirements of both the home department and Neuroscience. Each student takes a series of core courses in neuroscience and courses appropriate to the emphasis (specialization) selected. A minimum of 30 neuroscience course credits is required. The total number of courses taken will depend on

how many courses will meet both neuroscience requirements and those of the home department. In addition to the coursework, all students “will successfully complete a series of original research studies, culminating in a doctoral dissertation, that substantively add to the base of knowledge in neuroscience.” It is estimated that it will take students five years on the average to complete the necessary course work and research.

The new program is designed to “maximize “ resources through the utilization of faculty already in the participating departments, and through the use of existing courses and facilities. With 55 faculty from 13 departments available to participate, no new faculty are needed to implement he program. Even though the proposed curriculum is very broad in scope, only the yearlong, intensive Survey of Neuroscience and the Advances in Neuroscience Research Seminar will need to be added to initiate the program.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

In analysis of the concept paper and the proposal, Commission staff considered role and mission, program duplication, program need and demand, and quality issues such as curriculum and research.

Role and Mission and Program Duplication

A Ph.D. program in neuroscience clearly is in Boulder’s mission and no questions were raised on that matter at the concept paper stage, or subsequently.

The only concern expressed by the Commission at the concept paper stage was about potential duplication or overlap with the existing Ph.D. program at the Health Sciences Center. This matter was given careful attention during the development of the full proposal. One argument against the linking of the two programs is the physical separation of the two institutions and the complexities that arise from doing a joint program. More compelling is the differences in the two programs. The existing program at HSC focuses on cellular neuroscience and provides interdisciplinary training in neuroscience within a medical school context. The proposed program at Boulder will be broad in scope, spreading across, as described in the proposal, the full spectrum of neuroscience, with particular strengths in behavioral and cognitive neuroscience. As such, the program is intended to be complementary to that at the Health Sciences Center, rather than competitive. The external reviewer spoke to the distinction between the program at Boulder and the type of program offered in a medical school setting such as the Health Sciences Center.

It is useful to note that the having two institutions in the same system offer the Ph.D. in neuroscience is not unusual when the medical school and the graduate school are at separate locations. Examples can be found in several states, e.g., Indiana, Illinois, and Texas.

The absence of a Ph.D. in Neuroscience puts Boulder in a difficult position to compete for students, faculty, and resources with institutions that have such a degree. While the proposal makes this point, the external reviewer emphasizes it. He states that “(If) CU-Boulder hopes to maintain its excellence in the disciplines represented in this proposal, there is no choice

but to create a Ph.D. program in neuroscience.”

Program Need and Demand

Several departments at Boulder that will be participating in the new program have been offering their students the opportunity to focus on neuroscience in their degree programs. Approximately 25 students have either completed such a focus or a working in it. The proposed Ph.D. program will attract many of these students already at Boulder. In addition, it is likely that the implementation of a Ph.D. in neuroscience will attract students who otherwise would attend other universities that already have such a degree. Despite the number of Ph.D. programs nationally, the very high ratio of applications to acceptances (ca. 12 to 1) suggest that there is a considerable unmet need that the program at UC-Boulder would help address. Commission staff believe that the enrollment projections of four initially, expanding to 20 at full implementation, have been developed using appropriate methodology and are achievable. (Attachment C)

The market for graduates of the proposed program appears to be good. The proposal acknowledges the importance of employment opportunities for graduates of the proposed program in the both academic and non-academic settings. The training provided in the program is intended to prepare graduates for either setting. Letters to the university from 24 businesses in the state show the wide range of firms that may employ those trained in neuroscience. The external reviewer also pointed to expanding opportunities for graduates interested in neuroscience education due to the increasing number of institutions offering undergraduate programs in neuroscience.

Program Quality and Resources

In the matter of academic quality and the availability of resources necessary to implement and sustain a quality program, the Commission relies substantially on the governing board. The Regents have provided assurances that these matters have been considered in their review of the proposal and that the necessary resources are available to support a quality program (Attachment D).

The participating departments are providing most of the resources and the Dean of the Graduate School has assured the necessary reallocation of the additional funds needed to implement the program. (see Attachment E for projected program revenues and expenditures). While neuroscience faculty may participate in the activities of the University of Colorado's Coleman Institute, the Institute will not be contributing funds to the proposed degree program.

The external reviewer was asked to comment specifically on the matter of resources. He noted the number and experience of the faculty and the ability of the participating departments to provide “critical instructional support and ample physical facilities.”

The external reviewer also spoke to the structure of the program. In his view students will receive “an appropriate combination of course work and laboratory experience.” He also praised 1) the program's flexibility, allowing students to “cut across” disciplinary or

departmental boundaries in this interdisciplinary field, 2) exposing students to research early in the program, and 3) the neuroscience seminar series.

Summary

In the view of Commission staff, there is sufficient student demand and opportunities for graduates of the proposed Ph.D. program in Neuroscience. Further, the University of Colorado at Boulder has the necessary resources and support throughout the institution to implement a high quality program. Finally, without such a program, CU-Boulder will be at an increasing disadvantage in the competition for students, faculty, and extramural funding in the highly competitive field of neuroscience.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Commission approve the request of the Regents of the University of Colorado to offer a Doctor of Philosophy in Neuroscience at the University of Colorado at Boulder.

Attachment A

Proposal for a Ph.D. Program in Neuroscience at the
University of Colorado at Boulder

External and Peer Review

George V. Rebec
Chancellor's Professor of Psychology
Director, Program in Neural Science
Indiana University
1101 E. Tenth Street
Bloomington, IN 47405-7007

Office: 812-855-4832

Fax: 812-855-4520

E-mail: rebec@indiana.edu

Quality

Although neuroscience, as a field of study, has a relatively short history (the first Ph.D. programs were established in the 1960s), neuroscience is rapidly becoming mainstream. More than 200 doctoral programs now exist in the United States. The emphasis of these programs is the nervous system, and the focus of study ranges from the level of molecules and membranes to neural circuits and behavior. Some programs cover the entire range, while others are more likely to focus on one end of the spectrum or the other depending on faculty interests as well as historical and other considerations. In all cases, however, the emphasis is on research, and the main goal of a graduate program in neuroscience is on research training. The Ph.D. program in neuroscience proposed at the University of Colorado at Boulder (CU-Boulder) fits nicely into this training model.

The quality of the proposed program is high. Students will receive an appropriate combination of course work and laboratory experience. Course work is fairly standard and covers topics that provide sufficient breadth across the field as well as in-depth specialization in a primary area. Importantly, the program is flexible enough to allow students the opportunity to cut across existing departmental boundaries in pursuit of their training goals. This is a critical consideration because neuroscience is an interdisciplinary field, drawing on the natural and mathematical as well as the computational and behavioral sciences. Interdisciplinary training will be reinforced by the availability of faculty members from many different departments for teaching formal courses and serving on student advisory committees. The exposure of students to research early in their graduate careers, an important emphasis at CU-Boulder, is another indicator of a high-quality program. It also is noteworthy that the proposed program provides ample opportunities for evaluation of student progress -- such as course grades, qualifying exams, research presentations, and publication record. These requirements ensure that program quality will be maintained.

Capacity of the Institution

The number and experience of participating faculty members at CU-Boulder is consistent with the goals of the proposed program. Moreover, the departments from which these faculty members are drawn provide critical instructional support and ample physical facilities. In short, the institution is well suited to maintain a high-quality neuroscience program.

Other resources such as library material, computer equipment, and laboratory facilities are adequate.

The budgeted costs for the proposed program are minimal but should allow the program to operate at a level of high quality. The important consideration here is that the basic infrastructure for neuroscience in the form of many active faculty members and a highly supportive group of participating departments already exist at CU-Boulder. Thus, major expenses either to start the program or to maintain its operation are not necessary. It is recommended, however, that as the program reaches its anticipated steady state the requested time for an administrative assistant be increased from 25 to 50% to maintain smooth operations within the program and to coordinate efforts among the participating campus units. Presumably, the Center for Neurosciences will bear this cost. The Center also will support a seminar series, which is a vital part of an active neuroscience-training program.

Although no large expenditures are required to initiate the program, it would have been useful to see some statement of commitment to neuroscience training from the CU-Boulder administration. It may not be necessary at this point, but as the program grows and develops – perhaps in ways that cannot now be anticipated – a clear administrative commitment is necessary to

ensure long-term viability. In fact, some level of administrative support will be required if the program is to attract funding for institutional training grants, center grants, and other extramural mechanisms that define the highest quality neuroscience programs in the country. Strangely, the only letter of administrative support comes from the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center (UCHSC) in Denver.

Student Demand

The level of interest in neuroscience is high across the country, and CU-Boulder is in a good position to capitalize on this interest. The program, moreover, can reach critical mass quickly by incorporating students who are earning Certificates in Neuroscience. The number of likely graduate applicants across participating departments and institutes seems sufficient to sustain the program's anticipated steady-state level of students. It would have been helpful, however, to provide a consistent estimate of what this level is expected to be. The numbers listed on pp. 3, 22, 26, and Table 1 suggest a range of between 20-40 students. A total of 25-30 students seems a reasonable goal given the current level of faculty participation. It also would have been helpful to include information on the anticipated quality of the applicant pool such as GRE scores, GPAs, and other quantitative indicators of recent applicants to participating departments. The national reputation of these departments, however, is sufficiently high that applicant quality should not be a concern.

Another factor that could contribute to student demand is that the proposed program is clearly distinct from neuroscience programs offered through medical schools, including the UCHSC in Denver. At CU-Boulder, the program will be relatively broad based covering a large range of disciplines, many of which are not represented at the UCHSC. In addition, CU-Boulder can offer teaching experience that can serve as an attraction for students interested in the rapidly growing field of neuroscience education; many colleges and universities now offer undergraduate majors in neuroscience. The high popularity of such majors, moreover, will ensure a continuing demand for graduate-level training.

Need for Graduates

The demand for neuroscience doctorates remains high. Although overall growth in academia has slowed, interest in neuroscience is relatively strong; the increasing popularity of undergraduate majors (see above), moreover, is likely to maintain and perhaps accelerate this trend. Also noteworthy is evidence that federal funding of neuroscience research continues to make sizable gains. Thus, the prospects for future graduates are bright. It also is important to note that a steadily increasing array of neuroscience opportunities exist outside academia. Research institutes (federal and private), biotechnology companies, pharmaceutical firms, and others are looking for neuroscience doctorates. An especially appealing feature of the proposed program at CU-Boulder is that it offers the type of broad-based and flexible training in neuroscience that industry demands. The program also includes training in computational neuroscience, a relatively new area of study that has many industrial applications. Thus, CU-Boulder graduates should be well prepared to fill a number of employment opportunities in neuroscience.

Further evidence of a long-term need for neuroscience graduates is the strong support for a doctoral program voiced by many Colorado companies. As only the second neuroscience-training program in the state, the CU-Boulder program will be in an excellent position to meet the increasing demand for neuroscientists in Colorado and across the country.

Economic Impact on Colorado

A state aiming to be at the forefront of the high technology revolution cannot ignore the advantages offered by the availability of a cadre of highly trained neuroscientists. Computational neuroscience and neural network modeling, for example, have applications in many different industries and are likely to increase in popularity as computer, robotics, and data-analysis firms continue to find new applications for these areas of specialization. It also would be beneficial for Colorado's colleges and universities to bolster their research mission in neuroscience to take advantage of increasing levels of federal and private-industry support of projects aimed at improving human health.

Summary and Recommendation

This proposal makes a strong case for establishing a doctoral program in neuroscience at CU-Boulder. Such a program clearly builds on the strength of many existing departments and institutes. Comparable units at other major research universities are already affiliated with graduate neuroscience programs and have substantially improved their national status as a result. If CU-Boulder hopes to maintain its excellence in the disciplines represented in this proposal, there is no choice but to create a Ph.D. program in neuroscience. In short, a neuroscience program is essential if CU-Boulder is to compete successfully with other major universities for faculty and resources. The program proposed here, moreover, offers a high level of quality and scholarly rigor that will ensure first-rate graduates and a high level of national recognition. Student demand for such a program is high and the demand for program graduates is likely to be high as well. Because many of the elements required for such a program are already in place, start-up and maintenance costs would be minimal. The proposed program is excellent and deserves enthusiastic support.

Response to the External Evaluation of the University of Colorado-Boulder's Neuroscience PhD Proposal

The external evaluation was very positive on all major aspects of the University of Colorado-Boulder's Neuroscience Ph.D. Proposal and enthusiastically supports its approval. The evaluation was very thorough and thoughtful. Two key points were made regarding the strengths of the proposal. First, the evaluation explicitly commented on the high quality and scholarly rigor of the proposed program. Second, it emphasized that having a Neuroscience PhD program at the University of Colorado at Boulder is essential for CU-Boulder to maintain its excellence in the disciplines represented and essential for CU-Boulder to compete successfully with other major universities for faculty and resources.

There are two points of confusion and not of substance that bear clarification. Both are artifacts arising from the version of the proposal that the reviewer was provided. The first arises from the fact that the reviewer was not provided with the letters of support from the CU-Boulder administration. Given these missing documents, the evaluation raises a question regarding support for the Neuroscience Program by the CU-Boulder administration. The CU-Boulder administration is indeed very strongly supportive of the proposed Neuroscience PhD program, as evidenced in part by their comments at the Regents meetings where the proposal was discussed. Letters of support from the CU-Boulder administration have been received by the CCHE and will be included in their report.

The second point of confusion regards anticipated student enrollment in the PhD program. As the reviewer correctly noted, there are discrepancies between the original Concept Paper and Section II. By the time that Section II and the budget table were completed, we conservatively revised our anticipated student enrollment downward to approximately 20-25. That is, approximately 5 students per year with anticipated completion time of 4-5 years; hence 25 students if one assumes 5 years to complete. We did not realize that we could change the numbers in the Concept Paper when the Full Proposal was submitted, despite the more conservative estimates presented in Section II.

ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS

We anticipate 4 new enrollments per full academic year in the program for an enrollment of 20 students overall when the program is fully implemented. We are projecting that 25% of new students will enroll as in-state students, while 75% will enroll in the first year as out-of-state. We further anticipate that almost all of these students will enroll as in-state by their second year. These estimates are based on enrollment in the current certificate program. We are predicting that attrition will be minimal and that students will take an average of 5 years to complete a degree. The majority of the students will carry 7 or 8 credits per semester or 15 per year. The projected program graduates is based on an average completion time of 5 years and does not include students who may elect to enter the Ph.D. program from the certificate program and who may have already completed a significant portion of the Ph.D. requirements.

