

**CCHE Agenda**  
October 2, 2003  
Western State College  
Gunnison, Colorado  
10:00 a.m.

I. Approval of Minutes

II. Reports

- A. Chair's Report – Baker
- B. Commissioners' Reports
- C. Advisory Committee Reports
- D. Public Comment

III. Consent Items

- A. Statewide Transfer Policy Clarifications and Changes – Conner
- B. Teacher Education Reauthorization:
  - (1) University of Northern Colorado – Futhey
  - (2) Colorado State University – Futhey
- C. Revised Morgan Community College Master Plan 2003 – Johnson [updated]
- D. University of Colorado Health Sciences Center – Fitzsimons Research Complex 2 and Fitzsimons Environmental Health & Safety II – Johnson
- E. 2004 Commission Meeting Schedule – Foster
- F. Performance Funding System for FY 2004-2005– Jacobs

IV. Action Items

- A. Proposed Financial Accountability Policy – Schweigert (60 minutes)
- B. Revision of Admission Standards Policy – Futhey (45 minutes)
- C. FY 2004-2005 Operating Budget Request to the General Assembly – Schweigert/Mullen (60 minutes)
- D. Prioritization of Capital Projects FY 04-05 – Johnson (15 minutes)

V. Items for Discussion and Possible Action

- A. Colorado Declaration on Higher Education – Farina
- B. Teacher Education Legislative Report (2003) - Futhey

VI. Written Reports for Possible Discussion

- A. Report on Out-of-State Instruction – Breckel
- B. FTE - Service Area Exemptions – Breckel
- C. General Education Course Sections Report – Conner

**TOPIC: CHAIR'S REPORT**

**PREPARED BY: RAYMOND T. BAKER**

This item will be a regular monthly discussion of items which the Chair feels will be of interest to the Commission

**TOPIC: COMMISSIONERS' REPORTS**

**PREPARED BY: COMMISSIONERS**

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

**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.

**TOPIC: STATEWIDE TRANSFER POLICY CLARIFICATIONS AND CHANGES**

**PREPARED BY: JETT CONNER**

**I. SUMMARY**

The Statewide Transfer Policy approved by the Commission in January 2003, requires editorial changes for clarification. These changes in the policy ([Attachment A](#)) were developed in collaboration with the GE-25 Council and the Academic Council of the CCHE. They are also designed to reflect suggestions made by members of the higher education community.

The problems with the current policy language include:

- Lack of explicit language indicating that the acceptance of guaranteed transfer courses by a receiving institution depends upon the acceptance of the student for admission to the transfer institution. Currently, language in the policy implies that successful completion of statewide guaranteed general education courses guarantees admission. Separate CCHE policies govern statewide transfer admissions.
- Language in the policy implies that every guaranteed general education transfer course will apply to all majors. Some majors, especially the sciences, require critical foundational and prerequisite courses appropriate for that particular major.
- Course selection rules in the chart on p. I-L-5 of the Statewide Transfer Policy ([Attachment A](#)) that were determined to be too restrictive.

The proposed revisions will:

- Correct any misimpression that completing all or part of statewide guaranteed general education courses guarantees admission to a transfer institution.
- Add language indicating that specific general education or elective courses may be required in certain majors.
- Add flexibility to the course selection rules in the Content areas of Arts & Humanities and Social and Behavioral Sciences so that students can take a sequence of two courses in any one discipline in those areas, if they so choose.

**II. BACKGROUND**

Following approval of the new Statewide Transfer Policy in January 2003, several questions were raised about the implications of several statements, as well as about the need to address

problems some saw in the course selection rules in the Arts & Humanities and the Social and Behavioral Sciences content areas.

In May 2003, the GE-25 Council proposed rule changes for course selections to give students greater flexibility in choosing courses from specific discipline areas and to make it possible for students to select two courses in a sequence (e.g., American History I & II), a flexibility that was already approved for courses in the Natural and Physical Sciences area.

Also, questions arose from students, advisors and others about language in the Transfer Policy that seemed to guarantee admission to a transfer institution and that also seemed to imply that each and every general education course, guaranteed to transfer statewide, was appropriate for each and every major.

### **III. STAFF ANALYSIS**

The proposed language changes in the Statewide Transfer Policy are designed to clear up confusion in the policy's wording and to address concerns by the GE-25 Council that the course selection rules in several of the content areas were too restrictive and not consistent with other rules in the policy.

Staff proceeded, following a unanimous recommendation by the Council GE-25, to change the course selection rules and to reword the rules to meet the concerns expressed. Staff has heard no objections from institutions to the proposed course selection rules changes.

There is an important need to clarify language in the policy so that misinterpretation is minimized. Language in this policy finds its way into advising materials and college catalogs so it is important that the language is clear and instructive. Staff believe that the clarifications and rule changes are necessary.

### **IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

**That the Commission approve the proposed changes to the Statewide Transfer Policy.**

## **Appendix A**

### **STATUTORY AUTHORITY**

CRS 23-1-108.5. (1) The General Assembly hereby finds that, for many students the ability to transfer among all state-supported institutions of higher education is critical to their success in achieving a degree. The General Assembly further finds that it is necessary for the state to have sound transfer policies that provide the broadest and simplest mechanisms feasible, while protecting the academic quality of the institutions of higher education and their undergraduate degree programs.

The General Assembly finds, therefore, that it is in the best interests of the state for the commission to oversee the adoption of the statewide articulation matrix system of course numbering for general education courses that includes all state-supported institutions of higher education and that will ensure that the quality of and requirements that pertain to general education courses are comparable and transferable statewide.

CRS 23-1-125. Commission directive – student bill of rights – degree requirements – implementation of core courses – on-line catalogue- competency test. (1) Student bill of rights. The General Assembly hereby finds that students enrolled in public institutions of higher education shall have the following rights:

- (a) Students should be able to complete their associate of arts and associate of science degree programs in no more than sixty credit hours or their baccalaureate programs in no more than one hundred twenty credit hours unless there are additional degree requirements recognized by the commission;
- (b) A student can sign a two-year or four-year graduation agreement that formalizes a plan for that student to obtain a degree in two or four years, unless there are additional degree requirements recognized by the commission;
- (c) Students have a right to clear and concise information concerning which courses must be completed successfully to complete their degrees;
- (d) Students have a right to know which courses are transferable among the state public two-year and four-year institutions of higher education;
- (e) Students, upon completion of core general education courses, regardless of the delivery method, should have those courses satisfy the core course requirements of all Colorado public institutions of higher education.

## SECTION I

### PART L STATEWIDE TRANSFER POLICY

#### **1.00 Introduction**

The Statewide Transfer Policy pertains to the transfer of course credits from one Colorado public higher education institution to another as well as intra-institutional transfer. The policy applies to all Colorado public higher education undergraduate programs, focusing on student movement from two-year to four-year institutions, four-year to four-year institutions, four-year to two-year institutions, or within four-year institutions.

This policy does not address transfer issues where the state has limited legal authority: the transfer of credits from private, non-accredited, or out-of-state institutions, or the awarding of credit for non-credit bearing courses. However, this does not prohibit the acceptance of transfer credit from those institutions; it only identifies where acceptance of transfer credit is non-negotiable.

The policy is divided into the following sections:

- 1.00 Introduction
- 2.00 Statutory Authority
- 3.00 Policy Goals
- 4.00 Roles and Responsibilities
- 5.00 Transfer Options
- 6.00 General Education Procedures
- 7.00 Articulation Agreements Procedures
- 8.00 Transfer Agreements Procedures
- Glossary
- Articulation Agreement Format

#### **2.00 Statutory Authority**

The transfer policy is based on statutory authority of Colorado Revised Statute 23-1-108 (7) (a), C.R.S. 23-1-108.5, and C.R.S. 23-1-125.

#### **3.00 Policy Goals**

The policy goal is to ensure access to undergraduate degree programs, and facilitate completion of degree requirements, including:

- 3.01 The General Assembly implemented the Student Bill of Rights (C.R.S. 23-1-125) to assure that students enrolled in public institutions of higher education have the following rights:
- (a) A quality general education experience that develops competencies in reading, writing, mathematics, technology and critical thinking through an integrated arts and science experience.
  - (b) Students should be able to complete their associate of arts and associate of science degree programs in no more than sixty credit hours or their baccalaureate programs in no more than one hundred twenty credit hours unless there are additional degree requirements recognized by the commission;
  - (c) A student can sign a two-year or four-year graduation agreement that formalizes a plan for that student to obtain a degree in two or four years, unless there are additional degree requirements recognized by the commission;
  - (d) Students have a right to clear and concise information concerning which courses must be completed successfully to complete their degrees;
  - (e) Students have a right to know which courses are transferable among the state public two-year and four-year institutions of higher education;
  - (f) Students, upon successful completion of core general education courses should have those courses satisfy the core course requirements of all Colorado public institutions of higher education;
  - (g) Students have a right to know if courses from one or more public higher education institutions satisfy the students' graduation requirements;
  - (h) A student's credit for the completion of the core requirements and core courses shall not expire for ten years from the date of initial enrollment and shall be transferable.

#### **4.00 Roles and Responsibilities**

##### 4.01 Commission

The role of the Colorado Commission on Higher Education is to facilitate a simple statewide transfer process, including:

- 4.01.01 Ensuring that state-supported two-year and four-year institutions provide native and transfer students equitable treatment in assisting them to meet their educational goals.
- 4.01.02 Establishing, in consultation with the governing boards, a statewide transfer policy to assure that students can transfer qualified college-level courses between and among institutions.
- 4.01.03 Designating the approved list of state guaranteed general education courses.
- 4.01.04 Resolving student appeals regarding state guaranteed transfer courses or referring cases to the governing board for action..
- 4.01.05 Resolving inter-institutional impasses or problems pertaining to transfer negotiations.

## 4.02 Governing Boards

The governing board shall ensure that its institution complies with statewide policies and statutory requirements that pertain to transfer, including admission, degree approval, and student appeals.

## 4.03 Institutions

The institution's role is to administer an efficient and orderly transfer process. The responsibilities are effective when this policy is adopted unless specified otherwise, including:

- 4.03.01 Publishing the Student Bill of Rights in course catalogs, web sites, and advising centers as listed in this policy.
- 4.03.02 Honoring the transferability of state guaranteed general education course credits (Fall 2003).
- 4.03.03 Aligning existing transfer agreements for all approved baccalaureate degree programs with current statute and policy by June 30, 2003.
- 4.03.04 Publishing in printed and electronic form the general education courses that are designated as the state guaranteed general education course designation (Spring 2003).
- 4.03.05 Evaluating student transcripts within 30 days of receiving a complete set of transcripts. It is recommended that this happen within two weeks whenever possible.
- 4.03.06 Developing effective transfer advising systems, including training faculty and student advisors.
- 4.03.07 Establishing an aggressive student advising process to provide freshman students with planning information and transfer students with appeals information.
- 4.03.08 Developing advising partnerships among all four-year and two-year public institutions to jointly advise students.
- 4.03.09 Developing guaranteed two-year and four-year graduation agreements.
- 4.03.10 Implementing an appeal process that addresses student transfer appeals within 30 days of the date the student files an appeal.

## 4.04 Students

Students are responsible to act in their best academic interests and seek the information necessary for making informed choices, including:

- 4.04.01 Selecting courses from the state guaranteed general education list of courses if planning to transfer.
- 4.04.02 Contacting an advisor to understand the terms and benefits of the transfer agreements.
- 4.04.03 Filing an appeal in a timely manner to resolve transfer problems.
- 4.04.04 Understanding the limits in applying general education transfer credits within general education categories.

#### 4.05 GE-25 Council

The General Education Council (GE 25 Council) is responsible for recommending the criteria and framework for "statewide guaranteed general education courses," identifying general education assessments, and communicating the state criteria to the members' respective institutions.

### 5.0 Transfer Options

Sections 5.01 and 5.02 describe two options for students seeking to transfer among Colorado's public institutions of higher education: those students who transfer to four-year institutions after completing an associate of arts or associate of science degree from a two-year institution, and those students who transfer statewide guaranteed general education courses among any Colorado public colleges or universities.

To be effective, these transfer options require certain responsibilities on the part of both institutions of higher education and students. For their part, two-year and four-year colleges and universities need to continue to advise students to help them know which courses are most appropriate for their intended major programs of study. And for their part, students need to consult with their college advisors to make informed course decisions when planning to transfer to another institution. Informed decision-making is the best strategy for successfully transferring among institutions and ensuring this policy's effectiveness.

#### 5.01 Transfer of Associate of Arts and Associate of Science Degrees

Colorado public four-year higher education institutions will honor the transfer of an Associate of Arts (A.A.) degree and the Associate of Science (A.S.) degree earned at a Colorado public institution that offer A.A. or A.S. degrees. A student who earns an A.A. or A.S. degree at a Colorado public college, including completing the state guaranteed general education courses with a grade of C or better in all courses will transfer, upon admission, with junior standing into any arts and science degree program offered by a Colorado public four-year college. The credits earned in the associate degree program will apply at minimum to 35 credit hours of lower division general education and 25 credit hours of additional graduation credits. Since 1988 Colorado has had an operating two-plus-two transfer agreement that ensures a student who completes an A.A. or A.S. degree with a grade of "C" or better in all courses, will have junior standing at the receiving institution i.e., transfer 60 credit hours. Because all liberal arts and sciences degrees are designed to be completed in 120 credit hours, a transfer student can complete a four-year degree in the same time as a native student, 120 hours. The receiving institution will evaluate credit for prior learning, Advanced Placement, and correspondence courses following its standard policy.

## 5.02 Transfer of General Education

Colorado's state guaranteed general education courses are designed to allow students to begin their general education courses at one Colorado public higher education institution and later transfer to another without loss of general education credits. That is, the state guaranteed general education courses may be applied to the general education graduation requirement program or the graduation requirements of the declared major, whichever is in the student's best interest. Effective fall 2003, Colorado policy ensures that students who successfully complete a state guaranteed general education course will receive transfer credits applied to graduation requirements in all majors at all public institutions unless a specific statewide articulation agreement exists. As indicated in Section I-L-5.04 of this policy, certain majors may prescribe specific courses in the major or prerequisite courses that must be completed as part of the Associate of Arts or Associate of Sciences degree for admission into the degree program. Students should consult the transfer guides for each CCHE-approved baccalaureate degree program for information regarding specific major or prerequisite course requirements.