The enrollment figures are a conservative estimate based on: (a) the enrollment in the current certificate program and indications of interest in a Ph.D. program from these students; and (b) national statistics from other Neuroscience Ph.D. programs (see Appendix 6). According to a report of the Association of Neuroscience Departments and Programs, the average Neuroscience Ph.D. program receives 61 applications for graduate study per year (this figure is for 1998, the last year for which complete survey results are available) and enrolls 5.2 students. The demand for entrance into Neuroscience graduate programs has only increased (see Appendix 6), and so our estimate of 4 students per year is likely to be conservative.

ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS

Name of Program: Ph. D. In Neuroscience

Name of Institution: University of Colorado at Boulder

DEFINITIONS:

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

Headcount projections represent an unduplicated count of those students officially admitted to the program and enrolled at the institution during the academic year.

FTE is defined as the full-time equivalent number of those students majoring in the program, regardless of the classes enrolled, during the academic year.

Program graduate is defined as a student who finishes all academic program requirements and graduates with a formal award within a particular academic year.

SPECIAL NOTES:

To calculate the annual headcount enrollment, add new enrollees to the previous year headcount and subtract the number who graduated in the preceding year. Adjust by the anticipated attrition rate.

To calculate FTE, multiply the number of students times the projected number of credit hours students will be typically enrolled in per year and divide by 30.

The data in each column is the annual **unduplicated** number of declared program majors. Since this table documents program demand, course enrollments are not relevant and shall not be included in the headcount or FTE data.

		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	Yr 5	Full Implementation
1-a	In-state Headcount	1	5	9	13	16	17
1-b	Out-of-State Headcount	3	3	3	3	3	3
2	Program Headcount	4	8	12	16	19	20
3-a	In-state FTE	0.5	2.5	4.5	6.5	8.0	8.5
3-b	Out-of-state FTE	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5
4	Program FTE	2.0	4.0	6.0	8.0	9.5	10.0
5	Program Graduates	0	0	0	1	2	4

Attach a brief description explaining the specific source data for projecting the program headcount (e.g., actual enrollment in a similar program at a comparable college).

Steve Maier Professor
Signature of Person who completed the Enrollment Table Title

Michel R. Dahlin 7/12/01
Signature of Governing Board Information Officer



UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO SYSTEM

Boulder • Colorado Springs • Denver • Health Sciences Center

Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research

Campus Box 51
Boulder, Colorado 80309-0051
(303) 492-8911
FAX #: (303) 492-0330

MEMORANDUM

TO: Timothy Foster, Executive Director, Colorado Commission on Higher Education

FROM: Jack O. Burns, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research

DATE: January 22, 2002

SUBJECT: Quality, Capacity, and Cost Effectiveness of the Proposed Ph.D. in Neuroscience at the University of Colorado at Boulder

As part of the process of recommending a degree proposal to the Colorado Commission on Higher Education, the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research for the University of Colorado system provides an analysis of the quality, capacity, and cost-effectiveness of full proposals. This memorandum provides that analysis. It is based upon review of the proposal and discussion with the Board of Regents and with involved campus faculty and administrators.

Quality of Proposed Program

The proposed program is a Ph.D. in Neuroscience at the University of Colorado at Boulder to be offered by a consortium of faculty from numerous departments across several colleges. The program involves the study of the nervous system from the molecular and cellular level up to the level of behavior. The program plan is excellent; the external evaluator praised the quality of the program, the flexibility it provides for cross-disciplinary and interdisciplinary work, and its thorough student assessment plan. The curriculum provides both breadth and depth of disciplinary study. The faculty members involved in delivering this program are very strong, with outstanding research and teaching records.

Capacity of Institution to Offer Program

The University of Colorado at Boulder has made commitments in its faculty hires over the past decade to build a significant core of faculty with research expertise in various aspects of neuroscience. Departments involved in neuroscience have committed resources to support graduate students in the program. Laboratory space in existing programs will serve the doctoral students in this program. The faculty members in the program also have excellent track records in attracting funding that will supplement to support and research opportunities for the doctoral students admitted to the program. The Graduate School has pledged to reallocate the resources needed to cover the initial revenue shortfalls in early start-up period of the program.

Cost-Effectiveness of the Program

This degree program builds upon the existing strength of many departments and several colleges. Collaboration in curriculum development and resource sharing among the participating departments contribute to the cost-effectiveness of this program. And courses that support other doctoral programs will serve the students in this program.

Economic Impact

No major economic impact is claimed for this proposed new degree. There is demand for advanced training in this field; UCB should be able to attract high caliber students. The external evaluator confirms the value of neuroscience training for high technology companies; academic positions will also be available across the nation for graduates of this program.

Summary

UCB has provided the Board of Regents and the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research evidence of its ability to offer a Ph.D. in Neuroscience of very high quality and academic rigor. The external evaluation sustains this judgment. UCB has provided evidence of its capacity to offer this degree and of the program's cost effectiveness. The system administration and the Board both support the creation of the Ph.D. in Neuroscience.

PROJECTED EXPENSE AND REVENUE ESTIMATES

PURPOSE:

This table documents what the program will cost and how the institution plans to cover the costs.

All cost and revenue projections should be in constant dollars (do not include an inflation factor).

		ESTIMATED AMOUNT in DOLLARS				
		YEAR 1	YEAR 2	YEAR 3	YEAR 4	YEAR 5
Operating Expenses						
1	Faculty	83,000	83,000	83,000	83,000	83,000
2	Financial Aid specific to program	33,670	53,814	74,962	95,470	110,960
3	Instructional Materials	----	----	----	----	----
4	Program Administration	10,389	10,389	10,389	10,389	10,389
5	Rent/Lease	----	----	----	----	----
6	Other Operating Costs	12,050	12,050	12,050	12,050	12,050
7	Total Operating Expenses	139,109	159,253	180,401	200,909	216,399
Program Start-Up Expenses						
8	Capital construction	----	----	----	----	----
9	Equipment Acquisitions	----	----	----	----	----
10	Library Acquisitions	----	----	----	----	----
11	Total Program Start-Up Exp.	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL PROGRAM EXPENSES		139,109	159,253	180,401	200,909	216,399
Enrollment Revenue						
12	General Fund: State Support	2,584	12,918	23,252	33,586	41,336
13	Cash Revenue: Tuition	48,192	57,120	69,024	80,538	89,856
14	Cash Revenue: Fees		----	----	----	----
Other Revenue						
15	Federal Grants	33,670	53,814	74,962	95,476	110,960
16	Corporate Grants/Donations		----	----	----	----
17	Other fund sources*	10,800	10,800	10,800	10,800	10,800

Table A
Cost for Faculty per Course

Course	Credit Hours	Frequency per year	Faculty FTE per course	Faculty FTE per year	Average cost of 1.0 FTE	Cost per year of class
Survey of Neuroscience I	3	1.00	0.33	0.33	85,000	28,333
Survey of Neuroscience II	3	1.00	0.33	0.33	85,000	28,333
Advances in Neuroscience I	2	1.00	0.22	0.22	85,000	18,700
Advances in Neuroscience II	2	1.00	0.22	0.22	85,000	18,700

2. Financial Aid Specific to Program

All students will receive support as either Teaching Assistants or Research Assistants. Since all students will enter the Neuroscience Ph.D. program from one of the participating units, the Teaching Assistantships will not be specific to the Neuroscience Ph.D. program and will continue to be provided by the participating units, and the students will perform their assistantship duties in those units. That is, no Teaching Assistantships will be reassigned to the Neuroscience Ph.D. program, and so these are not costs specific to the Program. Based on the current support profile of students in the Neuroscience Certificate Program, it is expected that 1/3 of the students will be supported by Research Assistantships, and this support is calculated as specific to the Neuroscience Ph.D. program. Costs are calculated as follows from projections for AY 2001-2202 from the Office of Budget, Planning, and Analysis:

Table B
Stipend and Tuition costs for Graduate Students

Item	Cost
50% Research Assistantship Stipend	11,979 per year
In-State Tuition	1,737 per semester
Out-of-State Tuition	8,312 per semester
Total In-State Research Assistant	15,453 per year
Total Out-of State Research Assistant	28,603 per year

The Costs reported in Table 3 are based on the assumption that Research Assistantships to In-State and Out-of-State students will be awarded in the same ratio as there are In-State and Out-of-State students in the Program, as shown in Table 1. The number of Research Assistantships is estimated as 1/3 of the total students in the program, as shown in Table 1.

Instructional Materials.

None are required that are not already on hand.

TOPIC: 2002-2003 STUDENT FINANCIAL AID BUDGET PARAMETERS

PREPARED BY: DIANE LINDNER

I. SUMMARY

This agenda item presents the 2002-2003 Student Financial Aid Budget Parameters. In compliance with regulations for states that participate in federal financial aid programs, the Commission annually recommends guidelines for student living expenses (room and board, transportation, books and supplies, personal, and childcare expenses) for use by postsecondary institutions approved to participate in Colorado student financial assistance programs. While the state budget parameters establish a reference point, each institution may adjust the state parameters to reflect actual local costs – that is, actual cost of a two-bedroom apartment. Institutions that wish to modify the room and board costs must use actual data to support their adjusted budget and file their adjusted budgets with CCHE.

Previously, the Commission adjusted the previous year’s budget parameters by the Colorado Price Index (CPI). Following the Commission’s direction, CCHE staff used published data obtained from Chambers of Commerce (housing), business and industry (health and child care), and colleges and universities (e.g., books) to determine budget guidelines in 2001 and 2002. Table 1 shows the Student Budget Base for 2002-2003 for Students Living with Parents, Students Living On Campus and Students Living Off Campus.

Table1: Student Monthly Budget Base for 2001-2002

	Students Living with Parents	Students Living On Campus	Students Living Off Campus
Housing	\$122	Actual	\$575
Food/Board	\$225	Actual	\$300
Local Transportation	\$85	\$85	\$85
Medical	\$169	\$169	\$169
Personal Expenses	\$98	\$112	\$112
Total	\$699	\$366 +Actual Room & Board	\$1,241

The student monthly budget base includes monthly costs typically incurred by all students. Table 2 lists the parameters for the annual cost of books and supplies and discretionary costs that apply to certain students.

Table 2: Supplemental Student Budget Expenses for 2001-2002

	All Students
Books & Supplies Per Year	\$1,142
Child Care if appropriate per month	\$555
Non-local Transportation	Amount determined by Institution
Computer Allowance	\$1,000-1,500

II. BACKGROUND

Student budget parameters are used by financial aid administrators in determining student eligibility for need-based financial aid. Need-based financial aid (i.e., grants, work-study, and loans) requires a student need analysis. The need analysis is the process of estimating the amount of assistance a student will require, supplementing the resources theoretically available from that student and his or her family. Need analysis has two basic components: (1) the student's cost of attendance which is an estimation of what it will reasonably cost the student to attend a given institution for a given period of time called the **COA**, and (2) an estimation of the ability of the student and his or her immediate family to contribute to that educational cost, commonly called the **expected family contribution**. The expected family contribution (EFC) is obtained by a federally approved formula. The cost of attendance (COA) is a figure determined by institutions. The difference between the COA and the EFC is the amount of eligibility for a need-based student.

CCHE has traditionally provided guidelines and recommendations of statewide cost parameters for institutions to use in defining the COA. The United States Department of Education (USDE) interpreted the term "determined by the institution" to mean that the institution has the authority to determine reasonable cost elements, from empirical data, i.e., data based on valid student surveys, housing costs norms from a local realty board, etc. In other words, the USDE expects the institutional determination to be based on modifications of state data and adjusted for local economic conditions.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

At the March 2000 meeting the Commissioners requested that the staff collect primary data to establish the 2001-2002 and later year student financial aid budget parameters since the last survey was completed in 1991. To update the budget parameters, CCHE staff collected information from different sources. In 2002, Chambers of Commerce were contacted for average rental prices and costs of books, supplies, parking fees, child care, and board were adjusted by CPI. CCHE collected health insurance data from insurance companies and

computer hardware costs from computer industry published cost comparisons. The 2002-2003 student budget parameters are listed below.

Housing Costs:

Housing budgets vary for three groups of students.

For students living in dormitories, the housing parameter is the actual room expense that the campus charges students.

CCHE's financial aid guidelines define the housing budget for students living off campus as 50 percent of the average rent for a two-bedroom apartment. CCHE collected rental costs from Denver, Boulder, Colorado Springs and Grand Junction. The data indicated that the average rent of a two-bedroom apartment was \$950. CCHE staff added the average utility bill for a two-bedroom apartment (\$200). The rent and utilities totaled \$1,150. Following the guidelines, half of that cost (\$575) becomes the monthly housing budget parameter for students living off campus. These figures have not changed from the prior year.

For students living with parents, the housing budget is set at \$122. This budget parameter does not have a data source to calculate a direct cost to the student so the budget remains unchanged from previous years.

Food Expenses

For students living in dormitories, the food budget parameter is the actual cost of board.

In 2001, food expenses for students living off-campus were defined by the cost of a student meal ticket charged by institutions. The food budget parameter was increased by the estimated CPI of 3.8% for 2002-2003.

CCHE's financial aid guidelines assume that food is a shared cost for students who live with their parents. The estimated food costs for a family of four averages \$900 per month or \$225 per family member. The food cost parameter for this group of students is set at \$225 per month.

Local Transportation Expenses Excludes Non-local Transportation

The Financial Aid Guidelines define local transportation expenses as the cost of owning a bike, using public transportation or sharing the operation of an automobile. CCHE set the monthly local transportation parameter at \$85, the cost of a monthly regional RTD pass or a total of \$3.25 per day for on-campus parking and shared monthly gas expenses. This parameter is unchanged from the 2001-02 budget.

Medical Expenses

For institutions that do not have health insurance or medical care funded through student fees, CCHE establishes a maximum health expense parameter of \$169 per month. This is based on the average monthly HMO premium for a health plan with a \$10 co-pay. The data sources included major health care providers in Colorado.

Personal Expenses

The financial aid guidelines define personal expenses to include the cost of laundry, dry cleaning, toiletries, clothing, recreation and recreational transportation. Based on typical costs in a college town, a student may expect to spend \$14 a month on laundry, \$25 on dry cleaning or clothing, \$21 on shampoo, toothpaste, and other toiletries, \$42 a month for concerts, movies or other campus events, and \$10 for transportation. In 2002-03, CCHE set the personal expense parameter at \$98 for students living with parents and \$112 for all other students. The only difference between the two budgets is that students living with parents do not typically pay laundromat costs.

Books and Supplies

The parameter for books and supplies is \$1,142 based upon responses from Colorado institutions, public and private and adjusted for the estimated CPI.

Child Care

The range is the actual cost of care per child, per month, up to a maximum of \$555 per child per month. This cost is unchanged from the 2001-02 child care parameter based upon responses from Colorado institutions, public and private.

Non-local Transportation

CCHE does not establish this parameter. Institutions may include the cost of plane fare for students who live outside a normal travel range. It is intended to finance two round trips home per year.