The state's guaranteed general education curriculum is organized into five categories: communication, mathematics, fine arts and humanities, social and behavioral sciences, and physical and life sciences. To complete the Colorado state guaranteed general education core, students are required to take 11 courses or 35 to 37 semester credit hours and earn a C grade or better in each course. The guarantee is limited to the number of semester credit hours in each general education category.

Sem. Cr. Hr.	General Education Categories
6	<b>Communication:</b> 1 Intro. Writing course (3 semester credits) <b>Communication:</b> 1 Intermediate Composition (3 semester credits)
3-5	<b>Mathematics:</b> 1 course (3 to 5 semester credits)
9	<b>Arts and Humanities:</b> Fine Arts and Expression Humanities Ways of Thinking <i>Select 3 courses from different categories</i> <i>Select 3 courses with no more than 2 courses from any 1 category</i>
9	<b>Social and Behavioral Sciences</b> History Economic and Political Systems Geography Human Behavior and Social Systems <i>Select 1 history course</i> <i>Select 2 courses from 2 different disciplines</i> <i>Select 3 courses, 1 of which must be history, with no more than 2 courses from any 1 category</i>
8	<b>Physical and Life Sciences:</b> Select 2 laboratory courses

All state guaranteed general education courses in communication, mathematics, arts and humanities, social and behavior science, and physical and life science shall be identified by a state-assigned common number.

When evaluating a transfer student's transcript, each Colorado public higher education institution will apply state guaranteed general education credits to its general education graduation requirements. Institutions may require additional general education graduation requirements beyond the 35 semester credit hours of state guaranteed general education credits. If an institution requires less than 35 general education credits, the institution will accept in transfer the full 35 credits and apply these credits toward a student's graduation requirements.

### 5.03 Statewide Articulation Agreements

An Articulation Agreement is a statewide agreement among all Colorado community colleges and all four-year public institutions offering a particular degree program. It is most commonly used for undergraduate professional programs that have specific course requirements established by accrediting or external licensure boards<sup>1</sup>.

### 5.04 Transfer Guides

Each institution is responsible for implementing a Transfer Guide for each CCHE-approved baccalaureate degree program unless a statewide articulation agreement is in place. The Transfer Guide shall be designed so that a student can complete a baccalaureate program in no more than 120 credit hours unless there are additional graduation requirements recognized by the Commission. The transfer guide defines the 25 credit hours required beyond the state guaranteed general education credits and may include required courses in the major or prerequisite courses for admission into the degree program. The transfer guides are to be on file with CCHE.

## 6.00 General Education Procedures and Processes

Institutions may nominate a course that is an institutionally approved general education course for consideration as a state guaranteed general education course. To nominate a course, the institution must submit a signed nomination form and supporting material.

**5.2.1 CCHE will consider nominations each fall. USING A FACULTY REVIEW PROCESS, WORKING COMMITTEES WILL EVALUATE NOMINATED COURSES AGAINST THE ADOPTED STATEWIDE CONTENT AND COMPETENCY CRITERIA.** CCHE will forward the recommended courses to the Commission for action.

CCHE will assign a common number to approved state guaranteed general education courses. Institutions will list the state guaranteed course number in all printed catalog materials, including on-line catalogs.

Courses that receive the state guarantee continue to carry that designation unless the

---

<sup>1</sup> Currently Colorado has several approved statewide articulation agreements --Business, Nursing, Engineering, and Teacher Education.

institution chooses to withdraw the course from general education, the course is not offered within a two-year period, or evaluations indicate that a course is not meeting the state criteria.

## **7.00 Articulation Agreement Procedure**

To develop an articulation agreement, CCHE or a sponsoring governing board will convene a committee that includes representatives from each public institution offering the degree program for purposes of negotiating the terms of the articulation agreement including course equivalencies. Each academic vice-president will sign the agreement, and publish the approved agreement so that students, faculty, and academic advisors are fully informed of the terms of the agreement. The articulation agreement format is included as Appendix B.

Transfer appeals filed by students transferring in these fields of study will be decided by the terms and conditions specified in the Statewide Articulation Agreements. Individual transfer guides in these fields of study will not supplant the existing statewide agreements.

## **8.00 Transfer Guides Procedures**

Transfer guides are institutional-specific agreements which contain information about graduation requirements for a particular CCHE-approved degree program, including course equivalency and program admission requirements and prerequisites. Once negotiated, an institution or governing board transmits the guide to CCHE and publishes the approved agreement so that students, faculty and academic advisors are fully informed of the terms of the agreement.

Transfer appeals filed by students transferring in these fields of study will be decided by terms and conditions specified in the Transfer Agreement.

## **GLOSSARY      Definition of Terms**

Articulation Agreements: Articulation agreements apply to specific degree programs as unilateral agreements that specify the common terms, conditions and expectations for students transferring into the degree program. When these courses and/or degree programs are completed successfully at the sending institution, they will, for admitted students, be accepted in transfer and apply to graduation requirements for a specified degree program at all receiving institutions.

GE 25 Council: A council of 25 educational leaders representing each higher education governing board, including presidents, academic vice-presidents, faculty, and students.

General Education: General Education requirements represent an institutional statement about the general body of knowledge and skills that the recipient of any undergraduate degree conferred by an institution should possess.

Institution: A Colorado public higher education institution.

Institutional Dispute: A disagreement between institutions regarding an interpretation of the Statewide Transfer Policy or a disagreement regarding compliance with the procedures and guidelines of this policy, including failure to reach agreement on a Transfer Agreement.

Inter-Institutional Transfer: A student who transfers credit from one Colorado public higher education institution to another Colorado public higher education institution.

Intra-Institutional Transfer: A change of major. A student changes his/her stated major or degree objectives at the institution where the student is currently enrolled.

Native Student: A student who begins and completes an undergraduate degree program at a single institution.

State Guaranteed General Education Course: Courses that the Commission has approved as meeting the state criteria, including satisfying the content criteria in communication, mathematics, social science, arts and humanities or natural and physical science and competency criteria in communication, reading, mathematics, technology, and critical thinking.

Student Transfer Appeal: A student's claim that a principle defined in the statewide transfer policy or a section of an institutional transfer agreement or articulation agreement has been violated. The Commission serves as the final court of appeal and all its decisions are binding.

Successful Completion: Successful completion means that the student passed all 35 state guaranteed general education credit hours with the requisite grade of "C" or better.

Transfer Guide: The written agreement reached between two or more specific institutions for a specific degree program about course equivalency, and program admission criteria.

Transfer Plan: A transfer plan is the specific plan developed by an advisor for a student with a specific transfer objective (e.g., Transfer into a Computer Science degree program at a specific institution.). An advisor at the sending or receiving institution may develop the plan based on an existing transfer agreement and may not include exemptions to a published transfer agreement.

Transfer Student: A transfer student is a student who begins a degree program at one institution and transfers to another institution.

Transcript Evaluation: The process by which an institution evaluates credits attempted and earned at a different institution, applies accepted credits to graduation requirements, and informs a transfer student of what degree and course requirements remain to be fulfilled.

**TOPIC:                   TEACHER EDUCATION REAUTHORIZATION:   UNIVERSITY  
                                  OF NORTHERN COLORADO**

**PREPARED BY:    CAROL FUTHEY**

**I.     SUMMARY**

The teacher education legislation of 1999 (C.R.S. 23-1-121) requires that each teacher education program undergo state review every five years, to ensure that the performance-based model designed as part of the 2000-2001 reviews has been implemented. The University of Northern Colorado (UNC) volunteered to pilot the state's new performance review in December 2002, conducted jointly with the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

The review teams recognized the excellence of UNC's program assessment system and the data to make program improvements. They concurred that the UNC teacher education programs demonstrated quality and met the state standards overall for admission, content, and mastery of skills defined in statute. At its April 2003 meeting, the Commission considered the strengths of the program as well as two areas of concern: 1) the counseling system for the elementary education program, and 2) poor performance by Social Science majors on the PLACE content examination. The Commission also discussed some suggestions pertaining to English as a Second Language endorsement area, and at the request of the State Board of Education, higher education suspended any action on this topic until the final endorsement standards are approved. The Commission tabled any action until UNC prepared a formal plan to resolve these concerns by June 2003.

In May 2003, UNC submitted a proposed plan to address the advising issues and the performance of Social Science majors on the Social Studies content exam. CCHE staff review of proposed advising changes addressed the quality and availability of advising options for Professional Teacher Education Program (PTEP) and Interdisciplinary Liberal Arts (IDLA) students to improve the counseling system for elementary education students. Plans called for monitoring the changes through the 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> year surveys. UNC also listed a number of actions to improve the performance of its Social Science candidates on content assessments, and CCHE staff concluded that UNC's proposed changes should result in improvement in content exam pass rates. Multi-year scores of Social Science majors on content exams will be the basis for CCHE staff to monitor expected improvements.

The Commission again, however, tabled any action due to three additional concerns that are discussed below. At the request of CCHE staff, UNC submitted an action plan in September 2003 to respond to the following concerns. The full action plan that addresses the issues is found in Attachment A.

## II. STAFF ANALYSIS

Commissioner concerns focused on three major areas—student teaching, mentoring/professional development opportunities for new and experienced teachers, and institutional commitment to the state’s higher education priorities. UNC has put forth a comprehensive and ambitious plan, particularly given the accompanying timeframe, that is responsive to Commissioner concerns. The points below briefly outline the issues and proposed institutional actions.

- A. Student Teaching Experiences:** This concern has three dimensions: 1) Student teaching experience lack of evidence of standardized criteria for selecting cooperating teachers in student teaching environment; 2) Some student teachers begin the teaching experience at awkward times that both complicate their integration into the classroom and prevents them from experiencing all they can learn from being present for the entire semester; and 3) Some student teachers are not prepared for the diversity of students and learning needs they face in the classroom.

Among the steps taken to address these issues, UNC has established rigorous criteria for selecting cooperating teachers including recognition of teachers as exceptionally competent or designated as “master teachers.” Faculty also are systematizing the selection of cooperating teacher assignments, precluding the possibility that students set up their own placement. Student teaching assignments are being better synchronized with the opening of the semester, but the proposed fall semester plan could become cumbersome. The institution may want to consider incorporating this experience into earlier coursework where students are observers.

For students to experience diverse learning styles and environments—three examples are of particular note. UNC has coupled elements of broadened learning styles with No Child Left Behind standards, including difficult case studies of students with literacy development. The tutoring program, wherein candidates will be required to complete approximately 40 hours in schools with high proportions of students qualifying for free or reduced lunch, will expose teacher candidates to a wider array of students from varying income levels. Finally, UNC, through its Center for Urban Education, will work aggressively to recruit and support a larger number of ethnic minority teacher candidates, and through the Rural Education Access Provider Program, provide students with opportunities to work in rural eastern plains communities.

- B. Mentoring/Professional Development Opportunities for New and Experienced Teachers:** For UNC to be recognized as “the flagship institution of teacher education,” the teacher education program must be proactive in providing leadership and commitment to professional development for teachers at all levels

of experience. There is a need for first-year teachers to be mentored through an on-going relationship with faculty from their respective teacher preparation program to reduce dropouts from the profession. Additionally, experienced teachers need quality, focused programs that help them learn and address new state standards as well as the practices and techniques being taught to teacher candidates.

The extensiveness of UNC's teacher education program delivery is summarized by the number of teachers served annually. In FY 2002 alone, more than nearly 500 sections were offered to more than 6,600 enrolled students through professional development programs as well as state- and cash-funded degree programs. Building on the existing delivery, several initiatives described in the action plan are of particular note. For example, UNC is initiating more faculty involvement in local induction programs that, if successful, could serve as a model for other institutions. Again, UNC is using No Child Left Behind monies and other grant support to expand programming to both experienced and beginning teachers that could address issues tied to "highly qualified" teacher availability.

- C. Institutional Commitment to the State's Higher Education Priorities:** A broader concern is the need to strengthen links between the teacher preparation program and institution with Colorado's priorities for higher education. More specifically, how does the teacher education program contribute to UNC's overall role in meeting the workforce needs of the state? Colorado clearly has specific educational needs that can be identified according to teaching area (i.e., math, science, special education), student demographic composition, school district socio-economic status, and/or geographic setting. To respond to these shortages, creative programs, such as CUMBRES, need to be better integrated with teacher preparation to facilitate the recruitment, retention, and graduation of a more diverse teacher workforce that better meets the demands of the K-12 system.

Among UNC's commitment to the state's priorities for higher education is a new degree in special education which currently enrolls 90 students. Plans also call for expanding outreach efforts to teachers with varying levels of experience, especially taking advantage of technology as an alternative method of delivery. This is an especially attractive option for reaching less densely populated regions of the state. A final undertaking is to better integrate the CUMBRES program into teacher education by increasing its visibility and changing the reporting line within the institution's administration.

The state's next review of UNC's teacher preparation program is scheduled for fall 2008, but the commissioners believe these concerns need to be addressed before the end of the approval cycle. Given the resource commitments that some of the initiatives will require, staff recognize that it is unrealistic that all of the

concerns can be addressed immediately. Thus UNC must submit an annual report each September to the Commission that describes actions taken over the prior year and enables staff to monitor UNC's progress in implementing actions until concerns are addressed.

### **III. STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

**That the Commission reauthorize the University of Northern Colorado to offer teacher education programs in Early Childhood; Elementary Education; K-12 programs in Art, Music, and Physical Education, Special Education; and secondary programs in Math, Social Science, Biological Sciences, Chemistry, Communication, Earth Sciences, English, French, Geography, German, History, Physics, Spanish, and Theater Arts.**

**Appendix A**

**STATUTORY AUTHORITY**

C.R.S. 23-1-121 (4) (a) (II), Following the initial review of teacher preparation programs pursuant to this section, the commission shall establish a schedule for review of programs that ensures each program is reviewed as provided in this section at least every five years.

**TOPIC:                   TEACHER EDUCATION REAUTHORIZATION:   COLORADO  
STATE UNIVERSITY**

**PREPARED BY:   CAROL FUTHEY**

**I.     SUMMARY**

The Colorado legislature instituted significant changes in 1999 that required teacher preparation programs to adopt a performance model for preparing teachers and demonstrate that program's graduates possess content knowledge and have mastered the skills needed to teach (C.R.S. 23-1-121). Pursuant to this legislation and the subsequent Teacher Education Policy adopted by the Commission, teacher preparation programs have redesigned curricula as part of the 2000 – 2001 authorizations. A mandatory five-year follow-up review cycle also was also developed. Colorado State University volunteered to pilot the new performance review in December 2002, less than two years after the initial site visit, but scheduled jointly with a visit from the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

The state's site visit report indicated that the CSU teacher education program approved in 2001 demonstrated quality and met the state standards overall for admission, content, and mastery of skills as defined in statute. An agenda item recommending Commission approval of the CSU program reauthorization was presented at the June 2003 meeting, but the Commission tabled any action at that time. Since then, CSU's School of Education submitted a rejoinder to the state's review of the program to CCHE ([Attachment A](#)).

**II.    STAFF ANALYSIS**

Based on its findings, the state's review team recommended two areas that CSU needed to address. The first is to establish CSU's critical assessment transition points and to define clearly student competencies (Basic, Developing, Proficient and Advanced Proficient). CSU has designed a thoughtful and detailed assessment model that is described in the attachment. For each of the various transition points through which a teacher candidate moves, the level of competency defined.

The second issue revolved around implementation of a general education assessment plan for teacher education candidates. New admits are assessed to establish their proficiency in basic skills and then measured periodically throughout the student's progression through the program. Proficiency in oral English, English composition, basic mathematics, and computer proficiency are evaluated using a variety of methods and tools. CSU has hired an assessment coordinator who will coordinate university assessment and provide a coherent approach to institution-wide assessment. This action

has been an important step in CSU's ability to respond to these interrelated concerns since the site visit.

The next scheduled review for CSU is 2008.

### **III. STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

**That the Commission reauthorize Colorado State University to offer teacher education programs in Early Childhood; K-12 programs in Art and Music; secondary programs in Agriculture and Natural Resources, Business Education, English, Family and Consumer Studies, Foreign Languages, Marketing Education, Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, Speech, Technical Education, Trade and Industry Education, and Linguistically Diverse: English as a Second Language; Principal License; and Special Services Provider endorsements in: Counselor, Occupational Therapist, and School Social Worker.**

**Appendix A**

**STATUTORY AUTHORITY**

C.R.S. 23-1-121 (4) (a) (II), Following the initial review of teacher preparation programs pursuant to this section, the commission shall establish a schedule for review of programs that ensures each program is reviewed as provided in this section at least every five years.

Response to the Colorado Commission on Higher Education Report  
“Teacher Education Authorization: Colorado State University”--On-site Visit November 2002  
Submitted by School of Education, College of Applied Human Sciences  
Colorado State University, Submitted September 2, 2003

**Introduction**

Our scrutiny of the report presented to the Colorado Commission on Higher Education has revealed that, although there were many, many areas of strengths noted, there were a few areas for improvement and areas of concern cited. The strengths were summarized in the initial report summary which stated,

*The review team concurred that Colorado State University’s teacher education programs demonstrated quality and met the state’s program performance standards for admission, counseling, content, and mastery of skills (p. 1 of 2)*

Specific key strengths cited included:

1. Field experience is the hallmark of CSU’s programs. It is intentional and so well designed that it looks effortless.
2. Quality of science teachers.
3. Quality of early childhood candidates.
4. Collaboration between the K-12 community and CSU in planning and implementing the program as designed.
5. Effectiveness of ED 450 “Instruction II- Standards and Assessment” in assisting the growth of teacher candidates. Students commented “this is the class where it all comes together.”
6. Literacy across the curriculum. In every classroom, a candidate had embedded literacy activities in the classroom.
7. Technology abilities of the candidate.
8. Candidates’ knowledge of standards and assessment and the ability to apply this knowledge in the classroom.
9. Highly developed assessment of candidate skills.
10. Solid infrastructure for program assessment.

We have extracted the following areas for improvement and concern from Part I of the report and will address them below:

1. Area for Improvement: “CSU’s Teacher Education Assessment Plan. CSU is at the early stages of developing an assessment plan in the undergraduate programs.”

**CCHE Recommendation 1:** Establish CSU’s critical assessment transition points and define them in terms of student competencies.

**CSU Response 1:** The assessment system for teacher education candidates is intended to monitor their performance and to manage and improve operations of the Licensing Program. Data are collected at multiple transition points throughout the progress of the candidate in the program and decisions about candidates are made based on multiple assessments. The following table (Table 1) depicts the overall model for the Teacher Education program with requirements for admission and advancement portrayed.

Table 1: Model of Teacher Education at Colorado State University

PHASE I Admission Requirements	PHASE I Courses	PHASE II Admission Requirements	PHASE II Courses	PHASE III Admission Requirements	PHASE III Courses	PHASE IV Admission Requirements	PHASE IV Courses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Completion</u> of 30 credit hours of post-secondary coursework</li> <li>• <u>Intent</u> to apply for admission to the program</li> </ul>	<p>EDCC 275 <i>"Schooling in the United States"</i> 3 credits (Course includes 6 hours of field experiences in the P-12 public school system)</p> <p>ED 340 <i>"Literacy and the Learner"</i> 3 credits (Course includes 30 hours of field experiences in the public school system.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Attendance</u> at the Orientation/ Advising Session</li> <li>• <u>Submission</u> of application outlined in Admissions Packet.</li> <li>• <u>Evaluation</u> of application and admission decision made based on scoring procedures used by Admissions and Retention Committee.</li> <li>• <u>Interview</u>, if required, by Admissions and Retention Committee.</li> <li>• <u>Documented</u> meeting with key education advisor.</li> <li>• <u>Submission</u> of admission contract.</li> <li>• <u>Successful</u> completion of Phase I courses.</li> </ul>	<p>ED 350 <i>"Instruction I: Individualization, Management"</i> 3 credits (Course is a Professional Development School (PDS) at the public junior high schools) Includes 98 hours of field experiences.</p> <p>ED 386 <i>"Practicum: Instruction I"</i> 1 credit (Includes field experiences aligned with ED 350)</p> <div style="border: 1px dashed black; padding: 5px;"> <p>ED 331 <i>"Educational Technology"</i> 1 credit (Course can be taken in Phase I or II of Program)</p> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Recommendation</u> to move forward in program from Phase II course instructors.</li> <li>• <u>Continued</u> adherence to admission contract.</li> <li>• <u>Documented</u> meeting with key education advisor.</li> <li>• <u>Successful</u> completion of Phase II courses</li> </ul>	<p>ED 450 <i>"Instruction II: Standards, Assessment"</i> 4 credits (Course is a Professional Development School (PDS) at the public high schools) Includes 116 hours of field experiences.</p> <p>ED 486 J <i>"Practicum: Instruction II"</i> 1 credit (Includes field experiences aligned with ED 450)</p> <div style="border: 1px dashed black; padding: 5px;"> <p>ED/VE *** <i>"Content Methods"</i> 4 credits (Course can be taken in Phase II or III of Program)</p> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Submission</u> of application for student teaching placement.</li> <li>• <u>Recommendation</u> from general and content methods instructors and signature of approval from key education advisor.</li> <li>• <u>2.75 Cumulative GPA</u></li> <li>• <u>Grades</u> of C or above in all professional education and teaching concentration courses.</li> <li>• <u>Documented</u> meeting with key education advisor.</li> <li>• <u>Continued</u> adherence to admission contract.</li> <li>• <u>Successful</u> completion of Phase III courses.</li> </ul>	<p>ED 485 A-B/VE 485 <i>"Student Teaching"</i> 11-12 credits (Course entails 14-16 weeks of full-time experience (600 hours) in a cooperating school site). Candidate must meet all institutional, state, and national standards at the "proficient" level. Candidate must submit a Student Teacher Portfolio and receive a passing grade in student teaching.</p> <p>ED 493A/VE 492 <i>Seminar: Professional Relations</i> 1 credit (Course includes career counseling, licensing information, and student teaching reflections)</p> <p>ED 493B <i>Seminar: Assessment of Learning"</i> 1 credit (Course includes further development of assessment skills, processes, and strategies) <i>Successful Completion of Phase IV Leads to...</i> ↗ Institutional Recommendation for a Colorado Provisional Teaching License.</p>

For admission to the Teacher Education Program, for the secondary and K-12 programs, candidates are required to be admitted to the professional preparation program before taking education beyond EDCC 275, ED 331, and ED 340. Candidates seeking admission can be undergraduate students currently enrolled in a bachelor's degree program at Colorado State University and post bachelor students who have completed a bachelor's degree at an accredited institution. The admission process requires submission of an application, evidence of working with school-aged children (20 hours), a 2.75 cumulative grade point average, a writing sample, three forms/letters of reference, a grade of C or above in all teaching concentration and professional education courses, evidence of computer proficiency, evidence of oral English proficiency, legal background review by the Colorado Bureau of Investigation and the Federal Bureau of Investigation using the Colorado Department of Education forms/processes, attendance at a program orientation sessions, and a completed contract of coursework required for licensure, signed and approved by the student, key adviser, and Director of Educator Licensing.

Teacher licensure candidates, after admission to the Program, are monitored closely in a number of areas, including basic skills. Grade point average is monitored, candidate disposition is monitored through Professional Progress Reports (PPR's), and candidates are required to meet with their advisors at least one time each semester.

Throughout their progress in the Licensing Program, candidates are examined in each course against the 45 standard elements required for licensing in Colorado. This information is maintained as an "electronic inventory" in a database that "tracks" the progress of all candidates. At the conclusion of each of the "core" education courses (EDCC 275, ED 331, ED 340, ED 350/386, ED 450/486J, ED/VE 485, ED 493A/VE 492, and ED 493B), instructors assign final grades and also record the level of proficiency attained by the candidate on these standard elements. Candidate proficiency is rated for each standard element at one of the following:

- Level 1 Basic: The teacher candidate is introduced to the standard/standard element and demonstrates a basic level of knowledge and understanding. The teacher candidates has not yet had the opportunity to apply the standard/standard element in a college classroom or field setting.
- Level 2 Developing: The teacher candidate demonstrates an increasing knowledge and understanding of the standard/standard element. The teacher candidate is able to begin demonstrating, with assistance, the standard/standard element in a field setting or college classroom, and to evaluate, with assistance, the success of the teaching performance.
- Level 3 Proficient: The teacher candidate demonstrates substantial knowledge and understanding of the standard/standard element. The teacher candidate demonstrates the ability to apply the standard/element in a field setting, and to assess student learning and evaluate teaching performance. This is the level expected of well-prepared first-year teachers.
- Level 4 Advanced. The teacher candidate demonstrates comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the standard/standard element: can consistently apply the standard/standard element in a field setting; can skillfully integrate it into an overall lesson; and critically evaluate student learning and teaching effectiveness in order to guide subsequent instruction.

Other candidate assessments include passing score on each candidate's respective subject matter knowledge PLACE (Program for the Licensing Assessment of Colorado Educators) or PRAXIS test prior to student teaching, submission of a student teaching portfolio, and recommendations from University supervisors and/or cooperating teachers. A full description of the student teaching portfolio, and its assessment, is found in the [Student Teaching Handbook](#). The Teacher Candidate Portfolio is an edited collection of a teacher candidates' evidence of professional growth and reflections representing progress through the entire professional preparation program. The teacher candidate portfolio differs from portfolios often required in individual courses because it represents the integration of learning in all courses. Portfolios should show candidates' progress toward their personal goals, program goals, and standards for teachers.

**CCHE Recommendation 2:** Establish a common schema for performance level. Basic, Developing, Proficient, and Advanced Proficient are interpreted differently for the 45 standard elements that CSU is measuring.

**CSU Response 2:** As reported above, candidate proficiency is rated for each standard element at one of the following levels:

- Level 1 Basic: The teacher candidate is introduced to the standard/standard element and demonstrates a basic level of knowledge and understanding. The teacher candidate has not yet had the opportunity to apply the standard/standard element in a college classroom or field setting.
- Level 2 Developing: The teacher candidate demonstrates an increasing knowledge and understanding of the standard/standard element. The teacher candidate is able to begin demonstrating, with assistance, the standard/standard element in a field setting or college classroom, and to evaluate, with assistance, the success of the teaching performance.
- Level 3 Proficient: The teacher candidate demonstrates substantial knowledge and understanding of the standard/standard element. The teacher candidate demonstrates the ability to apply the standard/element in a field setting, and to assess student learning and evaluate teaching performance. This is the level expected of well-prepared first-year teachers.
- Level 4 Advanced. The teacher candidate demonstrates comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the standard/standard element: can consistently apply the standard/standard element in a field setting; can skillfully integrate it into an overall lesson; and critically evaluate student learning and teaching effectiveness in order to guide subsequent instruction.

These schema were established by the Colorado Department of Education for institutions to utilize in assessing candidate proficiency. We recognize the general nature of these performance levels and are working closely now with our faculty and teacher partners to more clearly and objectively define each of these performance levels. Once defined, these will be shared with all faculty and teacher education candidates. Assessments will be adapted to these new criteria.

---

**CCHE Recommendation 3:** Implement general education assessment plan for teacher education candidates.

**CSU Response 3:** At Colorado State University, the following general education assessment plan is currently in place:

Proof of basic skills knowledge is established both at the time of admission into the program and throughout the candidate's progress in the program. This occurs in the following ways:

As a Condition of Admission:

### Oral English Proficiency

- A candidate must have taken SP 200 at CSU or its equivalent at another college and received a grade of B or above. If the candidate does not receive a B or above, or was not required to take a public speaking course for the bachelor's degree, the candidate may take and pass the Oral English Proficiency Exam.