Computer Allowance

The cost of attendance regulations in the federal Higher Education Amendment of 1998 provide for a reasonable allowance for the documented rental or purchase of a personal computer. Institutions may include this cost in their student budget for determining eligibility for state financial aid. With the decrease in hardware prices, few students rent computers. The average cost of a desktop computer is \$1,000 and \$1,500 for a laptop computer. The

data sources include Infotechnology magazine and DELL's brochure listing its products and price list, published January 2002.

Table 1 below shows the Student Budget Base for 2002-2003 for Students Living with Parents, Students Living On Campus and Students Living Off Campus.

Table1: Student Monthly Budget Base for 2001-2002

	Students Living with Parents	Students Living On Campus	Students Living Off Campus
Housing	\$122	Actual	\$575
Food/Board	\$225	Actual	\$300
Local Transportation	\$85	\$85	\$85
Medical	\$169	\$169	\$169
Personal Expenses	\$98	\$112	\$112
Total	\$699	\$366 <i>+Actual Room & Board</i>	\$1,241

The student monthly budget base includes monthly costs typically incurred by all students. Table 2 lists the parameters for the annual cost of books and supplies and discretionary costs that apply to certain students.

Table 2: Supplemental Student Budget Expenses for 2001-2002

	All Students
Books & Supplies Per Year	\$1,142
Child Care if appropriate per month	\$555
Non-local Transportation	Amount determined by Institution
Computer Allowance	\$1,000-1,500

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Commission approve the 2002-2003 Student Financial Aid Budget Parameters.

Appendix A

STATUTORY AUTHORITY

C.R.S. 23-3.3-102 Assistance program authorized-procedure-audits. (3) The commission shall administer the program with the assistance of institutions according to policies and procedures established by the commission.

TOPIC: PERFORMANCE CONTRACT FOR COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES—IMPLEMENTATION OF SB 01-229

PREPARED BY: RAY KIEFT

I. SUMMARY

SB 01-229 directs that a performance contract be established between the Board of Trustees of the Colorado School of Mines (CSM) and the Commission which specifies the performance goals that CSM shall achieve during the period of the agreement as well as the authority granted to the Board of Trustees for certain decisions and recommendations which here-to-for have resided with the Commission (e.g., block grant funding, tuition increases, new program approval). The performance contract is in lieu of CSM's annual compliance with Article 13, Section 23 of the Colorado Revised Statutes and its participation in the Quality Indicator System and the associated performance funding system.

II. BACKGROUND

In its report to the Colorado Department of Higher Education in response to HB 99-1289 (*Steady Progress: Higher Education Governance in Colorado at the Dawn of the 21st Century*, November, 2000), the Northwest Education Research Center (NORED) recommended that: "The Legislature should create a Colorado Compact Institution Program." and "Institutions selected as Colorado Compact institutions should agree to negotiate institutional performance agreements that represent a pledge to the state that in exchange for a stable funding base and relief from procedural controls, the institution will demonstrate that it provides more effective and efficient higher education services than before." (*Steady Progress*, p. 26 & 27)

During the early part of 2001, *Steady Progress* was discussed throughout the higher education community as well as in the Senate and House Education Committees. SB 01-229 emerged from these discussions with the foundational aspects of the Colorado Compact Institution Program applied to the Colorado School of Mines. SB 01-229 directed that a performance agreement be established between the Board of Trustees of CSM and the Commission which specifies the performance goals that CSM shall achieve during the period of the agreement as well as the authority granted to the Board of Trustees for certain decisions and recommendations which here-to-for have resided with the Commission.

Over the past several months, CSM and CCHE staff have negotiated a proposed performance agreement which follows the specific guidelines included in SB 01-229.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

The proposed performance agreement represents a commitment by the Board of Trustees and administration of CSM to strive to enhance the overall quality of the institution, strengthen its financial status, increase its commitment to providing student financial aid, “pushing” itself to attain higher retention and graduation rates, and establishing an admission “floor” with an admission “window” of 10%. The agreement also includes a relinquishing by the Commission of its program approval authority to the CSM Board of Trustees (assuming the proposed program is consistent with CSM’s role and mission), its tuition recommendation authority, and its QIS and performance funding system compliance requirements.

The specific requirements outlined in SB 01-229 are covered in the proposed agreement ([Attachment 1](#)). The results of program reviews, tests and examinations, employer, alumni, and student satisfaction surveys, accreditation processes, and facilities master planning will be available to the Commission in terms of monitoring the agreement and having dialogue with CSM regarding any aspect of the agreement.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Commission approve the performance agreement between the Colorado School of Mines and the Commission for the period FY 2002-2007 and forward the agreement to the appropriate committees of the General Assembly in accordance with the provisions of SB 01-229.

Appendix A

STATUTORY AUTHORITY

23-41-104.6 “...(2) For the reasons specified in subsection (1) of this section, the general assembly hereby authorizes the Colorado school of mines to operate pursuant to a performance contract, as described in this section, with the Colorado commission on higher education. (3) Beginning July 1, 2001, the board of trustees of the Colorado school of mines shall negotiate a performance contract with the Colorado commission on higher education that shall specify the performance goals that the institution shall achieve during the period that it operates under the performance contract. Compliance with the goals specified in the performance contract shall be in lieu of compliance with the requirements of the ‘Higher Education Quality Assurance Act’, article 13 of this title, and the Colorado school of mines shall therefore be exempt from the requirements of said act while operating pursuant to the performance contract. The specified goals shall be measurable and specific to the Colorado school of mines’ role and mission and shall include, at a minimum, the following issues:

- (a) Appropriate levels of student enrollment, transfer, retention, and graduation rates, and institutional programs specifically designed to assist students in achieving their academic goals;
- (b) Student satisfaction and student performance after graduation, including employment and enrollment in graduate programs;
- (c) Assessment of the quality of the institution’s academic programs, including assessment by external reviewers such as accreditation boards and employers and consideration of student performance on national examinations;
- (d) Increasing financial support to sustain and enhance essential functions that are partially state funded, including: (I) Education, industrial, and federal research capabilities and competitiveness; (II) Student financial aid; (III) Capital construction; (IV) Technological advancements.

(5) While operating pursuant to the performance contract negotiated pursuant to this section, the board of trustees of the Colorado school of mines: ...

(b) need not consult with nor obtain approval from the Colorado commission on higher education to create, modify, or eliminate academic and vocational programs offered by the Colorado school of mines, so long as such creations, modifications, and eliminations are consistent with the institution’s statutory role and mission; (c)

(I) Shall have sole authority to establish resident and nonresident tuition rates for the Colorado school of mines; except that the annual percentage increase in resident tuition rates shall not exceed a percentage equal to two times the rate of the percentage change in the consumer price index for the Denver metropolitan area.

(6) While operating pursuant to the performance contract negotiated pursuant to this section, the Colorado school of mines shall: (a) remain eligible for state-funded capital construction projects and controlled maintenance projects as provided in

section 23-1-106; (b) Continue to admit all Colorado resident applicants who meet the admissions criteria of the institution and shall provide equal educational opportunities to all students.

(7) During the period that the Colorado school of mines operates pursuant to the performance contract negotiated pursuant to this section, the general assembly shall make annual appropriations of general fund moneys as a single block grant for the support of resident students who are enrolled in the institution. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 23-1-105 and the distribution formula established by the Colorado commission on higher education, the commission and the board of trustees for the Colorado school of mines shall annually negotiate adjustments in said annual block grant appropriation of general fund moneys, taking into account the variety of factors affecting the level of costs incurred and the level of funding received by the Colorado school of mines.

**PERFORMANCE AGREEMENT
COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES AND CCHE
FY 2002 – 2007**

February 1, 2002

1. STUDENT ENROLLMENT, TRANSFER, RETENTION AND GRADUATION RATE
 - a. CSM will be a highly selective admission institution. Utilizing the current CCHE admission index, CSM will have an admission index of 110, an admission floor of 100, and an exception “window” of 10% which will be calculated on the number of students admitted, except for up to 20 applicants per year who may be granted a CSM Presidential exemption.
 - b. No more than one-half of the students granted admission utilizing the exception “window” will be non-resident students.
 - c. All Colorado high school graduates who meet the minimum admission standards will be admitted.
 - d. The admission standards for non-resident students will be no lower than the admission standards for Colorado residents.
 - e. CSM will establish minimum transfer admission standards which will be the same for non-resident and Colorado residents.
 - f. CSM will maintain current transfer agreements with Red Rocks Community College and will expand transfer agreements to one additional community college by 2004 and will work to expand the transfer agreement to a third community college by 2007.
 - g. CSM will maintain at least a 55% five-year graduation rate with a goal of a 60% five-year graduation rate, and will maintain at least a 60% six-year graduation rate with a goal of a 66.67% six-year graduation rate.
 - h. CSM will maintain at least an 80% freshmen retention rate with a goal of a 90% freshmen retention rate.

2. PROGRAMS SPECIFICALLY DESIGNED TO ASSIST STUDENTS IN ACHIEVING THEIR ACADEMIC GOAL
 - a. CSM will maintain its freshmen-mentoring program consisting of one mentor per 10-12 students.
 - b. CSM will continue career awareness programs beginning at the freshmen level.
 - c. CSM will continue specific programs to assist students. These may include: Honors, EPICS, Tutoring, Field Sessions, Counseling, Student Activities, and International Students Program.
 - d. Changes to any of these above-mentioned programs will be discussed with CCHE prior to any changes being implemented.

3. STUDENT PERFORMANCE ON NATIONAL EXAMINATIONS
 - a. CSM will annually administer the Fundamentals of Engineering examination after undertaking efforts to increase student participation in this examination. A passing rate of at least 90% will be the goal.
 - b. CSM will encourage appropriate graduating students to participate in the Graduate Record Examination. CSM and CCHE will jointly determine appropriate score levels for measuring institutional performance.
 - c. CSM will investigate the use of major field tests and examinations for graduating students in non-engineering fields and report on its investigation to CCHE. For those major field test and examinations selected by CSM, CSM and CCHE will jointly agree to appropriate passing rates and/or score levels for measuring institutional performance
 - d. The results of all national tests and examinations will be made available to CCHE.

4. STUDENT SATISFACTION

Every year, CSM will administer either a senior student exit survey or a survey of alumni. Consistent with the schedule of its primary professional accreditation organization (ABET), CSM will administer a nationally normed student satisfaction survey (e.g., Noel-Levitz). To the extent possible, these surveys will be by individual degree program. The results of the surveys will be made available to CCHE as part of the ABET accreditation review process.

5. STUDENT PERFORMANCE AFTER GRADUATION

Twice every six years, a survey of employers will be conducted regarding their assessment of the quality of CSM graduates and programs. The results of this survey will be made available to CCHE.

6. ASSESSMENT OF THE QUALITY OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

- a. CSM will maintain accreditation by ABET. CCHE will support efforts to maintain ABET accreditation. CSM staff will request that ABET agree that CCHE staff may observe the ABET accreditation process. The results of ABET reviews will be available to CCHE upon request.
- b. At least every three years, each academic program will be reviewed by an External Visiting Committee. CSM will notify CCHE of these reviews and provide the opportunity for a CCHE staff person to be an observer of the review. Reports of these reviews and the response of the CSM Board of Trustees will be made available to CCHE.
- c. At least 90% of bachelor degree recipients will either enroll in graduate school or be placed in a job directly related to their course of study within one year of graduation. Graduates entering military service will be considered as being placed. During times of national economic downturns, achievement of this level of placement may not be possible.
- d. CSM will survey recruiters who come to the CSM campus regarding their perspective of the quality of CSM academic programs. The results of this survey will be made available to CCHE as part of the ABET accreditation review process.

7. 120 CREDIT LIMITATIONS FOR ACADEMIC DEGREE PROGRAMS

CSM will be exempted from 120 credit limitations for those academic degree programs where accreditation standards and requirements result in graduation requirements exceeding 120 credits.

8. GENERAL EDUCATION COURSE COMPETENCIES (HB 1263)

CSM will participate in general education course competencies as outlined in HB 1263.

9. FACILITIES MASTER PLAN AND CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION

Prior to July 1, 2003, CSM will provide CCHE with a facilities master plan. Once the Master Plan has been reviewed and approved by CCHE, all CSM self-funded capital construction projects included in the approved Master Plan will be authorized to proceed after CSM Board of Trustee review and approval.

10. INCREASING FINANCIAL SUPPORT

- a. During the five-year term of this performance agreement, CSM will strive to increase the size of its endowment to a level that brings CSM to be one of the top ten public higher education institutions with an endowment measured by endowment dollars per SFTE.
- b. During the five-year term of this performance agreement, annual sponsored research at CSM will increase. During times of economic downturns, this goal may not be achieved.
- c. During FY 2002-03, for graduate students at CSM, each 27 credit hours generated will be counted as one SFTE. The graduate SFTE used for the initial conversion from 30 credits to 27 credits will be the FY 2000-01 graduate SFTE.

11. COMMITMENT TO STUDENT FINANCIAL AID

- a. CSM will continue to increase financial aid for all students.
- b. Unless there is a significant decrease in State and Federal funding of financial aid, CSM will maintain the level of funding for financial aid for students at no lower than the FY 2001-02 level of \$8,850,000.
- c. CSM will increase the level of financial aid for resident students during each year of the term of this performance agreement consistent with the annual level of increase in resident tuition-and state financial support.

12. BLOCK GRANT OF GENERAL FUND AND RELATIONSHIP TO RESIDENT ENROLLMENT

The level of the block grant of general fund to CSM will not change, except for annual inflationary adjustments as measured by the Denver-Boulder CPI, as long as CSM's resident SFTE remains within a range of +/- 2% of CSM's FY 2001-02 resident SFTE. If resident SFTE for any fiscal year of the term of this performance agreement increases or decreases more than 2%, the level of the block grant of general fund to CSM will be renegotiated by CSM and CCHE and communicated to the JBC.

13. TUITION RATES

- a. The CSM Board of Trustees may recommend an annual increase in the resident rate of tuition up to but not exceeding twice the rate of Denver-Boulder Consumer Price Index. CSM will provide to CCHE, the JBC, and the Education Committees its recommendation for the resident rate of tuition by February 15 of each year of the term of this performance agreement.
- b. The CSM Board of Trustees may recommend annually a non-resident rate of tuition. This recommendation shall be made to CCHE, the JBC, and the Education Committees by February 15 of each year of the term of this performance agreement.

14. CREATION, MODIFICATION, OR ELIMINATION OF ACADEMIC DEGREE PROGRAMS

- a. For any new academic degree program, CSM will provide to CCHE a copy of the discussion paper given to the CSM Board of Trustees for the meeting when the proposal is first discussed, but not acted upon by the Board. CCHE may respond to the discussion paper before the next regularly scheduled meeting of the CSM Board of Trustees at which time the proposal will be scheduled for action by the Board of Trustees. CCHE's response will be limited to the proposed program's consistency with the role and mission of CSM. No new academic degree program will be approved or implemented if CCHE determines the program is inconsistent with CSM's role and mission.