### Proficiency in English Composition and Basic Mathematics

- As a condition of admission into the Teacher Licensure Program, the applicant must also submit written responses to a number of relevant essay questions posed in the application form. The written answers are evaluated and scored using a formal rubric and scoring guide (contained in the "Admissions Packet") to assess basic skills.
- Basic skills proficiency in English composition and basic mathematics will be verified through the completion of, with a "C" or above, COCC 150, College Composition, and in any beginning college algebra course or higher course in mathematics. The University requires that all undergraduate students meet specific prerequisites prior to enrolling in college composition or college mathematics. These prerequisites are:

College  
Composition

All undergraduate students are required to take and pass the **Composition Placement Examination** before enrolling in COCC 150, unless the student is able to transfer equivalent credits from another college or if the student has achieved a required score on the Advanced Placement English Composition and Literature Test or the Advanced Placement English Language and Composition Exam.

The Composition Placement Exam, offered by the English Department is scored on a scale of 1 to 6. Approximately 91% of test takers are placed into COCC 150; 3% test out with credit; and 6 % require remediation.

College  
Mathematics

All undergraduate students are required to take and pass the **Entry Level Math Exam (ELM)** or the **Math Placement Exam (MPE)** prior to enrolling in any beginning algebra course or higher course in mathematics. The only variance to this policy occurs when a student is able to transfer equivalent credits from another college or if the student has achieved a required score on the Advance Placement Exam (AP Exam).

The Entry Level Math Exam (ELM) is designed to place students into the beginning college mathematics course(s). Students may choose to take either the ELM or the MPE. In order to pass over the beginning college mathematics course(s), the student may opt to take the Math Placement Exam (MPE). A satisfactory score on the MPE will permit the student to be placed in mathematics courses at a higher level. If a student chooses to

take the MPE first and is unable to pass the exam, then the student must take the ELM. If a satisfactory score on the ELM is not achieved, then remediation is required of the student, until the student can pass the ELM.

### Computer Proficiency

- Teacher licensure candidates must demonstrate computer proficiency prior to formal admittance into the Teacher Licensure by either documenting successful completion of a computer applications course (such as BD150, BD111) within the last three years or completing a computer proficiency test.
- The computer proficiency test is a computer-scored test in which students will demonstrate their knowledge of basic and intermediate skills in word processing, spreadsheets, database, presentation software, and basic computer literacy.
- Either system will provide students and the teacher licensure program with a report that lists areas of proficiency and non-proficiency. If a student needs improvement in some areas, the student will be directed to online learning resources to build needed skills. A student will complete these online learning resources and retake the computer proficiency test in the non-proficient areas. The process repeats until the student has demonstrated proficiency in all areas.

## 2. Areas of Concern:

---

**CCHE Recommendation 1:** CSU is requested to provide CCHE with data on the Consumer and Family Studies candidates in April 2004, documenting the candidates' performance, evaluations of cooperating teachers, and/or changes to the curriculum.

**CSU Response 1:** Under Part IV A 2 of this report (p. 16), it was reported, "The two Consumer and Family Studies students who were observed did not exhibit understanding of content or have comparable technology skills to other CSU candidates." We are not aware of who the students are that are mentioned, although we believe the students visited were not student teachers and are considered strong candidates given their early level of participation in our program. We are unable to find other specific evidence in this report about concerns for the Consumer and Family Studies program and therefore are most eager to investigate this further. We will begin a comprehensive analysis of this program, including the items mentioned in CCHE's recommendation and deliver this analysis to CCHE by April 15, 2004. If this analysis shows that the two students observed are representative of the 32 overall candidates enrolled in this endorsement area, then we will endeavor to make immediate changes.

---

**CCHE Recommendation 2:** CSU's distance delivered teacher education programs will be evaluated during the CSU Pueblo review.

**CSU Response 2:** Under Part IV B 5 of this report (p. 19), it was reported, "There is a question about the nature of the off-campus Counselor Education program: does it have significant involvement of CSU faculty on-site or is it a CSU extension program utilizing University of Southern Colorado (now CSU-Pueblo) personnel and Pueblo-based adjuncts?"

As reported under the previous area of concern for Consumer and Family Studies, we are unable to find other specific evidence in this report substantiating this concern. The CSU Counselor program and CSU Leadership (principal licensure) program will, if requested, be reviewed by the state reviewers during the CSU-Pueblo overall review of teacher preparation. Our program is presently preparing for a national CACREP review (national accreditation). The self-study that is being drafted can be shared with on-site reviewers during the Pueblo review.

### **Final Remarks**

The professional education unit in the School of Education is grateful to the State Review Team, comprised of CCHE and CDE staff for its thorough and insightful review of the School's professional education programs. We acknowledge and recognize the overall accuracy of the team's report and hope that the additional information provided in this rejoinder will be useful in acknowledging our ongoing efforts to deliver the very highest quality professional education program. We believe that substantive and positive efforts have been made with each standard, and concur that the unit has successfully met each standard at the initial (assessment was noted as "in progress") and advanced level. Yet, we also recognize that our professional education program can be improved. Therefore, we appreciate the opportunity provided through this state review to further examine and implement strategies for improvement.

**TOPIC:                   REVISED MORGAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACILITY  
                              MASTER PLAN 2003**

**PREPARED BY:       GAIL HOFFMAN**

**I.       SUMMARY**

The State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education System approved the Morgan Community College (MCC) Facility Master Plan on December 11, 2002, and a revision to it on September 10, 2003. This revised master plan was submitted to CCHE in October 2002. MCC then submitted an amendment to the revision in May 2003. The revised master plan updates the 1994 facility plan that CCHE approved in 1995.

The revision included some corrected information on full-time equivalent enrollment (FTE) at Fort Morgan and the five satellite campuses, discussed the impact of technology on enrollment, and amended the project requests to take into account:

- Completion of a recent addition/renovation project (Technology Building);
- Colorado state government's budget situation; and
- Improbability of state capital construction dollars being available for higher education for several years.

The net result of the changes was a reduction in capital projects from seven to six, and a drop in the amount of state capital construction dollars requested from \$10 million to a little more than \$6 million. The focus of the revisions to the master plan was to improve student space: classrooms, teaching labs, library expansion, and assembly and exhibit space. The changes will leave MCC with a 1,310-square-foot space deficit for offices. College officials believe that space needs can be addressed in a future master plan update.

The master plan recommends building renovations and construction of several additions and new buildings at the main campus in Fort Morgan. The recommendations are based on CCHE or Council of Educational Facilities Planners, International (CEFPI) guidelines. Where no guidelines existed, the consultant conducted additional space studies. The master plan assumes that enrollment for the entire college will grow at a little more than three percent a year. That was the average rate of growth from 1998 through 2002, when full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollment for the main campus in Fort Morgan and the satellite centers together grew nearly 13 percent. *Only enrollment figures and projections at the Fort Morgan campus were used in calculating space deficits on which the proposed capital construction projects were based.*

Capital construction projects for the Fort Morgan campus outlined in the facility master plan are shown below, by priority order listed:

**Morgan Community College Proposed Capital Projects**

<i>Project Title</i>	<i>Total Gross Square Feet (gsf)</i>	<i>Estimated Cost</i>	<i>Purpose</i>
Adult Education Building	3,214 gsf new	\$1,574,476 Cash Funds (Foundation)	Relocate Adult Education programs to main campus from downtown facility
Cottonwood Hall Expansion/Renovation	7,025 new, 5,000 renovation	\$2,956,950 State Funds	Expansion of open labs, faculty offices, and library
Spruce Hall Addition	6,707 new	\$1,870,750 State Funds	More classroom, teaching labs, faculty offices, assembly & exhibit space
Day Care Center	3,214 new	\$1,358,397 Cash Funds (Private Developer)	Contract with a private vendor to build and manage a facility on campus to meet student needs
Community Center	29,603 new	\$7,133,480: \$1,426,696 State; \$5,706,784 Cash	Joint venture with community to provide space for physical education and large assembly functions
Adult Education Expansion	1,071 new	\$337,743 Cash Funds (Morgan Community College Foundation)	Anticipated growth in Adult Education programs
<i>Totals</i>	<i>50,834 new; 5,000 renovation</i>	<i>\$15,231,796: \$6,254,396 State; \$8,977,400 Cash</i>	

Cottonwood, Aspen, and Spruce halls house the main academic programs in one long, brick-clad metal building. The Day Care Center, Community Center, and Adult Education Building will be constructed around a campus green that will be located to the east of the main academic building. The Technology Building that houses the Automobile Technology and Collision Repair Technology programs was completed in 2002. It was built to the east of the main academic building. Pedestrian paths and small gathering places on the campus green will help link the various buildings and provide access from parking lots located on the perimeter. A loop road around the campus will provide access to parking lots.

The total amount of proposed additions would more than double the owned square footage for the 20-acre main campus, now at a little more than 49,113 gsf. In addition, Morgan Community College uses a Foundation-owned 6,044 gsf building for adult education and owns the historic 5,300-gsf Bloedorn Building for outreach programs, both

in downtown Fort Morgan. The proposed academic uses with the greatest needs are physical education and recreation, teaching laboratories, offices, and open laboratories. Support spaces for which the greatest need is projected are for assembly and exhibit, as well as more library space.

The need to renovate and remodel existing spaces can be justified based on the condition the buildings are in today and the need to upgrade facilities to keep pace with changes in teaching technologies. Increasing academic and academic support space at the Fort Morgan campus may be needed based on lower than optimum spaces today. If anything, the master plan appears to highlight the need for larger, leased facilities for the satellite centers in Burlington and Bennett. Leasing facilities is not paid for with capital construction funds, which is why the master plan doesn't discuss facility needs at the satellites in detail.

## **II. BACKGROUND**

Morgan Community College serves an area of about 11,500 square miles and a population of about 55,000 people. All or part of the northeastern Colorado counties of Morgan, Washington, Yuma, Lincoln, Kit Carson, Adams and Arapahoe counties are in the CCHE-set service area. College course offerings include traditional core curricula for students intending to transfer to a four-year institution, vocational training, and continuing education in industrial and agrarian programs that local eastern Colorado economies demand. Technology links between Morgan Community College facilities make possible the use of simultaneous recording and broadcasting for long-distance instruction.

Morgan Community College began in 1970 as Morgan County Community College, conducting early classes in storefront sites in Fort Morgan and Brush. When the college became part of the statewide community college system in 1973, it was renamed Morgan Community College. Its service area was expanded to include Yuma and Washington counties. The college has always provided a two-year college education program, occupational programs, continuing education, and adult basic education.

During 2000-2001, the college's main campus in Fort Morgan accounted for about 60 percent of the total headcount enrollment and 59 percent of the FTE enrollment. The other satellite centers in leased spaces in Bennett, Limon, Burlington, Yuma, and Wray accounted for about 40 percent of the total headcount enrollment and about 41 percent of the total FTE enrollment. (See chart on page 4.) The satellites are all located at a relatively far distance from the main campus at Fort Morgan: Yuma 60 miles; Bennett, 75 miles; Limon, 85 miles; Wray, 90 miles; and Burlington, 150 miles. The Yuma and Wray sites are administered as one location. Classes for the satellite centers are taught at the centers and in area high schools.

Since CCHE approved the 1994 Morgan Community College Facility Master Plan, the temporary two doublewide trailers, together called Willow Hall, were demolished to make way for the Technology Building, which was completed in 2002. Willow Hall housed the student bookstore and student center. The college also is renovating the Bloedorn Building downtown, which it acquired as a gift in 1990 and uses for outreach programs.

**III. STAFF ANALYSIS**

Enrollment Projection

Factors in making enrollment projections include:

1. Numbers of high school graduates in the area;
2. Data on what percentage of area high school graduates typically elect to attend a particular college;
3. Impact of the economy on enrollment;
4. Area population declines and increases among various age groups;
5. Percentage of different age groups represented among the general student population; and
6. Possible additional student FTE generated from new programs or new satellites.

The facility master plan for Morgan Community College projects a nearly 13 percent increase in *total* student FTE enrollment (Fort Morgan campus and the satellites) from 2002 through approximately 2006, the target year of this master plan, from 988 to 1,114. The projection is based on past enrollment growth between 1998 and 2002.

**Morgan Community College FTE Enrollment, 1991-1992 through 2001-2002**

	91-92	92-93	93-94	94-95	95-96	96-97	97-98	98-99	99-00	00-01	01-02	% Change 92-02	% Change 97-02
FTE	584	757	846	716	769	815	879	927	959	959	988	69%	12.6%
% Change	8.6%	29.6%	11.8%	(15.4%)	7.4%	6%	7.9%	5.5%	3.5%	(0%)	3%		

Source: CCHE FY 2002 Final FTE Student Enrollment Report, October 3, 2002

Morgan County, the county from which 35-41 percent of main campus students enrolled from fall 1998 through fall 2000, increased in population 25 percent from 1990 through 2000. The contribution that the Fort Morgan main campus and the satellite centers make

to the total enrollment in headcount and FTE is shown below; the FTE figures are in parentheses.

**Headcount & FTE\* by MCC Site, 1996-2000**

<i>Site</i>	<i>1995-1996</i>	<i>1996-1997</i>	<i>1997-1998</i>	<i>1998-1999</i>	<i>1999-2000</i>	<i>2000-2001</i>	<i>% Change 1995-2000</i>
Bennett	228 (56)	279 (64)	337 (87)	335 (101)	362 (136)	341 (121)	49.56% (116%)
Burlington	208 (40)	202 (42)	267 (48)	262 (57)	299 (54)	296 (56)	42.3% (4%)
Fort Morgan	1,374 (601)	1,351 (619)	1,603 (592)	1,744 (619)	1,917 (622)	1,959 (645)	42.5% (7.3%)
Limon	171 (62)	296 (66)	288 (89)	304 (91)	250 (87)	294 (74)	71.9% (19.3%)
Wray/Yuma	275 (10)	388 (24)	492 (60)	403 (59)	377 (60)	352 (63)	28.4 % (530%)
<i>Totals</i>	<i>2,256 (769)</i>	<i>2,516 (815)</i>	<i>2987 (876)</i>	<i>3,048 (927)</i>	<i>3,205 (959)</i>	<i>3,242 (959)</i>	<i>43.7% (26%)</i>

*Sources: Morgan Community College Facility Master Plan 2002; May 15, 2003, Revisions to Master Plan*

\* FTE figures in parentheses

The enrollment figures for the Fort Morgan campus above show that the number of students has increased each year but in 1996-1997, when FTE enrollment dipped from a high of 619 in 1996-1997 to 592 in 1997-1998. That change is partly attributed to the discontinuation of the truck driving training course in 1997. Enrollment in the truck-driving training course was 96 in 1996, 25 in 1997. The main campus of the college made up the enrollment loss gradually, mostly through technology courses originated on campus. Since the base year 1997-1998 used in the master plan, however, FTE enrollment at the Fort Morgan campus has grown 9.4 percent, or an average annual rate of 2.36 percent. This is a lower average rate of growth than the 3.5 percent average projected annual enrollment growth in the master plan.