CSM will report to CCHE any proposed modification in existing academic degree programs at the time that the proposed modification is presented to the CSM Board of Trustees for initial discussion. CCHE may respond to the proposed modification before the next regularly scheduled meeting of the CSM Board of Trustees at which time the proposed modification will be scheduled for action by the Board of Trustees. No program modification will be approved or implemented if CCHE determines that the changes are inconsistent with CSM's role and mission.

15. QUALITY ASSURANCE ACT (QIS)

CSM and CCHE are committed to accountability and to providing the public with information regarding the performance of CSM. Although, CSM is exempt from the requirements associated with the Quality Assurance Act (QIS), CSM will furnish, upon request from CCHE, information and data to assure public accountability including information for such matters as the Consumer Guide (e.g., graduation rates, retention rates, persistence rates, test and examination scores and passing rates, etc.).

16. ADVISORY BOARD

The President of CSM and the CSM Board of Trustees may nominate members to serve on an advisory board to the CSM Board of Trustees.

_____	_____	_____	_____
President, Colorado School of Mines	Date	Executive Director, CCHE	Date
_____	_____	_____	_____
Chairman, CSM Board of Trustees	Date	Chairman, CCHE	Date

TOPIC: COLORADOMENTOR PROGRAM PRESENTATION

PREPARED BY: JEANNE ADKINS

I. SUMMARY

There will be a demonstration of the ColoradoMentor Program web site.

TOPIC: REVIEW OF FINANCIAL AUDIT FINDINGS DIRECTED TOWARD COLORADO'S HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS IN FY 2000-2001

PREPARED BY: JEANNE ADKINS, ROBERT HADDOCK AND KATHLEEN VONACHEN

I. SUMMARY

The State requires annual audits of all publicly supported institutions and their governing boards. In FY2001, the institutions and their governing boards received unqualified opinions (no significant issues were identified in the audit). The reports also show that the institutions and their systems have addressed many of the prior year audit recommendations. However, the FY2001 audits did identify issues that need to be addressed. Three key issues were raised at University of Colorado institutions. The issues related to various boards and their institutions are discussed in summary below. This report does not outline all elements of the audit, but rather summarizes issues for each governing board and provides summary information on action on FY2000 recommendations to boards and institutions. Full audits are public documents and available for review.

II. BACKGROUND

University of Colorado

The consolidated University of Colorado audit directed seven recommendations to the system and its campuses. The auditors made five recommendations to the system, one to the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center and one recommendation to the Boulder Campus. The University agreed to implement all seven recommendations. Overall, the auditors stated that the University of Colorado system needed to improve its security over its payroll system, ensure that modifications to its information technology systems are approved by the State Controller's Office and address issues related to the disposal of equipment.

Additionally, the audit report identified three "key issues" that the system needed to improve, including:

1. Monitoring and control over payroll processes. The auditors stated that with over \$719 million in payroll to 19,000 employees there is risk of fraud, errors and omission since some individual employees can create positions, authorize funding, authorize hiring and input time worked. The auditors recommended that the University segregate these duties to minimize risks.

2. Reconciliation between UCHSC's fixed asset system and People Soft system. The auditors found significant issues between two receivable billing systems causing large revenue and accounts receivable balances and posting errors in the accounting ledgers. The problem was corrected but required significant work by University employees to reconcile differences.
3. Oversight over employee use of procurement cards. The auditors found that employees were not following University policies for signing monthly statements, providing invoices for purchases and reviewing and signing their monthly statements.

The FY2000 University of Colorado audit contained nine recommendations. Of these, the system implemented five, partially implemented three and did not implement one recommendation.

State Board of Agriculture

The auditors directed four recommendations to the State Board of Agriculture/CSU system and its institutions in FY 2000-01. Three recommendations were to the University of Southern Colorado. The other recommendation was to Fort Lewis College's. Colorado State University did not have any audit recommendations.

The recommendations to USC focused on federal programs (two recommendations) and its residence hall (one recommendation). The first recommendation directed USC to ensure that Perkins Loan Program regulatory compliance and documentation procedures are followed. USC also was directed to ensure that returns of Title IV student grants or loan assistance funds are accurately calculated for all students and unspent funds are returned to Title IV programs on a timely basis. USC residence hall operations were directed to revise their 10-year repair and replacement plan, improve reconciliation of resident student billings and more closely follow operating and management agreement procedures.

Fort Lewis Residence Hall operations were directed to improve their accounting for cost of individual auxiliary activities and analyze the profitability of each auxiliary. The auditors also recommended that the school review its computer system to determine if the system could be used to help eliminate redundant manual record-keeping.

The FY2000 SBA/CSU financial audit contained seven recommendations. Of these, the system implemented six and partially implemented one recommendation.

Community Colleges of Colorado

The auditors identified six areas where community colleges could improve. While the auditors stated that none of the issues was a significant problem, they directed that the community colleges implement all the recommendations to ensure that the colleges follow appropriate accounting procedures in their financial operations.

The audit recommended that Lamar Community College and Northeastern Junior College improve controls over cash by reconciling bookstore deposit slips with daily register tapes. The audit also included two recommendations to Lamar Community College, Pueblo Community College and the system office, directing them to improve their accounts receivable practices related to making allowances for doubtful accounts.

Both Lamar Community College and Pueblo Community College were directed to improve procedures related to fixed assets and physical inventories. Auditors also recommended that Lamar Community College ensure its equipment identification and inventory systems are current.

Colorado Northwestern Community College and Red Rocks Community College were directed to adhere more closely to the provisions of the Carl Perkins Grant federal program. The auditors also suggested that the system office review its cut-off procedures to ensure that all accounts are properly stated as of year-end.

In FY2000 the auditors made five recommendations to Community Colleges of Colorado. The system implemented four and partially implemented one of the recommendations.

Trustees of the State Colleges

The FY2001 audit contained four recommendations, one to each the four State Colleges as follows:

- Adams State had not complied with one of the general covenants of the series 1994 bond issues. The auditors recommended that the college improve its monitoring of fees, rental rates and charges for building usage to ensure that fees and costs adequately cover bond costs.
- The auditors recommended Mesa improve its food service operations by collecting sales revenue data and conducting formal market surveys of meal plans to ensure that the plans are adequately documented and comparable with similar plans statewide.
- The auditors found that Metro had charged more expenses than appropriate to its departments for various employee benefits and PERA resulting in a balance of \$136K in

the account at June 30, 2001 (a carry forward from prior years). The account should have been zero. The auditors recommended that Metro analyze clearing accounts and fringe benefit allocation percentages and write off the remaining carry forward balance of the clearing account.

- The auditors recommended that Western State document its financial aid policies and procedures in a manual as required by CCHE and as dictated by good business practices and inform financial aid applicants of these policies and procedures as required by the state.

In FY2000 the auditors made seven recommendations to the four State Colleges, two to Adams State. Both were implemented. Three recommendations were directed to Metro and one was fully implemented while two were partially implemented. Two recommendations were addressed to Western State and both were implemented. Mesa did not have any recommendations in FY2000.

University of Northern Colorado

UNC's audit included three recommendations. The audit stated that while none of the issues was significant, an error in the input of payroll withholding data indicated a need for further verification of payrolls by the University. The auditors also stated that the University needed to improve its review of calculation of the allowance for doubtful receivables to detect potential errors and ensure that Perkins loan grace periods are changed from the end of the semester to the day after the borrower withdraws from the University or drops to less than half-time enrollment.

In FY2000 the auditors also made three recommendations to the University ranging from procurement cards to direct deposit of student employee payroll and better control over leases and financing agreements. All three recommendations were implemented.

Colorado School of Mines

CSM's audit report included five recommendations. CSM agreed to implement all five. The recommendations ranged from the need to improve monitoring of federal programs to improving cash controls. One recommendation directed CSM to ensure that the estimates it submits to the federal government are complete and accurate. A second recommendation identified a problem in CSM monitoring of sub-recipients. A third recommendation directed Mines to improve its counseling of students who were borrowing for the first time and for students leaving school. Two other recommendations directed CSM to perform bond arbitrage calculations and to improve its oversight of cash receipt handling from its departments.

In FY2000, the auditors made 12 recommendations to CSM. The School implemented eight, partially implemented two and did not implement two recommendations

Auraria Higher Education Center

Auraria's audit contained five audit findings and recommendations. Four recommendations were directed to the AHEC Book Center. The first suggested that the AHEC Book Center require all cash advances, refunds, and buy-back documentation be completely and accurately filled out by personnel and customers. The auditors recommend that the Book Center improve procedures for ordering and returning merchandise, that they develop written policies and procedures related to the purchase and return of merchandise, and monitor the coding of inventory received to ensure proper coding is used when pricing new and used textbooks. A fifth recommendation directed the Auraria Child Care Center manager to sign the document to indicate that a review had taken place.

The auditors made five recommendations to the Auraria Center in FY2000. Four were implemented and one was partially implemented.

Colorado Mountain College Local District Junior College

The auditors for Colorado Mountain College recommended that CMC return program funds not being used to the Federal Family Education Loan Program on a more timely basis.

Aims Community College Local District Junior College

Aims Community College's independent auditors had not concluded their audit for FY2001 at the time of this agenda item presentation. Un-audited financial statement data was included for Aims Community College and is subject to further modification.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

All of the state's higher education systems received unqualified opinions from the auditors in their FY2001 financial audits. While the audits did not contain any significant material findings, most of the institutions were directed to improve various aspects of their accounting operations. The institutions are consistent in their efforts to address audit issues as can be seen in the prior year recommendations status updates.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

This report is presented for information and review by the commission. No action is required on the report by the Commission. Each institution must work with the Office of the State Auditor to select a firm for its annual audit. Upon completion, the State Auditor reviews the audits for any substantive or material issues of concern. This summary review of the annual audits is part of the general fiscal oversight by the Commission of governing board and institution financial practices.

TOPIC: REPORT OF DISTANCE EDUCATION COORDINATING COUNCIL

PREPARED BY: JEFF RICHARDSON

I. SUMMARY

Ten motions were passed by the Commission on January 9, 2001, to effect policy direction regarding distance education coordination for the state. Seven of the motions have been completed or acted upon, one is in progress and two have yet to be addressed.

In addition, four new initiatives have been independently adopted: statewide e-Library planning, faculty and program awards in distance education, technology assessment and evaluating enrollment statistics. CCHE will pursue work on the e-Library and enrollment statistics, leave further work on a distance education award to the discretion of the institutions and table further work on technology assessment.

II. BACKGROUND

The principal goal of distance education is to increase access to higher education for students. The motions adopted by the Commission set the expectation of multi-institutional coordination, communication and collaboration designed to maximize access, assure academic quality and promote cost-effective delivery.

Access is improved via distance education for four key groupings of students: those on campus with schedule conflicts; those in the workforce or at home whose schedules or locations preclude attending class in person; those living in rural areas of the state for whom distance is a barrier to attendance; and those in high school who are ready to take college-level work.

Data reported to the Commission show substantial distance education activity in Colorado on the part of the 28 public higher education campuses. These data show that distance education is playing an increasingly significant role in higher education in Colorado and warrants close attention, coordination and when necessary, guidance.

In Fiscal Year 1999-2000 the online medium (e.g., Internet) dominates delivery mode. Online enrollments doubled between FY98-99 and FY99-00 reaching a total of 25,082 enrollments. Online is the principal way to support asynchronous interaction (e.g., anytime, anywhere). This mode of interaction provides the most convenience and access to students. The three campuses with the largest online enrollments are (in rank order): Metropolitan State College of Denver, University of Colorado – Denver, Front Range Community College. The full report for FY99-00 distance education enrollments is under internal review by

Commission staff and will be submitted to the Commission in March as a written report.

Further, during the past year, the Commission adopted a new FTE policy that allows distance education courses to be counted among FTE enrollments used to compute state support. It should be noted here that distance education courses have in the past been routinely included in most institutions' FTE counts of for state funding. Ninety percent of all distance education courses (not including correspondence) are reported for FTE, with the remaining 10 percent reported as Extended Studies cash-funded programs.

Finally, similar technology is used for support of both the distance education course and the normal classroom-based course. This convergence of distance education and technology-enhanced classroom instruction presents an opportunity for institutions to leverage the economies of scale of combined distance and on-campus technology with regard to shared costs, faculty support and development and student familiarity.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

The status of each of the ten Commission motions stands as follows:

1. **Establishment of the Distance Education Coordinating Council.** Each system CEO designated a representative. To these representatives was added the CCHE chair, a faculty representative, and a student representative.
2. **Conduct a market study of distance education.** Action on this item was tabled after preparing a plan of action and then further considering the goals of a market study. It was decided that the information a market study would develop is readily available from the annual distance education enrollments reports of CCHE and from each program's own knowledge of program and course demand.

DECC also considered whether dramatic increases in distance education enrollments would lead to exceeding TABOR limits and therefore redirect funds from established on-campus programs. DECC recognized that the proper approach to this issue is to address the funding issues and not artificially limit the student access to distance education. Funding issues are being addressed nationally as well as by the Blue Ribbon Panel.

3. **Establishment of a statewide online course catalog.** The project to develop a statewide catalog of distance education offerings has been started with the goal of deploying the first version of the catalog in May 2002 via ColoradoMentor. The effort has the full participation and support of the major online programs in the state. The catalog will be limited to Internet-based courses, it will not include correspondence or site-based courses. A policy team has been formed to address certain institutional questions raised by the advent of a statewide course catalog. A technical team is

designing the system around a prototype already developed by the CU system for its four campuses.

4. **Issuance of RFP for outsourcing distance education support services.** A Course Management System Team was put in place in August 2001. This team developed the RFP, solicited proposals, evaluated the results, and through Pikes Peak Community College, issued the following seven awards. A full executive summary is available.

Category	Vendor	Price Concessions Based on Aggregated Volume
Licensed CMS	Blackboard	None. However, 10% discount to all new and existing Colorado clients
	WebCT	Up to 20% if over 9 institutions
	Prometheus	Up to 40% on courses over 250
Hosted CMS	eCollege	8.6% if enrollments exceed 45,000
	Jones Knowledge	Up to 40% if enrollments over 30,000
CMS Hosting Services	Eduprise	None offered.
	Embanet	Up to 33% with over 10,000 enrollments

5. **Participation in the State Portal project.** Funding has delayed this project. Therefore, action on this item has been tabled.
6. **State incentive grants for distance education program development.** Several avenues for funding incentive grants were explored. Until further progress is made on the other items the DECC is chartered to accomplish staff recommends it would be premature to seek legislative or institutional support for funding this activity. The incentive grants, when and if funded, would target outcomes deemed to increase student access and program cost-effectiveness. Alternatively, the DECC has initiated an awards program and endorsed a statewide business school core curriculum project.
7. **Development of cost models and cost reporting guidelines for distance education.** This item is pending action. The DECC has focused its resources on accomplishing other items deemed higher in priority.
8. **Distance education tuition and fees.** This item is pending action. Progress on this item is dependent on item 7, that is, the development of cost models and cost-reporting guidelines and obtaining some valid cost data from institutions.

9. **Regarding intellectual property.** All institutions provided information on their intellectual property policies for copyrightable academic material to the Commission on November 1, 2002. A report analyzing and summarizing those policies has been prepared and is available upon request. Based on their responses, all have in place board-approved policies necessary to deal with the issues of copyrightable academic material, or in the few cases where policies need to be updated, that this process is underway within specific timelines. The rights and privileges of both the creator (faculty member, staff and students) and the institution are recognized and protected by the policies, and the policies call for procedures to effectively define and implement the interests of creator and institution.

10. **Guiding principles for the conduct of distance education programs at Colorado public institutions** of higher education. All institutions are in agreement with the set of principles developed by the American Council on Education entitled, *Guiding Principles for Distance Learning in a Learning Society*.

In addition to the 10 Commission motions adopted in 2001, the DECC has undertaken four initiatives on its own, described below:

- A) **Statewide E-Library.** Students taking courses of any type require library access to support their studies. On campus this support is provided by the physical library and by certain online resources made available to campus students. Such support also is required by distance education students, but access to both the physical library and online resources may be unavailable or limited. Therefore, early on the DECC recognized that an important additional issue it must examine is library support.

DECC concluded the best way to approach this task would be to set forth the goal of providing certain online library services to all residents of the state to support life-long learning, continuing education, distance education, professional development and general education.

A Statewide E-Library Team comprised broadly of library system representatives from higher education, secondary education and public libraries was formed. This team has conceived the following goal (still in draft form):

All Colorado residents, particularly distance education students, faculty and staff, will have equitable access to quality library and information resources and qualified, well-trained librarian support to meet their needs for learning, working and living.

This effort is still in the planning stage with the intent of developing a full proposal this spring to include mission, plan of action, evaluation, governance, staffing and funding.

- B) **Faculty and Program Awards.** To promote and stimulate the development and delivery

of quality innovative distance education courses, the DECC plans to offer two awards of excellence in distance education, one to the outstanding faculty member using this method, and one to the outstanding distance education program. The faculty competition is being conducted in concert with the Colorado Faculty Assembly. The program competition is being conducted internally by DECC. The DECC asks the Commission to consider presenting these awards at the May Commission meeting. Presentations by the awardees will be incorporated into the annual Teaching with Technology Conference organized by the University of Colorado. Criteria for the faculty award include: innovativeness, evidence of success, and potential for replication.

- C) **Technology Assessment.** Distance education depends on technology for its success. As noted elsewhere above, there are parallel opportunities for the use of technology in the classroom. Since the DECC is familiar with the use of technology for instruction, with the support of CCHE staff, it has been asked to examine the impact of technology in the classroom.

Information technology is a part of contemporary life. It plays an important role in the advancement of knowledge in many academic disciplines. Colleges and universities have invested heavily in the deployment of information technology resources in the academic setting for direct use by faculty and students. CCHE has established a goal for the integration of technology by 50 percent of all classes, but no well-defined means consistent across all institutions exists to measure progress toward this goal.

The DECC has discussed ways to assess the scope of integration of technology in education, especially from the student's point-of-view.

- D) **Enrollment Statistics.** CCHE staff has been collecting enrollment statistics on distance education since Fiscal Year 1998-1999. It was begun in conjunction with the HB 99-1289 studies and is now being continued on a routine basis since the growth of these programs is a question raised regularly by the General Assembly. An updated report is under internal review and a report will be published this spring.

IV. **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends the DECC continue to meet as needed to complete its work on any pending motions from January 2001, specifically the two dealing with distance education costs and pricing. CCHE staff will work directly with the e-Library task force to further develop the proposal for a statewide e-Library. Staff will direct DECC to leave further progress on a distance education award to the institutions. Staff will direct DECC to table further investigation into assessing the use of technology in the classroom.

Appendix A

STATUTORY AUTHORITY

C.R.S. 23-1-108. Provides general duties and powers of the commission with regard to systemwide planning, specifically, “(a) for the best use of available resources,” which is interpreted to include IT resources, including those for distance education.

C.R.S. 23-1-109. Duties and powers of the commission with regard to off-campus instruction. (4) The commission shall administer any centralized, statewide extension and continuing education program of instruction which may be offered by any state-supported baccalaureate and graduate institution. All instruction offered outside the geographic boundaries of the campus, including instruction delivered by television or other technological means, shall be a part of this program unless exempted by policy and action of the commission.

C.R.S. 23-13-104. Provides statewide expectations and goals for higher education, including “(1) (d) technology integration to lower the institution’s capital and administrative costs and improve the quality and delivery of education and provide effective stewardship of existing assets, recognizing that all technology changes may not result in lower costs in the academic arena. To meet this goal, each institution shall: (I) integrate technology to reduce the institution’s cost per unit of education; (II) integrate technology to improve the marketability of graduates in the workplace; (III) improve student access and continuing education through increased distance learning; (IV) improve learning productivity.”

TOPIC: REMEDIAL EDUCATION REPORT

PREPARED BY: SHARON SAMSON/ MICHELLE DERBENWICK

I. SUMMARY

The attached report is a summary of the progress of the implementation of the Remedial Policy.

II. BACKGROUND

C.R.S. 23-1-113.3 mandates a Remedial Policy that informs the General Assembly on the state of Remedial Education in Colorado, including the number of undergraduate students assessed as requiring remediation, the cost of remediation, and the distribution of remedial students across K-12 districts.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

[Attached report.](#)

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

This report is an information item only; no formal action is required by the Commission.

Appendix A

STATUTORY AUTHORITY

The policy applies to all state-supported institutions of higher education, including all four-year state-supported universities and colleges that support freshmen, extension programs of the state-supported universities and colleges, junior and community colleges, and local district colleges. The governing boards and institutions of the public system of higher education in Colorado are obligated to conform to the policies set by the Commission within the authorities delegated to it by **C.R.S. 23-1-113.3**.

Commission directive—basic skills courses. (1) ON OR BEFORE SEPTEMBER 1, 2000; THE COMMISSION SHALL IMPLEMENT STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES WHEREBY BASIC SKILLS COURSES, AS DEFINED IN SECTION 23-1-113 (4) (c), MAY BE OFFERED BY STATE INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION PURSUANT TO THIS SECTION.

COLORADO COMMISSION ON
 **HIGHER
EDUCATION**

ACCESS TO HIGH-QUALITY, AFFORDABLE EDUCATION FOR ALL COLORADANS

REMEDIAL EDUCATION REPORT

FEBRUARY 2002

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The statute (**C.R.S. 23-1-113.3**) defined the Commission's role and responsibilities, including to (1) design and implement statewide policies for remedial education, (2) provide the General Assembly information on the number, type, and cost of remedial education provided, (3) develop appropriate funding policies that support the institutional roles and missions, (4) ensure the comparability of these placement or assessment tests, and (5) ensure that each student identified as needing basic skills remedial course work is provided with written notification identifying which state institutions offer such basic skills courses and the approximate cost and relative availability of such courses, including any electronic on-line courses.

In August 2000 the Commission adopted its Remedial Education Policy.

In March 2001 the Commission revised its FTE Policy. The policy clearly identifies that only community colleges, Adams State College and Mesa State College may claim FTE in remedial courses for state support.

In October 2001 the Commission accepted the remedial plans submitted by the Colorado public colleges and universities. In all cases, students had two opportunities to demonstrate that they had mathematics, writing and reading skills necessary to succeed in college. Institutions have integrated the testing into Student Success Centers and advised students on available options to satisfy remedial needs, including the availability of on-line courses.

CCHE staff, in consultation with the governing boards, developed a reporting system. The reporting system is designed to provide the General Assembly with information on remedial students and provide feedback reports to the high schools. The first remedial assessment file was submitted October 15, 2001. Institutions will report remedial enrollments on the 2001-02 Student Enrollment File. Linking the remedial assessment data with the enrollment data will provide a composite picture of remedial needs, the responsiveness of Colorado higher education to meet student needs, and costs of remedial education.

The initial data indicate that 40% of assessed first-time students need some form of remedial assistance. The greatest need is in mathematics, with 8,518 students requiring at least one remedial math course. This equates to 32% of students entering a two-year or four-year public college who need math remediation. The four-year college math remediation rate is 13% while 74% of the students entering a two-year college need math remediation.

ACT has agreed to assist CCHE in future analyses. ACT and CCHE share a mutual interest in learning whether Colorado's junior year ACT test increases the college participation rate of Colorado high school students and whether statewide testing improves the level of college preparation. This study will be included in the January 2003 legislative report.

II. BACKGROUND

The policy applies to all state-supported institutions of higher education, including all four-year state-supported universities and colleges that admit freshmen, extension programs of the state-supported universities and colleges, junior and community colleges, and local district colleges. The governing boards and institutions of the public system of higher education in Colorado are obligated to conform to the policies set by the Commission within the authorities delegated to it by C.R.S. 23-1-113.3.

C.R.S. 23-1-113.3 Commission directive – basic skills courses. (1) ON OR BEFORE SEPTEMBER 1, 2000; THE COMMISSION SHALL ADOPT AND THE GOVERNING BOARDS SHALL IMPLEMENT STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES WHEREBY BASIC SKILLS COURSES, AS DEFINED IN SECTION 23-1-113 (4) (c), MAY BE OFFERED BY STATE INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION PURSUANT TO THIS SECTION.

III. CCHE REMEDIAL POLICIES

At its August 2000 meeting, the Commission approved a new Remedial Policy designed around three policy goals:

- All degree-seeking first-time students are prepared to succeed in college level courses.
- Students assessed as needing remedial instruction have accurate information regarding course availability and options to meet the college entry-level competencies.
- Colorado public high schools are informed about the level of college readiness of their recent high school graduate.

In March 2001 the Commission revised its FTE Policy. The current FTE Policy clearly identifies that only community colleges, Adams State College and Mesa State College may claim state support for remedial education and what circumstances apply. As part of the policy design, a new FTE reporting form was included in the annual FTE Report making it possible to monitor the state cost of supporting remedial education.

IV. REMEDIAL PLANS

In accordance with CCHE's Remedial Policy, each governing board submitted remedial plans for its institution. CCHE staff reviewed the remedial plans for completeness, comparability of cut scores and compliance with the statute. While certain institutions are using additional assessment tools to determine the level of college readiness, the scores on these tests correlate to the ACT subtest scores. The Academic Council had previously negotiated common cut scores for ACT subtests, including:

A student must score a 19 or higher on the Act Math subtest to be considered college-ready in mathematics.

A student must score 18 or higher on the ACT English subtest to be considered college-ready in writing.

A student must score 17 or higher on the ACT English subtest to be considered reading at college level.

Setting the common cut scores was critical to ensure that no student would be tested twice or receive conflicting advice regarding their need for remedial assistance.

The cut scores were based on an analysis conducted by ACT that 50% of the students who earn a 19 or higher on the ACT Math subtest will earn a C or better in college level math. Similarly, a student who scores 18 or higher on the ACT English subtest will earn a C or better in college composition course. Reading did not have a similar statistic research base but the studies show that reading is closely correlated to writing skills: students who lack college-level reading skills most probably will lack college-level writing skills. CCHE and the institutions agreed to monitor the reading cut score.

The remedial plans share a common definition of who will be assessed -- all first-time, degree-seeking students. First-time means a student who enrolls at a college for the first time or those who change enrollment status from non-degree-seeking to degree-seeking regardless of the number of college credits earned. Prior enrollment as a high school concurrent student does not prevent a student from being categorized as first-time. The following students are exempt from taking a placement test in reading, writing, or mathematics:

- Students who have earned a bachelor or associate degree.
- Students who have been previously assessed at a Colorado public college or university.
- Students who have successfully completed basic skills instruction in mathematics, writing or reading are exempt from testing in that subject area only.
- Students who have successfully completed a college-level course in English are exempt from the requirement for basic skills assessment in writing and reading.
- Students who have successfully completed a college-level course in mathematics are exempt from the requirement for basic skills assessment in mathematics.
- Students enrolled in a vocational certificate program, unless they seek to enroll in college-level English or mathematics

In general, colleges are using the ACT test either as a screening test or actual college-level basic skills test. A screening test differentiates students who demonstrate college readiness from those who need to take a specific placement test. For example, community colleges use the ACT test for screening and the Accuplacer for placing a student in a particular math or writing course. In all plans, a student who does not meet the basic skills standards in the initial testing has an opportunity to retake the test or use the placement assessment to measure college readiness. Because all incoming Colorado high school graduates will take the ACT test in their junior year, it minimizes the testing burden on the student.

The following table summarizes the institutional remedial plans, listing the placement or challenge test for each institution with the cut score following the assessment test, the frequency of testing, institution notification procedures for informing students of test results and information on remedial course availability.