Based on 2000-2001 enrollment figures, the ratio of numbers of students (headcount) to FTE is 3.38:1 for the campus as a whole and 3.46:1 at the MCC main campus in Fort Morgan. According to the college's October 2001 Academic Planning Report, between 65-160 students annually enrolled in non-credit courses from 1996-1997 through 2000-2001. The non-credit courses include grant writing, defensive driving, storytelling, and beginning guitar, as well as professional development courses such as the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) Compliance Audit training, OSHA Certification, and Computer Skills seminars. Enrollments fluctuate based upon specific needs of communities.

In addition, the cash-funded adult education program enrolls about 800 students each year in two levels of graduate equivalency diploma preparation and five levels of English as a Second Language (ESL). Both adult education sections are growing, primarily due to

the influx of Hispanic Morgan County residents; the Hispanic percentage of the total county population grew 25 percent from 1990 to 2000.

Since the base year of 1997-1998 to 2000-2001, FTE enrollment percentage growth at the Bennett, Burlington, and Limon satellite centers exceeded the growth rate for the Fort Morgan campus.

For master planning purposes, Morgan County's overall population is expected to increase 10 percent between 2000 and 2005. Between 1998 to the master plan target year of 2006, the FTE enrollment growth at the main campus in Fort Morgan is expected to increase 22 percent, from 521 to 637. But, for the period 2002 through 2006, the FTE enrollment growth at the Fort Morgan campus is projected to increase just 13 percent.

Much of the 13 percent overall enrollment projection is due to growth in the demographic group that contributes most to the college's enrollment: the 17-25 year group, which made up 42 percent to 48 percent of the total college students in 1996 through 2002. The numbers of students in this age group increased 52 percent from 1996 through 2002.

Based on 2000-2001 enrollment figures, the ratio of numbers of students (headcount) to FTE is 3.38:1 for the campus as a whole and 3.46:1 at the main campus of Morgan Community College in Fort Morgan. According to the college's October 2001 Academic Planning Report, between 65-160 students annually enrolled in non-credit courses from 1996-1997 through 2000-2001. The non-credit courses include grant writing, defensive driving, storytelling, and beginning guitar, as well as professional development courses such as the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) Compliance Audit training, OSHA Certification, and Computer Skill seminars. Enrollments fluctuate based upon specific needs of communities.

In addition, the cash-funded adult education program enrolls about 800 students each year in two levels of graduate equivalency diploma preparation and five levels of English as a Second Language (ESL). Both adult education sections are growing, primarily due to the influx of Hispanic Morgan County residents; the Hispanic percentage of the total county population grew 25 percent from 1990 to 2000.

Enrollment projections took into account demographic characteristics of the counties that make up Morgan Community College's service area. Those characteristics are depicted on the next page:

**County Demographics, Morgan Community College Service Area**

	Adams	Arapahoe	Kit Carson	Lincoln	Morgan	Washington	Yuma
Population 2000	363,857	487,967	8,011	6,087	27,171	4,926	9,841
Projected Population 2005	411,878	520,672	8,154	6,393	29,750	5,040	10,275
% White	63.3%	73.9%	73.9%	84.2%	67%	92.7%	86.1%
% Hispanic	28.2%	11.8%	13.7%	8.5%	31.2%	6.3%	12.9%
% Black	3%	7.7%	1.7%	5%	0.3%	0%	0.1%
% Other	5.5%	6.6%	10.7%	2.3%	1.5%	1%	0.9%
Median Household Income	\$40,802	\$50,748	\$32,964	\$29,117	\$31,197	\$29,870	\$31,639
High School Grads	128,251	230,583	3,398	2,288	9,180	2,435	4,598
College Grads	21,157	88,573	729	396	1,587	380	786
Persons Per Square Mile	305.2	607.7	3.7	2.4	21.1	2.0	4.2

Source: Morgan Community College Facility Master Plan 2002

In the fall of 2000, Morgan County contributed 41 percent of the total MCC enrollment, followed by Yuma, 13 percent; Kit Carson, 10 percent; other counties, 9 percent; Adams, 8 percent; Arapahoe, 7 percent; and Lincoln and Washington each with 6 percent.

Past enrollment increases, the changes in population, the headcount and FTE enrollments at the various sites, past growth in the age 17-25 demographic group, and the declining economy (which may result in more student enrollments), support the projected 13 percent student FTE enrollment growth at the Fort Morgan campus. However, the slower than projected FTE enrollment growth from 1997-1998 through 2000-2001 indicate that the Fort Morgan may not reach the 637 FTE goal until after the target year of 2006.

Academic Program and Facility Needs

Many of the course offerings at Morgan Community College are in line with those demanded by the agricultural economy: medical specialties, small business, automotive repair, and agricultural training.

The facility plan responds to academic planning for Morgan Community College by providing for:

1. Teaching and open laboratories for programs expected to be developed for Allied and Occupational Health (possible Associate in Applied Science degrees in Medical Assistance, Radiology, and Surgical Technician), Computer Sciences, and Vocational Programs (possible Associate of Applied Sciences degrees in Construction Trades and Industrial Technology);
2. A Community Center that would provide space for physical education and recreation and venues for exhibits, dance, concerts, and large-group meetings; such a facility would assist the community college in offering the full Colorado Transfer Core Curriculum in art, music, drama and physical education. Students would then be better able to transfer to four-year institutions.

Morgan Community College implements a new program using several criteria: verification of need, potential student population, labor market supply and demand, and availability of appropriate faculty and facilities. After a program has been introduced, it must have 12 completions within three years or generate 60 FTE annually in order for it to continue to be offered. Unlike the four-year colleges, two-year colleges can begin new programs without CCHE approval. The criteria required of the community college system resulted in the college introducing the following new programs during 2002, according to the latest Academic Planning Report:

1. Ag/Business Financial Analysis
2. Ag/Business Marketing and Risk Management
3. Ag/Business Planning and Financial Records
4. Business Human Resource Management
5. Business Supervisor
6. Medical Transcriptionist
7. Rural Business Entrepreneurship
8. Team Management
9. Rehabilitation Aide
10. Carpentry
11. Electrical Power Technician
12. Heavy Equipment Operator
13. Microsoft Certified Systems Engineer

In 2000, Morgan Community College expanded its agricultural programs curriculum with an Associate of Applied Science degree in Agricultural Production Management, with a core of elective computer science degree courses. The Limon Center added a CISCO Network training program in 2001. At some of the centers, the college would like to add entry-level coursework for nursing students so that some are not compelled to get such

training in Kansas. The main campus in Fort Morgan only offers the second year of training for future licensed practical nurses.

The primary reason Morgan Community College submitted the master plan was to be able to build a separate cash-funded adult education building on campus. The Morgan Community College Foundation is unwilling to continue to spend money to maintain its 70-year-old building in downtown Fort Morgan for adult education. A separate building is needed because the current four classrooms are not adequate to serve both groups of students. Being on campus will make it easier for students earning their high school equivalency diplomas to enroll in the college.

State-funded expansions and renovations of Spruce, Aspen, and Cottonwood Halls would address existing and future space deficits in the library, exhibit space, classrooms, teaching labs, offices and support spaces (discussed on page 10), as well as improve site circulation and infrastructure of the existing buildings. *Even if enrollment does not increase at the rate projected, the space needs analysis in the master plan indicates the Fort Morgan campus already needs about double the amount of space it has today to adequately provide its current courses and programs.*

A day care center on campus, funded by a private developer, would make it easier for students with children to attend class on campus. In addition, Morgan Community College wants to provide the Colorado Core Curriculum to its students to better enable transfers later to four-year institutions. That curriculum includes art, music, physical education, and drama. However, the college has no facilities to offer these activities. The Community Center would be planned to meet the 19,370 assignable-square-foot deficit for physical education and recreation, as well as to offer venues for dances, concerts, exhibits, and large-group gatherings. Because the community would use the Community Center as well, it would be a joint venture between the college and outside groups.

The downturn in the demand for those with computer science degrees may result in a decision to not offer certain computer science programs. But, in any case, computer training is needed for a wide variety of disciplines. Planning for information technology is discussed below.

#### Information Technology Planning

The relatively remote population centers and their distance from Fort Morgan make forms of distance education imperative. Distance education, for Morgan Community College, includes making classes available at area high schools through the five satellite centers in Burlington, Limon, Bennett, Wray, and Yuma. The college intends to improve two-way voice, data, and video connectivity from Fort Morgan to the satellite centers. CCHE approved the Morgan Community College Technology Access Project in 1998 that established infrastructure connectivity between the seven counties and Fort Morgan in order to deliver instruction through instructional technology. The college has two-way

interactive learning through a classroom studio and a PicTel classroom, which are both housed on the main campus.

In 1999, CCHE approved the Information Technology and Connectivity Plan to expand and improve upon the 1998 plan. However, delays in implementation of the Colorado Multi-Use Network (MNT) upon which the plan depended caused it to be put on hold. Morgan Community College intends to again request funding for this project in fiscal year 2005. If state funding were available but the MNT still wasn't accessible, the project could still go forward using others means of connecting the centers.

Technology can help deliver courses to those who might otherwise not be able to attend college. But it can also cause the need for larger classrooms because equipment for distance learning (monitors, cameras, white boards, etc.) can occupy large amounts of space. MCC is considering more Internet-delivered courses, but finds that many of the areas MCC serves do not have adequate, reliable Internet service. Current MCC staff at the centers often cannot connect to the main campus mainframe due to lack of Internet service in their areas. (These are among the problems the MNT was supposed to address for rural areas.) MCC continues to try to work with both private and public partners to expand distance-learning options for students.

The CCHE report on distance education, given to the Commission for its January 10, 2003, meeting, showed Morgan Community College ranked 24<sup>th</sup> out of the 26 higher education institutions in *online* enrollments in 2001. Two-way video accounted for 79 percent of all distance education enrollments and other methods—primarily the Internet and on-line courses—accounted for the rest of the distance education methods. Morgan Community College had an 11 percent drop in the number of students enrolled in distance education courses between 2000 and 2001. A drop in distance education, while overall enrollment increases or remains about the same, could indicate a greater demand for on-site courses, thus creating more need for space. The apparent decline in distance education also could reflect the cyclical nature of some course offerings, for example a science/math course alternating between a three-credit offering one year and a five-credit course offering the next.

Today, various long-distance media are used to deliver courses: two-way interactive courses served with fiber and microwave that links the main campus with three high schools; a PictureTel system between the main campus and five high schools; a network of schools that uses digital fiber; and another network of schools that uses analog fiber to deliver courses. Another group of high schools will be linked to the main campus at a future date.

Fort Morgan Campus and Satellite Centers

Everything that happens in the satellite centers is supported in some degree by the main campus, from offices for faculty who teach in the satellite centers, to distance-education programs that are broadcast to the centers, to resources as the library.

The space needs at the Fort Morgan main campus must be considered in relationship to the satellite centers, which offer courses at the centers, in area high schools, and the Bloedorn Center in downtown Fort Morgan. The chart that begins below gives additional details about programs and FTE enrollments:

**MCC SATELLITE CHARACTERISTICS**

<i>Site</i>	<i>Programs Current/Planned</i>	<i>Size of Leased Site</i>	<i>Service Area</i>	<i>FTE in 2002</i>
Bennett	Associate of Arts and Associate of Science/career-based programs planned; classes taught in Bennett, Strasburg, Byers, and Deer Trail high schools	380 square feet; houses part-time director and part-time clerk	Eastern part of Adams and Arapahoe counties	173
Limon	Associate of Arts, Associate of Science, CISCO Network Technicians program, GED, some Associate in Applied Sciences courses/study continuing on possible new programs; classes taught in Limon, Woodlin, Ariciaree, Genoa-Hugo, Arriba-flager, High Plains, and Kit Carson high schools	822 square feet; houses part-time director and part-time administrative assistant	Lincoln County, southern portion of Washington County	98
Burlington	College-level computer classes, small number of other course/additional programs dependent on more space; classes taught at Burlington, Stratton, and Bethune high schools	3,355 square feet donated by City of Burlington; mechanical systems inadequate; houses full-time director and full-time administrative assistant	Kit Carson County	63
Yuma-Wray	Associate of Arts with coursework for students completing prerequisites for occupational programs such as nursing, computer classes for public, and extensive business classes toward Associate of Applied Science degree in business technology, supervision, and business/classes taught at Wray, Yuma, Otis, Lone Star, Idalia, and Liberty high schools.	Yuma Center: 462 square feet providing office and six computer stations; space considered inadequate. Wray Center: 1,703 square feet with an office and two classrooms; possible relocation in 2003 to space owned by Rural Ameritown with three classrooms, office could result in higher enrollment	Yuma County and part of Washington County	Not stated in plan; 2000-2001 FTE enrollment was 88.
Bloedorn Center, downtown Fort Morgan	Bloedorn Center for Community and Economic Development includes Small Business Development Center and MCC's agricultural programs such as Farm Ranch Management, Young Farmers, and Industrial Agricultural Technology Training	MCC owns the space	Entire area	Most cash funded

### Low Usage vs. Space Deficits

The master plan acknowledges that the Fort Morgan campus doesn't meet the space utilization requirements outlined in CCHE space utilization guidelines for classrooms and laboratories. Out of the four classrooms at the Fort Morgan campus, for example, only one classroom is used more than the CCHE-suggested 60 hours a week, two are used 25-30 hours a week, and the third 45 hours a week. The utilization hours include an average of 36 hours of scheduled classroom use. Adding the estimated six hours of additional, unscheduled use brings the average classroom use to 42 hours a week. When the classrooms are occupied, 58 percent of the student stations are used, compared to the CCHE guideline of 70 percent.