INST	PLACEMENT / CHALLENGE TESTS	TEST AVAILABILITY
CC	Mathematics: Accuplacer Elementary Algebra test – 72 Reading: Accuplacer test – 83 Writing: Accuplacer test in Sentence Skills -- 86	Provides assessment testing continually before and during each semester. No cost to student
AIMS	Mathematics: Compass 88 or Accuplacer 70 Reading: Compass 83 or Accuplacer -- 83 Writing: Compass 93-94 or Accuplacer 100	Walk in testing at Greeley; testing by appointment at Fort Lupton and Loveland
CMC	Mathematics: Accuplacer Elementary Algebra test – 72 Reading: Accuplacer test – 83 Writing: Accuplacer test in Sentence Skills -- 86	Provides assessment testing continually before and during each semester. No cost to student
ASC	Mathematics: Adams State developed a Mathematical Placement Exam based on questions developed by the Mathematical Association of America Placement Testing Program -- 19 English: Adams State English Placement – 46 Reading: CAAP Reading Test – 22	Testing is free but each enrollment in remedial course is \$50.
CSM	Mathematics: NA – CSM does not admit students who score below 25 on Math Reading: CSM developed reading test; scored by 2 readers Writing: CSM developed writing test; scored by 2 readers	Prior to registering for first semester courses
CSU	Mathematics: For students with ACT scores 19 or above -- CSU's Mathematics Placement Exam. For others: Entry Level Mathematics Exam that was written to align with high school exit standards Writing: CSU's Composition Placement exam with a score of 3 out of 6. Scoring guidelines parallel ACT essay guides.	Orientation sessions
FLC	Mathematics: FLC Mathematics Placement Exam with score of 13 Reading: Accuplacer test – 80 Writing: Accuplacer test in Sentence Skills -- 86	Tested during freshmen orientation session before registering for class. Additional test dates continuously between first day of class and census date.
MESA	Mathematics: Compass -- 50	ACT scores are available before

INST	PLACEMENT / CHALLENGE TESTS	TEST AVAILABILITY
	Reading: Compass – 76 Writing: Challenge by writing an essay score 3 on 6 point scale.3	students register. Challenge essays may be written anytime. Compass is a computer-based assessment and scores area available immediately.
METRO	Mathematics: MSCD developed test -- 9 out of 15 Reading: Nelson Denny Form G 84 Writing: 30 minutes to write essay; scored by faculty using Educational Testing Service scoring guidelines. -- 3 out of possible 6	Assessment testing by appointment
UCB	Alternate demonstration of college readiness: Analyze high school transcripts, including enrollment in AP courses in English or Math, four or more years in English or Math with passing grades in all courses.	Students will be advised to enroll in a community college course during the first semester of college enrollment.
UCCS	Opportunity to retake ACT exam Alternate demonstration of college readiness: Analyze high school transcripts, including enrollment in AP courses in English or Math, four or more years in English or Math with passing grades in all courses.	In addition to the state ACT test date, national test date, UCCS offers the ACT exam at its testing center (\$33).
UCD	Mathematics: Accuplacer Elementary Algebra test – 72 Reading: Accuplacer test – 83 Writing: Accuplacer test in Sentence Skills -- 86	Contracts with CCD to test transfer and freshmen without ACT scores students using the Accuplacer.
UNC	Mathematics Accuplacer Elementary Algebra test – 50 Reading: Accuplacer test – 56 Writing: Accuplacer test in Sentence Skills – 66	UNC offers on-line and paper versions of Accuplacer test at the Career Services Testing Center
USC	Mathematics: USC Placement exam scoring at Intermediate Algebra mastery level; worked with ACT on scoring guidelines Reading: Accuplacer test – 81 Writing: USC proctored 300 – 500 word essay scored by 2 faculty.	During Student orientation or by appointment at USC’s Learning Center
WSC	Mathematics: MAA Basic Algebra – 16 Reading: WSC English Placement I -- 15 Writing: WSC English Placement II – 18	Placement tests offered during orientation sessions.

INST	DELIVERY			STUDENT INFORMED	INFORMATION ON REMEDIAL COURSE AVAILABILITY
	REGULAR COURSE	CASH FUNDED	CONTRACT WITH CC		
CC	X		NA	Writing	Published in course schedule, catalog, and on web site.
AIMS	X		NA		Published in course schedule, catalog, and on web site.
CMC	X		NA		Published in course schedule, catalog, and on web site.
ASC	X			Same day as test	Published in course schedule, catalog, and on web site.
CSM			X (RRCC)	Personal letter	Required one-on-one tutoring in CSM Writing Center during first CSM semester while co-enrolled in Remedial course.

INST	DELIVERY			STUDENT INFORMED	INFORMATION ON REMEDIAL COURSE AVAILABILITY
	REGULAR COURSE	CASH FUNDED	CONTRACT WITH CC		
CSU			X (FRCC)	Writing	Published in course schedule, catalog, and on web site.
FLC		X			Published in course schedule, catalog, and on web site.
MESA	X				Published in course schedule, catalog, and on web site.
METRO			X (CCD)	Within 2 days	Available remedial courses listed on class schedule, information sheets at the Assessment Center and from academic advisors.
UCB				Individually notified	Provide student with list of remedial courses available in the Denver Boulder area and on-line
UCCS		X	X (PPCC)	Mail notification	
UCD			X (CCD)	Notified individually	Student Success Advising Center for freshmen and sophomores informs students, assists in registering, monitors progress. Provides list of all remedial courses offered in metro area.
UNC			X (AIMS)	Notified by College Transition Center	List of remedial courses that will satisfy requirements, including AIMS, video, correspondence, weekend, on-line courses.
USC			X(PCC)	Notified with 24 hours of ACT test; within 3 hours of USC tests	Notification at orientation session, catalog, semester bulletins, advising handbook and at web site.
WSC		X		Prior to registering fall semester	Registration packet contains information on placement and basic skills needs and course schedule for basic skills courses. Offered every semester.

CCHE will continue to monitor the implementation of these plans to determine if they meet the needs of students.

V. REMEDIAL DATA

CCHE began collecting data on remedial assessment in 2001. The first file was submitted October 15, 2001. It includes assessment data on all undergraduate students entering Colorado's public colleges and universities. The remedial assessment data is designed to describe which students need remedial education and to inform school districts of their graduates' level of college readiness statewide.

The 2001 data collection year field-tested the robustness of the data design. The primary purpose of this submission was to ascertain if the data reported would answer the legislative questions regarding the state of remedial education or whether additional reports are necessary. Based on prior experience with new data submissions, CCHE anticipated that the 2001 file submission would have data shortfalls, but it would provide all constituent institutions an opportunity to verify their data for accuracy and consistency -- particularly the community colleges reporting undergraduate applicant data for the first time -- before the first legislative remedial data report.

Although the first legislative report on the number, type and cost of remedial education is scheduled for January 2003, the following tables give a brief overview of student remedial needs. Table 1 illustrates the proportion of undergraduate degree-seeking students who would be enrolling in post-secondary education for the first time who were assessed as requiring remediation in at least one subject. As open admission institutions, students entering two-year colleges are less likely to have ACT test scores. This situation will improve next academic year because all Colorado graduates will have ACT scores from the 11th grade testing.

	Total Cohort	# Completely Assessed	#Exempt / Waived	% Completely Assessed (Excluding Exempt)
2 Year School	18,165	8,388	2,551	53.7%
4 Year School	21,196	18,587	377	89.3%
Total	39,361	26,975	2,928	74.0%

Table 2 shows the percentage of students who require some remedial assistance. Collectively, the four-year remedial rate parallels the size of the admission window. Institution analysis will show if this observation applies across the board to all admission selectivity levels. The two-year college freshmen class includes a higher proportion of adults than recent high school graduates. This accounts in part for the high remedial rate. The 2003 report will include more descriptive analysis, comparing recent high school graduates between sectors.

	# Completely Assessed	# Assessed as Remedial in at Least One Area	% Assessed as Remedial
2 Year School	8,388	7,127	85.0%
4 Year School	18,587	3,774	20.3%
Total	26,975	10,901	40.4%

Table 3 demonstrates the distribution of remedial students across the remedial subject areas reading, writing, and mathematics. It confirms that 32% of students entering

college need math remediation. The four-year college math remediation rate is 13% while 74% of the students entering a two-year college need math remediation.

Table 3. Type of Remediation Identified for Assessed Students						
	2 Year Schools		4 Year Schools		Total	
No Remediation Required	1,261	15.0%	14,813	79.7%	16,074	59.6%
Math, Writing, and Reading	1,913	22.8%	205	1.1%	2,118	7.9%
Math and Writing	996	11.9%	518	2.8%	1,514	5.6%
Math and Reading	623	7.4%	148	0.8%	771	2.9%
Math Only	2,635	31.4%	1,479	8.0%	4,114	15.3%
Math or some combination with Math	6,167	74%	2,350	13%	8,518	32%
Writing Only	346	4.1%	409	2.2%	755	2.8%
Reading Only	251	3.0%	841	4.5%	1,092	4.0%
Writing and Reading	363	4.3%	174	0.9%	537	2.0%
Total Assessed	8,388		18,587		26,975	

TOPIC: CONCEPT PAPERS

PREPARED BY: WILLIAM G. KUEPPER

I. SUMMARY

This agenda item presents staff analysis of the concept papers prepared since the last Commission meeting:

B.A. in Criminal Justice at the University of Northern Colorado
B.A. in Special Education at the University of Northern Colorado

The report includes a summary of the issues identified by CCHE staff and a copy of the concept paper. No action is required of the Commission at this time, but if the Commission wishes to have additional issues addressed or questions answered in the full proposal, these can be added to those in the staff report.

II. BACKGROUND

Approval by the Commission of a new degree program proposal is a two-stage process. The governing boards submit a concept paper to the Commission that provides an opportunity for the Commission to identify potential state issues prior to developing the full proposal. In contrast, the full proposal includes details about curriculum, financing, capital construction needs, and other implementation details.

Stage 1: Concept Paper

Before an institution develops a full proposal, the governing board or its staff shall submit a short concept paper to CCHE that outlines the proposed program goals, the basic design of the program, the market it plans to serve, and the reasons why the program is appropriate for the institution and its role and mission. CCHE policy does not require the governing board to approve the concept paper.

After the Commission staff reviews the concept paper, a staff member meets with representatives of the governing board to discuss issues and concerns related to the proposed degree. The staff presents the issues that need to be addressed in the full degree program proposal. A concept paper may be submitted by the governing board at any time and may be included on any Commission agenda.

Stage 2: Full Degree Proposal

The full proposal for a new degree program reaches the Commission only after undergoing review by, and receiving approval from, the governing board. The request for new degree approval must include:

- A complete degree program proposal as defined by the governing board policy.
- The institution's responses to the peer review comments.
- Tables of enrollment projections, physical capacity estimates, and projected expense and revenue estimates.
- An analysis by the governing board of the potential quality, capacity, and cost-effectiveness of the proposed degree program.
- The governing board's response to the issues identified in the Commission's review of the concept paper.

In addition, graduate degree programs require review by an external consultant. The Commission staff selects and contacts the external consultant; the governing board staff reviews the list of potential reviewers.

Once the governing board approves a proposal, the Commission staff prepares an analysis of the proposal, an institutional profile giving additional context for the institution's capacity and market demand, and a recommendation based on the statutory criteria.

The Commission only considers degree proposals at its January or June meetings. This provides the Commission an opportunity to examine the proposals in the context of statewide need.

**TOPIC: CONCEPT PAPER: BACHELOR OF ARTS IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERNCOLORADO**

PREPARED BY: WILLIAM G. KUEPPER

I. SUMMARY

The University of Northern Colorado has submitted a concept paper for a Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) degree in Criminal Justice (Attachment A). The program is intended to provide students with a liberal arts education that “incorporates the skills and knowledge specifically linked to pursuing a career in various aspects of Criminal Justice.” Since 1981 the university has offered an emphasis in criminal justice within its Sociology major. The proposed program thus builds upon the strengths of that emphasis.

The proposed major will require 41 credits. Of these, 23 credits would be in a criminal justice core, nine credits of content electives, and nine of skills electives. A student majoring in the new program also will be required to complete a minor of at least 17 credits. The majority of the required courses are already being taught, although five new courses will be developed specifically for the core.

At UNC, about two-thirds of the majors in Sociology choose the emphasis in criminal justice. Assuming that similar numbers would select the new program, enrollments are projected at approximately 200 majors.

Projections included in the concept paper from a number of sources indicate a significant demand for graduates of criminal justice programs. Twelve Colorado community colleges offer certificates or associate degrees in Criminal Justice, and Metropolitan State currently offers a baccalaureate degree in the field.

Commission staff sees no issues in the concept paper that should prevent UNC from developing a full proposal for a BA in Criminal Justice. Matters identified by the staff that need to be addressed in a full proposal include: a clarification of the new resources needed to implement the proposed program, and the advantages graduates of the program would have over those currently completing the criminal justice emphasis in sociology.

II. STAFF ANALYSIS

In reviewing a concept paper Commission staff considers role and mission, program duplication, demand and need for the program, and institutional resources.

Because of the existing substantial involvement of UNC in criminal justice education, mission would not seem to be an issue. The proposed program fits within its statutory

authority as a “general baccalaureate...university,” and within the university’s interpretation of its statutory mission.

Preliminary projections of student interest in the program appear to be realistic. The substantial enrollments in the existing criminal justice track in Sociology provide a solid base for the projections. Because the institution is projecting that most of the enrollment will come from students who otherwise would have selected the track in Sociology, it is important that the full proposal contains an assessment of the impact of the new program on the existing ones.

The concept paper makes a strong case for the growing need for criminal justice professionals in this state and nationally. Forecasts on Colorado employment through 2008 note that jobs in fields in which criminal justice majors will seek employment will increase faster than average. Some fields, e.g., paralegals, will be among the fastest growing in Colorado.

As noted above, other programs in criminal justice do exist at institutions in Colorado. The current and projected demand for graduates of criminal justice programs suggest, however, that the addition of a program at UNC would not create unnecessary duplication.

III. ITEMS TO BE ADDRESSED IN THE FULL PROPOSAL

After discussions between Commission staff and representatives of the institution, it was agreed that the institutional mission and program duplication need not be addressed further than already done in the concept paper. It was further agreed that the following would be included in the full proposal:

The advantages that a graduate of the program would have in the job market over a sociology major completing the current emphasis in criminal justice, and over holders of an associate degree in the field.

- The role of the required minor in a student’s preparation in criminal justice.
- A further explanation of the costs associated with the program, particularly how many new courses would need to be added to implement the program.
- The impact of the proposed program on enrollments in, and resources available to, other UNC programs.
- How the program will emphasize the use of technology and student responsibility for learning.

IV. INFORMING THE GOVERNING BOARD

Following this meeting, the Commission staff shall inform the governing board about the above matters and any additional issues that the Commission may raise about the proposed Bachelor of Arts in Criminal Justice at the University of Northern Colorado.

CONCEPT PAPER

Proposed B.A. Degree Program in
Criminal Justice

Executive Summary

A Criminal Justice major is proposed as a new option for students interested in pursuing a Bachelor of Arts degree at UNC. The overarching goals of the new major are to provide students with a quality liberal arts education that incorporates the skills and knowledge specifically linked to pursuing a career in various aspects of Criminal Justice. A Bachelor of Arts in Criminal Justice would serve to assist UNC in its mission to provide the State of Colorado and the region with “well-educated citizens” and in improving “the quality of life in the state and region through teaching, learning, and the advancement of knowledge and community service.” The student need for a Criminal Justice major is found in the large number of Sociology majors currently emphasizing Criminal Justice, and a projected need of 42 percent more law enforcement officers and 51 percent more correctional officers for Colorado through the year 2008. The resources needed for establishing this degree are minimal. We can draw from existing faculty and offer courses relevant to criminal justice that we already offer in many departments across campus.

CONCEPT PAPER

Proposed B.A. Degree Program in Criminal Justice

Introduction

After initial planning in 1981, the Sociology Department at the University of Northern Colorado began offering an emphasis in criminal justice as a program area under the Sociology major. Twenty years later the enduring popularity of the criminal justice emphasis suggests the program can best continue to meet the needs of students and employers by becoming a separate major in the College of Arts and Sciences. To that end, faculty from the University of Northern Colorado propose establishing and offering a B.A. degree in Criminal Justice.