The school's nine laboratories are used an average of 28 hours, compared to the CCHE guideline of 40 hours. The laboratory student stations are used 56 percent of the time compared to the CCHE guideline of 80 percent student station occupancy. One laboratory for Auto Collision Repair is used more than 45 hours a week, and the other for Auto Technology is used more than 40 hours a week. The Health and Human Services lab is used about 40 hours a week. The others are used in the following manner: Occupational Therapy—18 hours; Physical Therapy—29 hours; Computer Science—10 hours; Science—17 hours; and the two General Labs—24 hours.

Morgan Community College attributes the low usage to having few classrooms or laboratories in which to schedule classes. A classroom or laboratory available at a specific time may not be suitable, resulting in low usage. At the same time, more desirably sized or equipped classrooms may be overbooked. A laboratory equipped for teaching second-year nursing students and equipped with patient beds, dummies, and other nursing equipment, for example, would not be appropriate for chemistry. Remodeling could do much to increase utilization of existing spaces and appears warranted. The need for state-funded additions, however, is less persuasive.

Despite the generally low average utilization of classrooms and laboratories, the plan projects massive space deficits for the Fort Morgan campus in academic, academic support, and auxiliary spaces. *The large deficits start with the assumption that in 1998, the base year, MCC already needed 49,257 assignable square feet (asf) of additional space, using both CCHE and CCEPI space guidelines.* Combined with projected enrollment increases and space needs for proposed new programs, this initial space deficit resulted in the projected space deficits by 2006, the target year, on the chart on the next page. The projected assignable square feet (asf) space deficits for the target year of 2006 for the Fort Morgan campus are based on the assumption that the 1998 FTE of 521 will grow to 637 by 2006, an overall 22 percent FTE enrollment increase, but an increase of about 13 percent from 2002 to 2006.

**MCC 1998 Base Year Space Projections for Student 521 FTE = 521**

	Existing ASF	Guideline ASF	Surplus/(Deficit)	% Surplus/(Deficit)
Academic Space				
Classroom	1,969	3,517	(1,548)	(97%)
Teaching Labs	18,434	25,088	(6,654)	(36%)
Open Labs	980	4,904	(3,924)	(400%)
Offices	8,936	16,069	(7,133)	(80%)
Physical Education/Recreation	630	20,000	(29,370)	(3075%)
Other Dept. Space	5,715	6,130	(415)	(7%)
<b>Total Academic</b>	<b>36,664</b>	<b>75,708</b>	<b>(39,044)</b>	<b>(106%)</b>
Academic Support Space				
Library	3,887	6,107	(2,220)	(57%)
Assembly & Exhibit	1,542	5,600	(4,058)	(263%)
Physical Plant	3,572	3,188	384	(11%)
<b>Total Academic Support</b>	<b>9,001</b>	<b>14,895</b>	<b>(5,894)</b>	<b>(65%)</b>
Auxiliary Space				
Student Union	2,051	5,517	(3,466)	(169%)
Day Care	0	2,250	(2,250)	N/A
<b>Total Auxiliary Space</b>	<b>2,051</b>	<b>7,767</b>	<b>(5,716)</b>	<b>(279%)</b>
Inactive/Conversion Space	1,397		1,397	100%
<b>Total</b>	<b>49,113</b>	<b>98,370</b>	<b>(49,257)</b>	<b>-100%</b>

**MCC 2006 Target Year Space Projections for Student 521 FTE = 637**

	Existing ASF	Guideline ASF	Surplus/(Deficit)	% Surplus/(Deficit)
Academic Space				
Classroom	1,969	3,884	(1,915)	(97%)
Teaching Labs	18,434	26,648	(8,214)	(45%)
Open Labs	980	5,688	(4,708)	(480%)
Offices	8,936	16,112	(7,176)	(80%)
Physical Education/Recreation	630	20,000	(19,370)	(3,075%)
Other Dept. Space	5,715	7,110	(1,395)	(24%)
<b>Total Academic</b>	<b>36,664</b>	<b>79,442</b>	<b>(42,778)</b>	<b>(117%)</b>
Academic Support Space				
Library	3,887	7,050	(3,163)	(81%)
Assembly & Exhibit	1,542	5,600	(4,058)	(263%)
Physical Plant	3,572	6,894	(3,322)	(93%)
	<b>9,001</b>	<b>19,544</b>	<b>(10,543)</b>	<b>(117%)</b>
<b>Total Academic Support</b>				
Auxiliary Space				
Student Union	3,500	6,399	(2,899)	(83%)
Day Care	0	2,250	(2,250)	N/A
<b>Total Auxiliary Space</b>	<b>3,500</b>	<b>8,649</b>	<b>(5,149)</b>	<b>(83%)</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>49,165</b>	<b>107,635</b>	<b>(58,470)</b>	<b>(119%)</b>

The space deficit for teaching laboratories shown here for the target year 2006 may be a space surplus because completion of the Technology Building added about 13,390 asf to the teaching laboratory inventory. The building was not finished when the consultants began working on the master plan. In addition, the college is considering discontinuing its occupational therapy program, possibly freeing that lab for other uses.

Information is not provided in the master plan on times when classes and laboratories are taught. It's possible that the usage could be increased if classes and laboratories were taught over a broader range of time, even accounting for different classroom and laboratory needs for various programs. Morgan Community College should be encouraged to increase the usage of its underused classrooms and laboratories, before it requests state funding to build additional classrooms and laboratories.

#### Financing of Capital Construction

The master plan doesn't address possible alternatives to state funding of four of the seven outlined projects. This is an important omission given the tough economic times in Colorado and the limited future availability of state capital construction dollars.

Morgan Community College should be commended for recommending private-sector development of a Day Care Center and Adult Education Building, and an 80 percent private/20 percent public financing split for the Community Center. The State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education should be asked to assist Morgan Community College—and other community colleges—in finding alternative means for financing capital construction projects.

#### Condition of Existing Buildings/Building Maintenance Plans

Morgan Community College included the facility condition indices (FCI) used by the State Buildings and Real Estate Programs of all buildings it owns in the revised master plan. The FCI ratings mean the closer to 100, the better the condition of the building. The MCC Five-Year Controlled Maintenance Program Plan addresses fire alarm, heating, ventilation, and air conditioning, infrastructure, landscaping, repairs to building entrance, roadway problems, parking, and roof repairs—assuming any state money will be available for controlled maintenance.

The following is a list of the FCI ratings for buildings Morgan Community College owns. The ratings for Bloedorn and Spruce Hall are not listed because they will receive new FCI ratings once their renovations are complete. (A few Spruce Hall renovations were done as part of the Technology Building project.) The FCI ratings are based on May 1999 surveys; the condition of the buildings may have deteriorated since then.

1. Sagebrush Hall, 1,248 gsf, FCI 78.12 (A storage building slated for demolishing in later stages of the master plan.)

2. Cottonwood Hall, 21,136 gsf, FCI 70
3. Aspen Hall, 11,591 gsf, FCI 64.07
4. Spruce Hall, 26,624 gsf, FCI to be revised
5. Bloedorn Center, 5,300 gsf, FCI to be revised

The FCI ratings indicate that Cottonwood and Aspen need controlled maintenance funding to preserve these state assets and that the remodeling projects that are part of this master plan are necessary.

#### Residential Housing Possibility

The master plan submitted to staff in January 2002 included plans for a 100-bed residence hall. A study done by Campus Housing Solutions for the college completed later, however, indicated insufficient need and raised questions about Morgan Community College's ability to support a residential campus. The revised master plan does not include the residence hall option, and Morgan Community College has decided to indefinitely postpone plans for it. Although the residential component is not in the revised master plan, the Commission should be aware that the possibility was considered. Colorado community colleges with residential halls are Lamar Community College, Colorado Northwestern Community College, Northeastern Junior College, Aurora Community College, Trinidad State Junior College, and Otero Junior College.

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

**That the Commission approve the Morgan Community College Facility Master Plan 2002 with the understanding that program plans for state-funded projects submitted to CCHE for the Fort Morgan campus based on this master plan should:**

- 1. Take into account the possible impact of information technology and the satellite centers on future enrollment at the Fort Morgan campus; and**
- 2. Show an increase in utilization of classroom and laboratory spaces since the 1998 base year before program plans for additions of Cottonwood and Spruce Halls are referred to CCHE or explain why higher utilization is not possible.**

## **Appendix A**

### **STATUTORY AUTHORITY**

23-1-106 – Duties and powers of the commission with respect to capital construction and long-range planning.

(3) The commission shall review and approve master planning and program planning for all capital construction projects of institutions of higher education on state-owned or state-controlled land, regardless of the source of funds, and no capital construction shall commence except in accordance with approved master plan, program plan, and physical plan.

(4) The commission shall ensure conformity of facilities master planning with approved educational master plans and facility program plans with approved facilities master plans.

**TOPIC: UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO HEALTH SCIENCES CENTER – FITZSIMONS RESEARCH COMPLEX 2 AND FITZSIMONS ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH AND SAFETY II**

**PREPARED BY: GAIL HOFFMAN**

**I. SUMMARY**

The University of Colorado Health Sciences Center (UCHSC) is seeking Commission approval of two program plans for its Fitzsimons campus.

Fitzsimons Research Complex II is a cash-funded project of \$205,820,165 and 400,000 gross square feet (gsf) that will be built opposite Research Complex I in the research zone to the west of the old Fitzsimons Hospital. It will have between eight and 12 stories to house wet laboratories, core laboratories, lab support, research office and conference, and animal holding spaces.

Environmental Health and Safety II is the last of the seven Fitzsimons projects authorized in HB 03-1256 to receive Commission action. That facility will be located immediately to the east of Environmental Health and Safety I and to the north of the adjacent PASCAL library storage just east of the education zone and the old Fitzsimons Hospital. The 6,000-gsf structure, estimated to cost \$1,806,291, will support programs occupying space within the new Research Complex II, the Lazzara Center for Oral-Facial Health, the Barbara Davis expansion space, teaching laboratories within Education IA, and the gross anatomy lab in Education IB. The addition to Environmental Health and Safety I will have processing and holding space for various hazardous and chemical wastes.

**II. BACKGROUND**

Research Complex II and Research Complex I will face each other in the research zone across a landscaped quadrangle. Research Complex II will be funded totally with gifts, federal grants, debt proceeds, and campus reserves. At \$205,820,165, Research Complex II will cost more to build outright than the seven projects authorized for construction in HB 03-1256. Cash-spending authority for Research Complex II is in SB 03-258, the Long Bill for fiscal year (FY) 2003-2004. It is one of two UCHSC projects footnoted with the requirement that the State Controller not release funds for FY 03-04 until both the legislative Capital Development Committee and Joint Budget Committee are notified that the CCHE has approved the program plans. The other UCHSC project with the same footnote was Infrastructure Phase 7, which the Commission approved at its June 5, 2003, meeting.

The lease-purchase agreements used to finance the seven HB 03-1256 projects, including Environmental Health and Safety II, are not to exceed a total cost of \$202,876,109, plus reasonable and necessary administrative, monitoring, and closing costs and interest. Annual aggregate rentals under all the lease-purchase agreements are not to exceed \$15.1 million. The other six projects that passage of HB 03-1256 authorized are:

1. Education Facility IB;
2. Education Facility II and Education Bridge (two projects in one program plan);
3. Library at Fitzsimons;
4. Academic Office Facilities - East and West; and
5. Facility Support.

The Commission previously approved the program plans for two through five (listed above) at its July 17, 2003, teleconference meeting. The Commission approved the program plan for Education Facility IB in 2002. Additionally, on June 5, 2003, the Commission approved a program plan amendment making Education IB smaller but keeping the cost equal to that outlined in the 2002 Supplements to the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center Facility Master Plan of 1998. Because Health Sciences Center officials discussed the possibility of reexamining the program space allocations to equalize the size of the two education buildings, the Commission deferred to CCHE staff the authority to approve any program plan amendment made later. Staff approved a program plan amendment on September 3, 2003.

The program plan for Environmental Health and Safety II was not submitted with the others in Spring 2003 because following passage of HB 03-1256, Health Sciences Center officials thought the greatest need would be for offices, and proposed switching the 6,000 gsf intended for Environmental Health and Safety II to Academic Offices. After further consideration, the Health Sciences Center decided to use the square footage for the waste processing facility. UCHSC then arranged for development of the program plan, which was submitted to CCHE staff in August 2003.

### **III. STAFF ANALYSIS**

The UCHSC Master Plan projected that by 2008, UCHSC would need 890,000 assignable square feet (asf) of research space. UCHSC currently has 559,241 asf of research space. With completion of Research Complex II ([Attachment A](#)) in December 2007, the Fitzsimons campus will fall short of the projected estimate by 70,759 asf. This is a need that the construction of Research Complex III will fill once cash funds become available. More research space is becoming necessary due to the increased grant funding UCHSC has attracted. In FY 1999-2000, UCHSC had \$199.1 million in sponsored funding. In FY 2004-2005, that figure is expected to reach \$307.1 million.

When complete, Research Complex II also will help expedite the transfer of all research teams to the Fitzsimons campus from both owned and leased spaces at the 9<sup>th</sup> and Colorado campus.

Research Complex II will be designed with generic-type for flexibility in use. This is the same approach used in design of Research Complex I. UCHSC planners found that about 90 percent of the space was adequate for the future occupants. Only about 10 percent of the space was modified for specific purposes out of contingency funds. Such an approach will be used for Research Complex II, which will have Schools of Medicine and Pharmacy researchers as the primary tenants.

Two types of expensive connections may be used to physically link Research Complex II with two buildings, Academic Office – West to the south and Research Complex 1 to the east. A pedestrian bridge linking Research Complex II with Academic West – South will benefit the researchers who will have their offices in the academic building and their research facilities in Research Complex II. A tunnel between Research Complex I and II may be used to connect the research animal holding facilities in the basement of the two buildings to better enable sharing of cage-cleaning equipment and other shared support services in the basement of Research Complex I. A pedestrian bridge also may physically connect Research Complex I and II. Combining the expenses of digging tunnels or building pedestrian bridges brings the total cost of the possible physical linkages to \$596.26 a square foot.