To make clear the need for a B.A. in Criminal Justice at UNC, and to show the appropriateness for such a degree in the College of Arts and Sciences, this concept paper addresses the issues of program goals, relevance to role and mission, the need for the program and the target market, resource implications, and concludes with a description of the program design.

Program Goals

The proposed Criminal Justice major will be organized and administered with the general goal of providing students with a quality liberal arts education and with more specific goals linked to providing the foundation for skills and knowledge needed to succeed in the criminal justice profession and as a member of a diverse and complex society. Orienting program goals include:

Providing students with the opportunity and means to develop an ability to communicate effectively, both orally and in writing, so they can be effective in their chosen career.

Providing students with an understanding and appreciation of cultural diversity and of the variation in human behavior.

Providing students with an understanding and appreciation for the importance of the critical thinking process.

Providing students with an opportunity to become involved academically and experientially in the planning and operation of the criminal justice process.

Providing students with an interdisciplinary, liberal arts perspective of the criminal justice process and how the police, courts, and corrections agencies serve to preserve and protect the social order in a free society.

Providing students with an understanding of criminal justice as both an academic discipline and a profession by developing a curriculum that informs students about the history, concepts, and theoretical foundation of the discipline while giving them practical knowledge necessary to the development of individual and group skills required of a criminal justice professional.

Preparing students for entry into the criminal justice profession by exposing them to the moral and ethical dimensions associated with various roles in the criminal justice system and providing them with knowledge, tools, and experiences, that enables them to respond in a professionally appropriate manner to various dilemmas facing professionals engaged in such a complex field as criminal justice.

Besides program goals that reflect the liberal arts tradition and preparing students to be productive members of the workforce and of society, the Criminal Justice program will also have goals intended to benefit the college, the university, and the community. Such goals include:

Increasing student enrollment by making it easier for more community college students who have an AA or AS degree in criminal justice to continue their education in a bachelors program in the same discipline.

The potential for additional degree programs (for example, a Bachelor of Applied Technology degree in Criminal Justice) that provide students with liberal arts course work that supplements the technical training they received while seeking an AA or AAS degree at a community college.

The potential for using distance learning to reach criminal justice professionals who desire a bachelors degree but whose work and location prevent them from attending UNC.

Program Relevance to the Institutional Role and Mission

The University of Northern Colorado has identified specific purposes and goals that assist the university in achieving its mission of developing “well-educated citizens” and improving “the quality of life in the state and region through teaching, learning, the advancement of knowledge and

community service.” The Criminal Justice major is relevant to the following specific goals identified as part of UNC’s mission statement.

To prepare a well educated citizenry whose understanding of issues enables them to be contributing members of a dynamic, diverse and global society.

A liberal arts educated workforce in the criminal justice profession is essential for a healthy society. Criminal justice systems across the nation have come to embrace the need for a well-educated workforce, particularly in the front-line area of law enforcement and the back-end area of corrections. The need for liberal arts thinking is imperative for furthering society's ideals of a fair-minded and unbiased system of justice as embraced by the rule of law

To prepare undergraduates in specialized fields of study.

The major in criminal justice will offer students the opportunity to acquire the knowledge, attitudes, and skills needed for entry into professional positions in criminal justice and for continuation of their education in graduate level criminal justice programs or in law school.

To serve as a resource to the state.

By providing one of the state's few undergraduate degree opportunities in criminal justice, the criminal justice major will assist Colorado as it continues to provide its citizens with criminal justice employees who reflect the state's respect for civil liberties while maintaining social order. In addition, the program's internship course will provide justice system agencies with competent and enthusiastic volunteers who can, where appropriate, help those agencies in the completion of their duties.

Need and Market for the Program

Student demand. Data provided by UNC's Institutional Research and Planning department indicate that in fiscal year 1995/1996 the Department of Sociology enrolled a total of 577 majors. Of that total, 248 students (61.9 percent) chose Criminal Justice as their emphasis area. Four years later (1999/2000), 69.5 percent of those criminal justice emphasis students graduated from UNC with a B.A. in Sociology: This graduation rate compares favorably with the rates in other College of Arts and Sciences departments.

Historically about two-thirds of all sociology majors declare an emphasis in criminal justice. We estimate that at least a similar proportion would declare a major in Criminal Justice. Having an identifiable group of students already committed to the criminal justice discipline provides a unique advantage when estimating demand for this new major. With its creation, the B.A. in Criminal Justice should immediately attract more than 200 majors.

The popularity of a criminal justice major is not unique to the University of Northern Colorado. In its annual survey of first year students, *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (January 26, 2001: A48) found that “law enforcement” (criminal justice was not a listed option) was the expected major for 1.1 percent of the freshmen entering four-year colleges and universities in fall of 2000. That percentage ranked law enforcement third highest among popular social science majors—although law enforcement was listed under “other fields” in the survey (see Table 1).

Table 1: Percent of entering freshmen expecting to major in popular social science fields nationally (Fall 2000)

Expected major	Percentage
Psychology	4.8 %
Political Science	2.8 %
Law Enforcement (CJ was not an option)	1.1 %
Economics	0.5 %
Sociology	0.5 %

Market demand. A degree in criminal justice is often the chosen major for persons interested in such occupations as law enforcement, victim advocacy, paralegal, investigations, probation/parole, juvenile justice, case management, community corrections, and institutional corrections. It is also an acceptable degree for entry into law school. According to the *Occupational Outlook Handbook, 2000-01 Edition*, the areas in which criminal justice majors often seek employment are expected to increase faster than average for all occupations through 2008 (Police Officers, Correctional Officers, Social Workers), or are considered among the fastest growing occupations in the economy through 2008 (Paralegals). The State Occupational Projections for 1998-2008 (<http://almis.dws.state.ut.us/occ/projections>) estimates that for the State of Colorado alone there will be a 42 percent increase in law enforcement officers and a 51 percent increase in correctional officers through 2008.

Duplication/Impact on Existing Programs. Colorado is unusual in its lack of bachelors level criminal justice degrees. While surrounding states typically have five or more universities offering a bachelors degree in criminal justice (e.g., five in Arizona, seven in Nebraska, seven in Kansas), only two Colorado colleges are offering a BA degree in criminal justice (*College Board Index of Majors 2000*). Western State College offers a bachelors degree identified as “criminal justice studies” and Metropolitan State College of Denver offers a degree identified as “criminal justice/law enforcement administration.” Other universities (e.g., University of Colorado, Boulder; Colorado State University, University of Southern Colorado) offer criminal justice as an emphasis area under another major (usually Sociology). The proposed major in criminal justice at the University of Northern Colorado will have a more discipline-specific curriculum and will appeal to students with confidence in their career path. Students interested in simply supplementing their knowledge of sociology, political science, and similar disciplines with information about the criminal justice process and its agencies will still be attracted to the emphasis areas offered at other Colorado colleges and universities.

Resource Implications

Its interdisciplinary nature means the proposed 41-hour major in criminal justice will require the department to be initially responsible for only five courses—14 hours (besides having responsibility for the General Education course, CRJ 110: Introduction to Criminal Justice). The remaining nine courses (27 hours) are chosen by students from among courses already being offered by the

university. The courses that would initially be the responsibility of the criminal justice department are:

- CRJ 110: Introduction to Criminal Justice (Gen Ed course; currently SOC 141)
- CRJ 2xx: Policing Systems
- CRJ 2xx: Judicial Process
- CRJ 3xx: Criminal Justice Research and Statistics
- CRJ 3xx: Professionalism & Ethical Issues in Criminal Justice
- CRJ 4xx: Practicum/Internship

The expertise of existing faculty who are interested in affiliating with the new department is sufficient to offer all six courses at least once every year. In addition, other sociology faculty and faculty from other Arts and Sciences departments have expressed an interest in affiliate status with a criminal justice major. As the department grows and increases its number of faculty members, the course offerings will also expand. Nevertheless, the initial need for faculty resources is minimal.

Basic Program Design for a Bachelor of Arts in *Criminal Justice* (41 hour major)

- I. General Education Requirements (6 hours)
 - Category 2* - Students will take STAT 150: Introduction to Statistical Analysis
 - Category 5f* - Students will take CRJ 110: Introduction to Criminal Justice (formerly SOC 141)
- II. Criminal Justice Core (23 hours)
 - CRJ 2xx Policing Systems (3 hrs)
 - CRJ 2xx Judicial Process (cover both adult & juvenile) (3 hrs)
 - SOC 347 Sociology of Corrections (3 hrs)
 - SOC 346 Criminology (3 hrs)
 - CRJ 3xx Criminal Justice Research and Statistics (3 hrs)
 - CRJ 3xx Professionalism & Ethical Issues in Criminal Justice (3 hrs)
 - SOC 444 Sociology of Criminal Law (3 hrs)
 - CRJ 4xx Practicum/Internship (2 hrs)
- III. Content Electives (9 hours linked to appropriate courses for **one area** below – at least 6 hours at 300 or 400 level)
 - Law Enforcement*
In consultation with their advisor, students will choose at least 9 credit hours from courses appropriate for persons interested in law enforcement. Such courses are plentiful in many disciplines and could include courses from African Studies, Anthropology, Community Health, Geography, Hispanic Studies, Multicultural Studies, Philosophy, Psychology, and Sociology.
 - Correctional Services*
In consultation with their advisor, students will choose at least 9 credit hours from courses appropriate for persons interested in correctional services. Such courses are plentiful in many disciplines and could include courses from African Studies, Anthropology, Community Health, Geography, Hispanic Studies, Human Rehabilitation Services Multicultural Studies, Philosophy, Psychology, and Sociology.
 - Justice Administration*
In consultation with their advisor, students will choose at least 9 credit hours from courses appropriate for persons interested in justice administration. Such courses are plentiful in many disciplines and could include courses from Accounting, Management, Philosophy, Political Science, and Sociology.
- IV. Skills Electives (9 hours chosen from any below --- at least 6 hours at 300 or 400 level)
 - Computers (Information Systems)*
In consultation with their advisor, students may choose courses that develop or expand computer skills. Such courses could include ones from Business Administration, Computing, Educational Technology, and Sociology.
 - Critical Thinking*
In consultation with their advisor, students may choose courses that develop or expand critical thinking skills. Such courses could include ones from Philosophy and Speech Communication.
 - Oral Communication*
In consultation with their advisor, students may choose courses that develop or expand oral communication

skills. Such courses could include ones from Speech Communication.

Research

In consultation with their advisor, students may choose courses that develop or expand research skills. Such courses could include ones from Geography, Interdisciplinary Studies, Psychology, Sociology, and Statistics.

Written Communication

In consultation with their advisor, students may choose courses that develop or expand written communication skills. Such courses could include ones from English.

IN ADDITION to the requirements for the major, Criminal Justice major students **must complete a minor** (17 hour minimum) in a field of their choice. No more than six credit hours of courses in any one prefix may be counted for both the major and minor.

3TOPIC: CONCEPT PAPER: BACHELOR OF ARTS IN SPECIAL EDUCATION AT THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN COLORADO

PREPARED BY: WILLIAM G. KUEPPER

I. SUMMARY

The University of Northern Colorado has submitted a concept paper for a Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) in Special Education (Attachment A). The program is intended to focus on preparing undergraduates to serve students with disabilities, ages 5-21, and, upon graduation, to secure licensure as a Special Education Teacher 1 (Moderate Needs).

The program builds on the substantial resources and reputation of the university in special education. UNC is, by statute, the primary deliverer of teacher education in the state. The university offers graduate degrees in all special education licensure areas, including Special Education Teacher 1 (Moderate Needs). The Commission awarded UNC's post-baccalaureate Special Education program a Program of Excellence. This provides an unusual combination of resources and experience in the field of special education and makes the university a logical place for the proposed bachelor degree.

The range of duties a special education teacher must perform is substantial. Because of this, the concept paper suggests that a major in special education, with its more intensive training, will be more valuable preparation than majoring in a liberal arts discipline as is currently done at UNC. With the documented shortage of special education teachers, duplication is not an issue.

The need for special education teachers in Colorado is well documented. The concept paper notes that a severe shortage has existed for a decade.

No issues with this concept paper were identified by the staff.

II. STAFF ANALYSIS

In reviewing a concept paper, Commission staff consider role and mission, potential program duplication, student demand, need for graduates in the field, and institutional resources.

The university's statutory mandate in teacher education not only means that the proposed program is within the institutional role and mission, the statute also articulates an expectation that UNC provide this type of program for the state of Colorado.

Given the current and projected demand for special education teachers, the initiation of this

program would not, in the opinion of Commission staff, create unnecessary duplication. Further, the specialized nature of the proposed baccalaureate program at UNC would set it apart from other programs preparing students for special education certification.

In addition, the Colorado Department of Education sees value in a well-constructed program addressing the need for special education teachers. The State Board is fully supportive of increasing the number of teachers trained in special education who meet the requirements set under the provisions of SB 99-154.

Student demand would appear to be sufficient to make the proposed program viable. The impact on existing programs at UNC that lead to licensure in special education is not explicitly stated in the concept paper but should be addressed in the full proposal.

III. ITEMS TO BE ADDRESSED IN THE FULL PROPOSAL

While Commission staff has no issues with the concept paper, it did identify matters that it wishes to see addressed further in the full proposal. After discussions between Commission staff and representatives from the institution, it was agreed that the following would be included:

1. How the holders of the proposed degree would be advantaged in the job market over those students preparing for certification in special education through other means.
2. How students doing this focused degree program will be prepared in the areas of literacy and mathematics.
3. How the implementation of the new degree program would impact, e.g., in enrollment, the other programs at UNC currently preparing students for special education certification.
4. How technology will be employed in the new program, how the program will emphasize student responsibility for learning, and how learning outcomes will be assessed.

IV. INFORMING THE GOVERNING BOARD

Following this meeting, the Commission staff shall inform the governing board about the above matters and any additional issues that the Commission may raise about the proposed Bachelor of Arts in Special Education at the University of Northern Colorado.

Concept Paper for a BA in Special Education University of Northern Colorado

The Division of Special Education at the University of Northern Colorado is proposing the establishment of a new Academic Degree Program entitled Bachelor of Arts in Special Education. The program will focus on preparing undergraduates to serve students with disabilities across a range of needs, ages 5-21, with state licensure as Special Education Teacher 1 (Moderate Needs).

The need for qualified special education teachers is critical in Colorado and across the nation. Following the State Review of Initial Licensure Programs, the Division of Special Education at the University of Northern Colorado was invited to develop a major in special education by the Colorado Commission on Higher Education.

Relevance to the Institutional Role and Mission

The mission of the University of Northern Colorado is “to develop well-educated citizens and to improve the quality of life in the state and region through teaching, learning, the advancement of knowledge and community service.” The University of Northern Colorado has a statutory mission in teacher education and is designated as the primary institution for teacher education in Colorado.