For Environmental Health and Safety II, the primary policy question it raises is whether state funds should be used for a function that the private sector could perform. For the cash-funded Environmental Health and Safety I, UCHSC has multiple contracts in place for the handling of the research wastes, which reduced the size and complexity of the facility. Included in the program plan for Environmental Health and Safety II is a discussion about the feasibility of contracting out the sterilization of items in the infectious (biomedical) area. The Environmental Health and Safety Department and several outside vendors concluded that sterilization is an integral part of the functions that will be housed in the building. Today, UCHSC annually disposes of 300,000 pounds of biomedical wastes - human blood, bodily fluids and tissues, and tissue culture wastes – with the assistance of an outside contractor. The expense of the disposition is estimated at \$100,000 for FY 2002-2003. Both the costs and the amounts of wastes are expected to escalate due to increasing transportation costs, labor costs, lack of competing vendors (Colorado has only one biomedical waste disposal vendor), the regulatory climate, and anticipated growth in biomedical research. Recognizing this, UCHSC is investigating other methods of disposition where possible. The options mentioned in the program plan include:

In-house departmental autoclaves (strong, pressurized, steam-heated vessels for sterilization and cooking): This would shift costs and tasks to the departments and would

require a program for maintaining and certifying the autoclaves. Successful use of the autoclaves could reduce disposal costs up to 40 percent.

Centralized sterilization or partnerships with other entities: University of Colorado Hospital, UCHSC, and a vendor could invest in autoclave/compactors. Such autoclaves would most likely be near the hospital and research buildings, and the wastes then would be removed and transported to the service part of the campus. A vendor may not get involved unless the vendor also has the contract to haul away other wastes as well. This option would require considerable planning and in-house investment but may yield more satisfactory service over the long term.

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

**That the Commission approves:**

- **Research Complex II (\$205,820,165 Cash Funds Exempt; 400,000 gross square feet)**
- **Environmental Health and Safety II (\$1,806,291 State Capital Construction Funds Exempt - state-backed Certificates of Participation; 6,000 gross square feet)**

[Attachment A](#): Cash-Funded Program Plan Evaluation FY 2003-04

[Attachment B](#): Program Plan Evaluation FY 2003-04

**Appendix A**

**STATUTORY AUTHORITY**

(23-1-106(3) C.R.S.)

The commission shall review and approve master planning and program planning for all capital construction projects of institutions of higher education on state-owned or state-controlled land, regardless of the source of funds, and no capital construction shall commence except in accordance with an approved master plan, program plan, and physical plan.

**CASH-FUNDED PROGRAM PLAN EVALUATION FY 2003-04**  
**Colorado Commission on Higher Education**

<b>Project:</b> Research Complex II at Fitzsimons	<b>Institution:</b> University of Colorado Health Sciences Center – Fitzsimons
<b>Original Submittal Date:</b> April 25, 2003	<b>Revision Date:</b>
<b>Total Project Cost:</b> \$205,820,165	<b>Total Square Footage</b>
<b>Anticipated Completion Date:</b> December 2007	<b>New Construction:</b> 400,000 gross square feet (gsf)
<b>Construction Cost:</b> \$153,602,459	<b>Remodel:</b>
<b>Purpose Code:</b> F-5	<b>Cost per Square Foot:</b>
	<b>New Construction:</b> \$384
	<b>Remodel:</b>
	<i>Comments: Square-footage costs very high compared to non-research buildings at Fitzsimons, but in line with additional costs that research buildings require for equipping labs and providing the necessary ventilation.</i>

**Phased Funding:\***

	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	Total
CCFE					
CF					
CFE	\$9,615,564	\$46,968,853	\$81,426,586	\$67,809,162	\$205,820,165
FF					
Total					

\*Cash-funding authority for a totally cash-funded project is typically given in one lump sum in a Long Bill. The chart above shows how the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center expects to spend the total \$205,820,165 between 2003-04 and 2006-2007.

**EVALUATION****Project Description:**

Construction of Research Complex II, combined with completion of Research Complex I in June 2004, will bring 1 million square feet of research space to the Fitzsimons campus, or just 400,000 gross square feet (gsf) short of the footage necessary to transfer all research facilities from the 9<sup>th</sup> and Colorado campus facilities, both owned and leased. Research Complex III will

provide the additional 400,000 gsf once cash funds are available for it. Research Complex II will

have wet laboratories, core laboratories, lab support space, research office and conference, and vivarium (animal holding facilities) space in its eight to 12 stories. The building will be designed with spaces as generic as possible for flexibility in use and for swapping of space and activities from one area of the building to another, with research programs of the School of Medicine as the primary tenants. Research Complex II will be constructed in the research zone of the campus on the west side of the landmark Building 500, the old Fitzsimons Army Hospital. It will be built to the west of Research Complex I, now under construction and expected for completion in June 2004. Research Complex II will be connected via one pedestrian passage way to Academic Office Facility – West, which will be built immediately to the south on the south side of 17<sup>th</sup> Place.

**Project Justification:**

If faculty members are expanding knowledge in health care through research, the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center (UCHSC) students will only benefit. Fostering basic and clinical research to create new knowledge and provide training opportunities for the next generation of Colorado health care providers, teachers, and scientists becomes more possible with construction of a second major facility to support the UCHSC research effort at Fitzsimons. Without the completed research space, the School of Medicine research program will be split between the 9<sup>th</sup> and Colorado and Fitzsimons campuses, harming the research mission of the School of Medicine. The building will help accommodate burgeoning growth in grant-funded research at the UCHSC. During the past 11 years, for example, the value of grant-funded research projects has more than tripled, from \$89.1 million in fiscal year (FY) 1991 to \$294.6 million in FY 2002

UCHSC ranks in the top 20 among academic research institutions in the country in terms of outside funding. Below is a chart showing the growth in total UCHSC sponsored program (grant) funding through FY 04-05 as depicted on the budget forms for this project:

	Actual FY 99-00	Actual FY 00-01	Actual FY 01-02	Projected FY 02-03	Projected FY 03-04	Projected FY 04-05
UCHSC Sponsored Program Funding	\$199.1 M	\$215.2M	\$253.3M	\$257.3M	\$280.3M	\$307.1M

**CCHE Recommendations:**

The program plan for Research Complex II (\$205,820,165 Cash Funds Exempt – Gifts, Federal Grants, Debt Proceeds, and Campus Reserves; 400,000 gross square feet) should be approved to expedite the transfer of research programs from the 9<sup>th</sup> and Colorado campus to the Fitzsimons campus and to position UCHSC for expected growth in research grants.

## **CCHE Comments:**

*Background:* Cash-spending authority for Research Complex II is in the Long Bill for FY 03-04 (SB 03-258). It was one of two UCHSC projects footnoted with the requirement that the State Controller shall not release funds for FY 03-04 until both the legislative Capital Development Committee and Joint Budget Committee are notified that CCHE has approved the program plans. The other UCHSC project so footnoted was Infrastructure Phase 7, which the Commission approved at its June 5, 2003, meeting. The University of Colorado System persuaded the General Assembly to include the two projects, even though the program plans hadn't yet been submitted to CCHE, to avoid having to delay the projects another fiscal year.

*Vivarium Space:* To the east of the future site of Research Complex I—in fact in the block closest to the interstate where the Central Utility Plant is located—is Building 610, a 6,900-gsf holding facility for research animals that dates from the days when Fitzsimons was an Army hospital campus. UCHSC is reluctant to demolish such specialized space, and shows it on its maps as Building 22. Both Research Complex I and II will have space for a centralized vivarium, or research animal facility, in the basement. Building 610 may be used as an interim vivarium for some researchers until the first two research buildings are finished. But its continued use as a campus satellite vivarium is questionable due to its relative size and distance from the research zone. Research Complex II will have 23,800 assignable square feet (asf) and 37,000 gsf for a centralized vivarium. About 9 percent of the asf in Research Complex II will be devoted to the vivarium. About 40 percent of all research funding at UCHSC requires the use of animals.

*Campus Comparisons of Research Space:* UCHSC in 2003 has 559,241 asf of research space, compared to the master plan projection of a need for 890,000 asf by 2008. When Research Complex II is completed, adding 260,000 asf to the research space inventory, the Fitzsimons campus will still need 70,759 asf of research space, a need that construction of Research Complex III will address.

*Building Connections:* The program plan discusses two types of connections between Research Complex 2 with other buildings in the research zone of the Fitzsimons campus. In one, a pedestrian bridge crossing 17<sup>th</sup> Place will connect Research Complex I with Academic Office Facility – West to the south. Many University researchers are expected to have their offices in Academic Office Facility – West. A tunnel will link the vivarium facilities in the basements of both Research Complex I and II. The reason for the tunnel is so that both vivarium facilities can share cage-cleaning equipment and other shared support facilities in the basement of Research Complex I. Transfer of animals (more than 50 percent mice) between Research Complex I and Research Complex II will be easier and less stressful to the animals if they can be indoors during transfers. Both types of connections are extremely expensive to build. A pedestrian bridge also may link Research Complex I and II. The program plan estimates the combined square-footage costs for building the tunnel and bridge at \$596.26. The cost for both the tunnel and pedestrian bridge will be paid from University cash funds, a reasonable source of funds for the two types of expensive connections.

*Transition from 9<sup>th</sup> and Colorado Campus:* UCHSC plans to retain use of the Biomedical Research Building and School of Pharmacy Building at 9<sup>th</sup> and Colorado until the Research

Complex III facility is built at Fitzsimons. This is because the first two research buildings will not provide all of the needed research space for the Fitzsimons campus.

### **Program and Facility Requirements:**

Research Complex II will have the animal facility in the basement and receiving docks on the first floor. Laboratory floors will have large, generic, open laboratories that will be supported by zones of specialized lab support and departmental offices. The offices of principal investigators will be enclosed and may be grouped with dry lab space. Core labs are planned to support research as shared facilities. Core labs to support researchers are:

- 1 A Biosafety Level (BSL)-3 suite for ongoing work on tuberculosis and other diseases requiring extreme care;
- 2 A Research Imaging Center for use of radiation in the diagnosis, detection, molecular imaging, staging, and treatment of various diseases such as cancer;
- 3 A flow cytometry lab for sorting of cells;
- 4 Quantitative specialized equipment, with accompanying freezers and refrigerators; and
- 5 DNA array/sequencing suite with array and sequencing in separate zones and related wet labs, freezers and refrigerators.

The BSL-3 suite will be located on the top floor to better meet the stringent ventilation requirements and the Research Imaging Facility will be on the first floor. The other core labs will be distributed on the other lab floors.

Rodents primarily will be housed in ventilated cages. A limited number of places for aquatic creatures also will be provided. Walkways constructed of steel will be used for maintenance access separated from the animal area.

Two separate drainage systems will be used, one for non-laboratory fixtures (toilet rooms, locker rooms and floor drains from janitor's closets, mechanical rooms, and other similar spaces) and one for all animal and procedure rooms in the animal area. The non-laboratory fixtures will be connected directly into the site sanitary sewer main, while the animal waste drainage system will connect with the site sewer after passing through a manhole. The manhole will be used to monitor the stream flows and for the possible introduction of a waste neutralization system if future codes and regulations require them.

Attention will be paid toward designing the facility so that it qualifies for Xcel Energy's "Energy Design Assistance" program in incorporating methods and designs that conserve natural resources and energy.

As for many of the planned facilities, an east/west pedestrian way will be developed in place of Charlie Kelly Boulevard, now renamed 17<sup>th</sup> Place. Only emergency vehicles and other similar vehicles will be permitted on 17<sup>th</sup> Place, with service vehicular traffic via 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Structured parking is planned for a future development, and surface parking will be provided for Research Complex II on adjacent land within the campus. However, no significant parking is included within the scope of the project.

### **Building Functional Uses:**

The building will have the following uses: wet and dry laboratories, core laboratories, laboratory support space, research office, conference, and vivarium.

### **Building Efficiency Factor/Space Utilization:**

The building will have a building efficiency factor of about 65 percent (260,000 asf/400,000 gsf). CCHE has no recommended building efficiency for research buildings. As a research building, the facility is likely to be used almost 24 hours a day, seven days a week for animal care and research.

### **Appropriateness of Funding:**

Budget documents for the project indicate Research Complex II will have the following cash fund exempt funding sources:

\$36,115,564: gifts and federal funds  
\$138,009,000: debt proceeds (University issued Research Building Revolving Fund bonds over a 25-year period at an estimated interest rate of 6 percent)  
\$31,695,601: unexpended plant fund – campus reserves  
\$205,820,165

Cash funds exempt are an appropriate source for construction of a building where research supported by grants from outside entities occurs. Also according to the budget documents, operational costs will come from cash funds exempt sources paid for from research funds. Operational costs in the first year of operation are expected to be \$1,552,000, rising to \$3,197,120 in the second year, \$3,293,033 in the third year, \$3,391,824 in the fourth year, and \$3,493,578 in the fifth year.

### **Facility Alternatives:**

Facility alternatives discussed briefly in the program plan, and the arguments against them, include:

1. Continue reuse of the existing Ninth Avenue facilities for research programs: This would result in a divided research program for the School of Medicine to the detriment of the School of Medicine. This would be counter to the planning goal to have all School of Medicine moved to the Fitzsimons campus upon the completion of Research Complex II and the academic office facilities and all campus research programs moved to Fitzsimons when Research Complex III is completed.
2. Lease of space: Leasing space from the Fitzsimons Redevelopment Authority for research programs intended for Research Complex II would result in redundant laboratory support, core laboratory and vivarium requirements between the leased facilities and Research

Complex I. This also would be counter to the campus master plan objective to create a health science center at Fitzsimons where scientific discoveries are translated into leading edge education and patient care, where collaboration flourishes across disciplines, and where all the resources required for humanistic research, education, and care are integrated. Research Complex II is an important element of this plan.

**Consistency with Institutional Master Plan:**

The UCHSC master plan of 1998 projected the need for about 5 million square feet of new program space and associated infrastructure for the UCHSC and University of Colorado Hospital. Research Complex II is consistent with the research mission of the UCHSC. In the 2002 Supplements to the 1998 master plan, this project was included in the financial plan update. The Commission approved the 2002 Supplements in February 2003.

**Consistency with Institutional 5-Year Capital Improvement Plan Schedule:**

Research Complex II is included in the latest campus five-year capital plan.

**Governing Board Approval:**

The Board of Regents approved the program plan for this project on April 24, 2003.