A goal of the University of Northern Colorado is to prepare undergraduate students in specialized fields of study so that students will acquire the knowledge and skills that prepare them for careers and/or advanced scholarly work as they study in programs informed by appropriate professional standards and practice. A second goal is to prepare teachers and other education professionals in programs that meet the state standards for licensure. An undergraduate major in special education will enhance meeting both of these goals.

The University of Northern Colorado has a national reputation as a premiere special education teacher preparation institution. This reputation has historical roots of excellence, and the existing faculty continues to maintain this reputation. This excellence is indicated by achievements. The Division of Special Education has been awarded federal funding for the National Center on Low-Incidence Disabilities; has been designated a Program of Excellence by the Colorado Commission on Higher Education; has received an award for innovative use of technology from the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education; and has received funding for additional research and personal preparation projects that brings the total of external funding to over \$3 million in the last year. The Bresnehan Halstead Center and the Kephart Center within the Division of Special Education provide national-level symposia each year. Under H.B. 1187, the University of Northern Colorado has been designated as the primary deliverer of undergraduate and graduate programs in teacher preparation. Because of this, the Division of Special Education has the unique position of offering graduate degrees in all licensure areas of special education. This has resulted in a faculty with expertise in all areas of special education. The combination of these resources creates the ideal

conditions under which to establish an undergraduate major in special education at the University of Northern Colorado.

Need and Market for the Program

The State of Colorado is experiencing a severe shortage of special education teachers. This has been a critical issue for more than a decade in Colorado. In the 2000 Annual Report to Congress, the Colorado Department of Education reported that 18% of the personnel delivering special education services in Colorado were unqualified. Only five states reported a higher percentage of unqualified personnel providing services to students with disabilities. It is critical that teacher preparation programs address this need with quality programs. Lorrie Harkness, Director of Special Education with the Colorado Department of Education, recommended that institutions of higher education be “encouraged to design programs that will prepare teachers to confidently design instruction to meet the diverse needs of students with disabilities so that they can maximize individual achievement.”

Special education teachers have a variety of roles and responsibilities they must perform on a daily basis. They assess and identify students with disabilities and then plan an Individualized Education Program in collaboration with other professionals and parents under the rules and regulations of the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act and the Colorado Exceptional Children Education Act. Another role is to provide direct individualized instruction and interventions in learning and behavior to meet the unique needs of students with disabilities. In addition, special education teachers are responsible for support of students with disabilities in general education curriculum through consultation and collaboration with general education teachers by providing adaptations and support systems. Because of the complexity of these multiple roles, quality preparation will be enhanced if undergraduate students are allowed to major in special education.

The current structure of a liberal arts major does not allow the students to receive the full benefit of the special education faculty expertise because of restrictions on the amount of coursework and the field experiences possible. A major will allow for the preparation of beginning special education professionals with exemplary knowledge and skills in a variety of roles and responsibilities including: management of individual special education programs and services, assessment, best instructional practices, technological expertise, collaborative support for students with teams of professionals and parents, and inquiry skills that enable teachers to access necessary resources. Under the current undergraduate requirement of a liberal arts major, these competencies are difficult to obtain and develop within a four-year program. A major in special education will provide an opportunity for students to master the necessary competencies within the four-year guidelines.

Duplication/Impact on Existing Programs

Metropolitan State College of Denver is seeking an undergraduate major in special education/elementary education. An undergraduate licensure program (K-12) is offered at the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs with math, English, or social studies as attached liberal arts majors. Western State College has a dual licensure program of elementary education and special education. A major in special education (K-12) will have a discipline-specific curriculum and will appeal to students who want to focus on special education. Students wanting to pursue dual licensure with elementary education will have a choice of attending either Metropolitan State College

or Western State. Students wanting to focus on a secondary content area with special education licensure will attend the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs. As such, the special education major (K-12) at the University of Northern Colorado will not duplicate any other program in the state but will attract students who wish to have a focused program with a more discipline-specific curriculum. Also, a major in special education will not duplicate other licensure programs at the University of Northern Colorado

It is anticipated that a BA with a major in Special Education will attract approximately 20 students initially, with maximum capacity of 50 new students each year being reached in three to four years. One-half to two-thirds of these students will be additions to the current University base of undergraduates

Goals of the program

1. To prepare entry-level special educators who understand and are able to provide individualized special education services in compliance with Federal and State rules and regulations.
2. To prepare special educators who will collaborate with families, students, and professionals to provide high quality individualized educational services to students with disabilities.
3. To prepare entry-level special educators who will provide direct research-validated services to students with disabilities.
4. To prepare special educators who will provide support services in general education classes for students with disabilities.
5. To blend instruction and field experiences in the preparation of high-quality special educators.

These goals will guide the development of curriculum and assessment strategies to ensure quality development of students in the program.

This major will consist of coursework selected and developed by the faculty of the Division of Special Education with input from its External Advisory Committee consisting of Directors of Special Education, parents of students with disabilities, persons with disabilities, general and special educators, related service providers, and Colorado Department of Education personnel. The coursework will align with the standards of the Council for Exceptional Children, the Colorado State Licensure Standards for Moderate Needs, the proposed Colorado Licensure Standards for Special Education Generalist, and the Performance-Based Standards for Colorado Teachers.

The proposed curriculum will consist of recommended general education requirements, content area coursework, courses in professional teacher preparation, and courses in special education theory, practice, and pedagogy. The program will be organized around nine themes including individual differences (disabilities, culture, and language), interpersonal/collaborative skills, direct instruction, legal responsibilities/processes, organizational/systemic processes, behavioral management,

knowledge and access of resources, inquiry skills, and implementation of special educator roles. Topics emphasized within these themes include normal developmental learning, general assessment concepts, foundational characteristics of disabilities, service delivery models, and technology.

Assessment strategies will include:

1. Student portfolios.
2. Teacher work samples
3. Benchmarks at the basic, developing, and proficient levels of performance.
4. Graduate surveys and job placement surveys.

Resource Implications

New capital facilities will not be needed. Resources will be needed to expand partnership district relations to provide sites for field experiences.

The current licensure program has nine courses and student teaching within the Division of Special Education. The proposed program will offer ten courses and student teaching within the Division of Special Education. The demographics of the faculty in the Division of Special Education are such that four senior faculty members will be retiring within a few years. The salary saving will allow for expansion with junior faculty entering at a lower salary. In addition, proposed licensure changes at the state level will reduce the number of graduate level licensure programs in special education from the current eight to six programs. It is not anticipated that additional funding will be needed for faculty to support a major in special education.

Concept Paper for a BA in Special Education University of Northern Colorado

The Division of Special Education at the University of Northern Colorado is proposing the establishment of a new Academic Degree Program entitled Bachelor of Arts in Special Education. The program will focus on preparing undergraduates to serve students with disabilities across a range of needs, ages 5-21, with state licensure as Special Education Teacher 1 (Moderate Needs).

The need for qualified special education teachers is critical in Colorado and across the nation. Following the State Review of Initial Licensure Programs, the Division of Special Education at the University of Northern Colorado was invited to develop a major in special education by the Colorado Commission on Higher Education.

Relevance to the Institutional Role and Mission

The mission of the University of Northern Colorado is “to develop well-educated citizens and to improve the quality of life in the state and region through teaching, learning, the advancement of knowledge and community service.” The University of Northern Colorado has a statutory mission in teacher education and is designated as the primary institution for teacher education in Colorado.

A goal of the University of Northern Colorado is to prepare undergraduate students in specialized fields of study so that students will acquire the knowledge and skills that prepare them for careers and/or advanced scholarly work as they study in programs informed by appropriate professional standards and practice. A second goal is to prepare teachers and other education professionals in programs that meet the state standards for licensure. An undergraduate major in special education will enhance meeting both of these goals.

The University of Northern Colorado has a national reputation as a premiere special education teacher preparation institution. This reputation has historical roots of excellence, and the existing faculty continues to maintain this reputation. This excellence is indicated by achievements. The Division of Special Education has been awarded federal funding for the National Center on Low-Incidence Disabilities; has been designated a Program of Excellence by the Colorado Commission on Higher Education; has received an award for innovative use of technology from the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education; and has received funding for additional research and personal preparation projects that brings the total of external funding to over \$3 million in the last year. The Bresnehan Halstead Center and the Kephart Center within the Division of Special Education provide national-level symposia each year. Under H.B. 1187, the University of Northern Colorado has been designated as the primary deliverer of undergraduate and graduate programs in teacher preparation. Because of this, the Division of Special Education has the unique position of offering graduate degrees in all licensure areas of special education. This has resulted in a faculty with expertise in all areas of special education. The combination of these resources creates the ideal conditions under which to establish an undergraduate major in special education at the University of

Northern Colorado.

Need and Market for the Program

The State of Colorado is experiencing a severe shortage of special education teachers. This has been a critical issue for more than a decade in Colorado. In the 2000 Annual Report to Congress, the Colorado Department of Education reported that 18% of the personnel delivering special education services in Colorado were unqualified. Only five states reported a higher percentage of unqualified personnel providing services to students with disabilities. It is critical that teacher preparation programs address this need with quality programs. Lorrie Harkness, Director of Special Education with the Colorado Department of Education, recommended that institutions of higher education be “encouraged to design programs that will prepare teachers to confidently design instruction to meet the diverse needs of students with disabilities so that they can maximize individual achievement.”

Special education teachers have a variety of roles and responsibilities they must perform on a daily basis. They assess and identify students with disabilities and then plan an Individualized Education Program in collaboration with other professionals and parents under the rules and regulations of the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act and the Colorado Exceptional Children Education Act. Another role is to provide direct individualized instruction and interventions in learning and behavior to meet the unique needs of students with disabilities. In addition, special education teachers are responsible for support of students with disabilities in general education curriculum through consultation and collaboration with general education teachers by providing adaptations and support systems. Because of the complexity of these multiple roles, quality preparation will be enhanced if undergraduate students are allowed to major in special education.

The current structure of a liberal arts major does not allow the students to receive the full benefit of the special education faculty expertise because of restrictions on the amount of coursework and the field experiences possible. A major will allow for the preparation of beginning special education professionals with exemplary knowledge and skills in a variety of roles and responsibilities including: management of individual special education programs and services, assessment, best instructional practices, technological expertise, collaborative support for students with teams of professionals and parents, and inquiry skills that enable teachers to access necessary resources. Under the current undergraduate requirement of a liberal arts major, these competencies are difficult to obtain and develop within a four-year program. A major in special education will provide an opportunity for students to master the necessary competencies within the four-year guidelines.

Duplication/Impact on Existing Programs

Metropolitan State College of Denver is seeking an undergraduate major in special education/elementary education. An undergraduate licensure program (K-12) is offered at the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs with math, English, or social studies as attached liberal arts majors. Western State College has a dual licensure program of elementary education and special education. A major in special education (K-12) will have a discipline-specific curriculum and will appeal to students who want to focus on special education. Students wanting to pursue dual licensure with elementary education will have a choice of attending either Metropolitan State College or Western State. Students wanting to focus on a secondary content area with special education

licensure will attend the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs. As such, the special education major (K-12) at the University of Northern Colorado will not duplicate any other program in the state but will attract students who wish to have a focused program with a more discipline-specific curriculum. Also, a major in special education will not duplicate other licensure programs at the University of Northern Colorado

It is anticipated that a BA with a major in Special Education will attract approximately 20 students initially, with maximum capacity of 50 new students each year being reached in three to four years. One-half to two-thirds of these students will be additions to the current University base of undergraduates

Goals of the program

1. To prepare entry-level special educators who understand and are able to provide individualized special education services in compliance with Federal and State rules and regulations.
2. To prepare special educators who will collaborate with families, students, and professionals to provide high quality individualized educational services to students with disabilities.
3. To prepare entry-level special educators who will provide direct research-validated services to students with disabilities.
4. To prepare special educators who will provide support services in general education classes for students with disabilities.
5. To blend instruction and field experiences in the preparation of high-quality special educators.

These goals will guide the development of curriculum and assessment strategies to ensure quality development of students in the program.

This major will consist of coursework selected and developed by the faculty of the Division of Special Education with input from its External Advisory Committee consisting of Directors of Special Education, parents of students with disabilities, persons with disabilities, general and special educators, related service providers, and Colorado Department of Education personnel. The coursework will align with the standards of the Council for Exceptional Children, the Colorado State Licensure Standards for Moderate Needs, the proposed Colorado Licensure Standards for Special Education Generalist, and the Performance-Based Standards for Colorado Teachers.

The proposed curriculum will consist of recommended general education requirements, content area coursework, courses in professional teacher preparation, and courses in special education theory, practice, and pedagogy. The program will be organized around nine themes including individual differences (disabilities, culture, and language), interpersonal/collaborative skills, direct instruction, legal responsibilities/processes, organizational/systemic processes, behavioral management, knowledge and access of resources, inquiry skills, and implementation of special educator roles.

Topics emphasized within these themes include normal developmental learning, general assessment concepts, foundational characteristics of disabilities, service delivery models, and technology.

Assessment strategies will include:

1. Student portfolios.
2. Teacher work samples
3. Benchmarks at the basic, developing, and proficient levels of performance.
4. Graduate surveys and job placement surveys.

Resource Implications

New capital facilities will not be needed. Resources will be needed to expand partnership district relations to provide sites for field experiences.

The current licensure program has nine courses and student teaching within the Division of Special Education. The proposed program will offer ten courses and student teaching within the Division of Special Education. The demographics of the faculty in the Division of Special Education are such that four senior faculty members will be retiring within a few years. The salary saving will allow for expansion with junior faculty entering at a lower salary. In addition, proposed licensure changes at the state level will reduce the number of graduate level licensure programs in special education from the current eight to six programs. It is not anticipated that additional funding will be needed for faculty to support a major in special education.

TOPIC: DEGREE PROGRAM NAME CHANGES & ENDORSEMENT TITLES

PREPARED BY: JOANN EVANS

I. SUMMARY

This agenda item describes the degree program changes that the Executive Director has approved during the month. This agenda item serves as public confirmation of an approved change unless the proposed action is not acceptable to the Commission.

In November 1997, the Commission adopted a policy requiring Commission approval of name changes that involve substantive changes to the curriculum, a different target market population, or expansion of the scope of the degree program. If non-substantive, the Executive Director approves the requested change. With the Commission's teacher education approval authority, this also includes changes to endorsement titles.

A. Institution: University of Southern Colorado

 Current Endorsement Title: Automotive Parts and Service Management

 Revised Endorsement Title: Automotive Industry Management

 Approved by: State Board of Agriculture (October 8, 2001)

Rationale:

The revised program name more accurately describes the content of the program. Automotive Parts and Service Management was too restrictive to represent the curriculum.

Scope of Proposed Change:

Curriculum and degree requirements remain the same.

Proposed Action by the Executive Director:

Approve the endorsement title change as requested, effective immediately.