**PROGRAM PLAN EVALUATION FY 2003-04**  
**Colorado Commission on Higher Education**

<b>Project:</b> Environmental Health and Safety II (Waste Processing Facility)	<b>Institution:</b> University of Colorado Health Sciences Center
<b>Original Submittal Date:</b> August 2003	<b>Revision Date:</b>
<b>Total Project Cost:</b> \$1,806,291	<b>Total Square Footage</b>
<b>Anticipated Project Completion Date:</b> June 2005	<b>New Construction:</b> 6,000 gross square feet (gsf)
<b>Construction Cost:</b> \$1,350,060	<b>Remodel:</b>
<b>Purpose Code:</b> F-5	<b>Cost per Square Foot</b>
	<b>New Construction:</b> \$225
	<b>Remodel:</b>

**No Phased Funding:**

	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007- 08	Total
CCFE (state COP)	\$1,806,291					\$1,806,291
CF						
CFE						
FF						
Total	\$1,806,291					\$1,806,291

**EVALUATION****Project Description:**

Phase II of the Environmental Health and Safety project will be a one-story, 6,000 gross square foot addition to the east side of Environmental Health and Safety I (now under construction). It will be located near the Preservation and Access Service Center for Colorado Academic Libraries (PASCAL) library storage building on the Fitzsimons campus of the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center (UCHSC). Because the building will be used to both handle and store radioactive, chemical, and biomedical wastes generated from the research and instruction functions at UCHSC, it will have to be built to comply with applicable rules and regulations of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act as the Colorado Department of

Public Health and Environment and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Personnel working in the building will separate radioactive and chemical materials by hazard class and place them inside Department of Transportation-approved drums and containers. The waste processing section of the building will have to be designed to prevent any releases. Steam and cooling from the central power plant on the UCHSC campus will be extended from the Phase I building.

### **Project Justification:**

Environmental Health and Safety II is necessary to support the Schools of Medicine and Pharmacy programs that will be located in the 400,000-gsf Research Complex II and the 58,000-gsf expansion space of the Barbara Davis Center for Childhood Diabetes. The addition also is needed to support the hazardous waste requirements for the new Lazzara Center for Oral-Facial Health Facility (87,500 gsf), the Gross Anatomy Laboratory in the Education IB facility, and the multipurpose teaching laboratories in the Education IA facility (22,000 gsf) inside Research Complex I. Implementation of the program plan will help the UCHSC Health and Safety Division fulfill its role at the Fitzsimons campus according to state and national rules and regulations regarding the storage and treatment of hazardous wastes.

### **CCHE Recommendations:**

The program plan for Environmental Health and Safety II should be approved to ensure that UCHSC Fitzsimons has sufficient capacity to handle the wastes generated on the Fitzsimons campus. Environmental Health and Safety II is authorized in HB 03-1256, which permitted UCHSC to use lease-purchase agreements to build seven academic facilities at the UCHSC Fitzsimons campus. The state will pay off the Certificates of Participation through lease payments for up to 25 years. Environmental Health and Safety II is the final HB 03-1256 project to go before the Commission for action.

### **CCHE Comments:**

*Background:* Although this project is in HB 03-1256 as one of the seven academic buildings at the UCHSC Fitzsimons campus that the governor and the General Assembly authorized financing for through lease-purchase agreements, UCHSC officials tentatively decided not to build it, believing the campus had a greater need for 6,000 gsf of office space for the Health Safety Division employees instead. Deciding against amending HB 03-1256 to remove Environmental Health and Safety II from the list of Fitzsimons projects, UCHSC officials submitted a program plan at a later date. Work on program plans for the other six academic buildings began in January 2003, while the program plan for this project wasn't developed until late summer of 2003.

*Academic Justification:* UCHSC paid for construction of Environmental Health and Safety I with cash funds, stating that that facility was needed more to support research than academic functions. When the University of Colorado was lobbying for passage of HB 03-1256, officials stated the Environmental Health and Safety II was needed for academic research. The distinction between what constitutes academic research and what is pure research is not that clear, in the

program plan or in reality. The reality is that faculty members engaged in research are often able to bring to the classroom cutting-edge ideas. Even faculty members who don't teach but devote their time strictly to research add to the academic environment in offering undergraduate and graduate students opportunities for hands-on studies. Whether the research carried out in various locations around the UCHSC campus is academic or pure research, it makes sense to have the facilities for handling the hazardous wastes generated in one single location.

*Costly Disposition of Biomedical Wastes:* Today, UCHSC annually disposes of 300,000 pounds of biomedical wastes – human blood, bodily fluids and tissues, and tissue culture wastes – with the assistance of an outside contractor. Expense of biomedical waste disposition was estimated at \$100,000 for FY 2002-2003. Both the costs and the amounts of wastes are expected to escalate due to increasing transportation costs, labor costs, lack of competing vendors (Colorado has only one biomedical waste disposal vendor), the regulatory climate, and anticipated growth in biomedical research. Recognizing this, UCHSC is investigating other methods of disposition of biomedical, infectious wastes where possible. The options mentioned in the program plan include:

In-house departmental autoclaves (strong, pressurized, steam-heated vessels for sterilization and cooking): This would shift costs and tasks to the departments and would require a program for maintaining and certifying the autoclaves. Successful use of the autoclaves could reduce disposal costs by up to 40 percent.

Centralized sterilization or partnerships with other entities: University of Colorado Hospital, UCHSC, and a vendor could invest in autoclave/compactors. Such autoclaves would most likely be near the hospital and research buildings, and the wastes then would have to be removed and transported to the service part of the campus. A vendor may not get involved unless the vendor also has the contract to haul away all wastes. This option would require considerable planning and in-house investment but may yield more satisfactory service over the long term.

*Ninth and Colorado Campus:* The Ninth and Colorado campus of UCHSC has about 6,500 assignable square feet (asf) of space devoted to waste treatment, storage, and handling of hazardous wastes for 664,000 asf of research space: wet laboratories, animal research, and related laboratory support and research office space. The Health and Safety Division has its main offices in the Cooling Tower and in two prefabricated buildings at the campus. Other HSD facilities are at widely scattered locations. They include receiving and processing of radioisotopes in the Cooling Tower, chemical waste receiving and temporary storage in the School of Medicine basement and in the old laundry facility, and biomedical waste storage in a trailer located near the School of Medicine. These facilities at Ninth and Colorado are expected to remain active and accommodate the HSD program at Ninth and Colorado campus until they are decommissioned and reassigned to another program. Only when Research Complex III is constructed at Fitzsimons will all the UCHSC research functions – including waste disposal – transfer to Fitzsimons.

## **Program and Facility Requirements:**

The Health and Safety Division (HSD) at UCHSC, which will operate both Environmental Health and Safety I and II when they are complete, is under the Vice Chancellor for Research and is divided into three units: Radiation Safety, Occupational Safety and Health/Hazardous Waste Management, and Biological Safety. All units must implement procedures to comply with state and federal laws and regulations and must interact with each other because their functions often overlap. During the next six years, through 2008, Health and Safety Division's program will expand to support the new academic and research facilities in order to handle about 1.2 million gsf of new research facilities at Fitzsimons. That square footage will be contained within Research Complex 1, Perinatal Research Center, Barbara Davis Center for Childhood Diabetes, Education IA and IB, Research Complex 2, and Lazarra Center for Oral-Facial Health. Currently, HSD operates satellite collection points for infectious (biomedical) wastes at the Perinatal Research Center and Building 500. Radioactive, chemical, and infectious waste collection points are planned for Research Complex I and II and the Barbara Davis Center. The academic and research laboratories in each new research facility will generate varying amounts of radioactive, chemical, and biomedical waste material. Those wastes must be methodically separated and moved to a central dock area in each research building. Each type of waste material will be transported periodically to the Environmental Health and Safety facility (both I and II) or to an off-site disposal facility.

HSD staff will receive, log, and track all radioactive materials brought to campus for research before delivering the material directly to the laboratories. Radioactive wastes will be taken by motorized cart from each research building to Environmental Health and Safety for processing and packaging for either decay on site or off campus.

Individual investigators will order hazardous chemical research material that the supplier will deliver directly to the research building dock area or laboratory. Chemical wastes from each research facility will be separated by type and transferred to the staging or dock area of each research building. HSD staff will periodically transport hazardous chemical wastes from each building staging area to the waste processing facility via motorized cart. At the waste processing facility, the chemical waste material will be processed and packaged for off-site disposal.

Non-radioactive biomedical, or infectious, wastes, will be processed and transferred from each research laboratory to the waste processing facility for final processing in an autoclave (a steam cooker) and pickup from an outside disposal contractor. Radioactive biomedical wastes will be transferred to the waste processing facility via motorized cart for processing and disposal.

All the work involved in the storage and treatment of hazardous wastes at the Fitzsimons campus must follow current legislation related to hazardous waste processing, treatment, and storage. Those pieces of legislation and pertinent policies include:

- Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976;
- United States Environmental Protection Agency;
- The Superfund Amendment and Reauthorization Act (for response plans for hazardous materials accidents);

- National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (for drain disposal);
- Toxic Substances Control Act (for disposal of the industrial compound, PCB);
- Colorado statutes, laws, and regulations regarding asbestos and solid waste;
- Nuclear Regulatory Commission (for rules on radioactive materials);
- Rocky Mountain Region Low-Level Radioactive Waste Board;
- Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment regulations and guidance; and
- National Emissions Standard for Hazardous Air Pollutants (for asbestos regulations).

The Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment regulates use and disposal of radioactive wastes under an agreement with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The department, in turn, gave UCHSC a radioactive materials license that gives UCHSC a great deal of discretion in the disposal of radioactive wastes. All UCHSC wastes shipped out of state for disposal at facilities elsewhere must meet regulations stipulated by the Rocky Mountain Region Low-Level Radioactive Waste Board, the Department of Transportation, and regulations of the state receiving the wastes. Acceptance of grant monies also requires adherence with these regulations.

Environmental Health and Safety II will be about 5 percent smaller than originally projected due to the relocation of office space into Building 500. The 6,000-gsf foot will have about 4,800 assignable square feet. Below are the space requirements for the facility:

### **Space Requirements for Environmental Health and Safety II**

<i>Function</i>	<i>Net Assignable Square Feet</i>	<i>Total Gross Square Feet</i>
Radiation Safety Waste Storage/Holding	2,910	3,547
Hazardous Chemical Waste	1,175	1,382
Universal Waste	215	253
Infectious		
Autoclave	370	435
Roll Off	40	52
Loading Platform	90	120
Other Space		
Small Storage Area	40	42
Circulation/Shipping/Receiving	100	105
Mechanical/Electrical	60	63
<i>Total</i>	<i>5,000</i>	<i>6,000</i>

UCHSC intends to use modular planning for this building. That means that standardized units or dimensions are used for flexibility and a variety of uses. Modular planning helps organize spaces within a building using a grid for the location of walls and partitions. As modifications are needed because of changes in use, instrumentation, storage requirements, or departmental organization, partitions can be relocated, doors moved, and spaces expanded or contracted without requiring reconstruction of structural or mechanical building elements.

Of the total project cost of \$1.8 million, \$133,740 (or just under 10 percent of the total construction cost) will be used for the purchase of fixed or moveable equipment and furnishings. The fixed equipment includes a large autoclave and shredder/grinder for infectious and radioactive wastes. Smaller items include emergency showers and eye wash stations. Moveable equipment includes those used for waste processing and handling.

**Building Functional Uses:**

Environmental Health and Safety II will not contain offices, because the offices for personnel will be in Building 500. But it will have loading docks; storage; waste treatment for infectious wastes; and circulation, shipping, and receiving areas.

**Building Efficiency Factor/Space Utilization:**

The building efficiency factor will be 83 percent. CCHE has no guidelines specifically for waste treatment and storage centers. The building will be used 24 hours a day, seven days a week for either permanent or temporary storage of wastes.

**Appropriateness of Funding:**

This project is one of seven authorized to be constructed using lease-purchase agreements with the holders of state-backed Certificates of Participation under HB 03-1256. Under that authorized financing mechanism, the project will be built with capital construction funds exempt funds, which will be used to make the lease payments for up to 25 years.

**Facility Alternatives:**

The program plan doesn't explore any alternative to building an addition to Environmental Health and Safety I, stating there's no other way to support new research and education facilities at the UCHSC Fitzsimons campus but constructing more space to handle it. The program plan mentions the possibility of contracting out the sterilization of biomedical wastes, but concludes that it would be better for UCHSC to do the sterilization in-house because it is such an important part of the functions housed in Environmental Health and Safety II. See comments section above for a discussion of the disposition of wastes.

**Consistency with Institutional Master Plan:**

This program plan is consistent with the 2002 Supplements to the UCHSC Facility Master Plan of 1998 that the Commission approved in February 2003. The need for such a facility is in the supplements, and the construction of new research and academic buildings by implication creates the need for the additional space.

**Consistency with Institutional 5-Year Capital Improvement Plan Schedule:**

This project and the others that HB 03-1256 authorized are not in the 5-Year Capital Improvement Schedule because they were approved at the legislative level under a different process than that used for most capital construction projects.

**TOPIC: 2004 COMMISSION MEETING SCHEDULE**

**PREPARED BY: TIM FOSTER**

**I. SUMMARY**

The Commission will meet eight times during the year 2004 for regular meetings. Teleconference or special meetings may be scheduled based upon need. Following is the 2004 meeting schedule for the Colorado Commission on Higher Education. During the months of January through April 2004, the Commission will meet on Friday afternoons, and during the months of May through December 2004, the Commission will meet on Thursday mornings. There are no regular Commission meetings scheduled in the months of July, September, or December.

**COLORADO COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION  
2004 MEETING SCHEDULE**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Location</b>
January 9, 2004	Colorado History Museum, Denver
February 6, 2004	Ben Nighthorse Campbell Center, Fitzsimons
March 5, 2004	St. Catejan's Center at Auraria Higher Education Center, Denver
April 2, 2004	Colorado History Museum, Denver
May 6, 2004	Community College of Aurora, Aurora
June 3, 2004	Colorado State University, Fort Collins
August 5-6, 2004	To be determined
October 7, 2004	Mesa State College, Grand Junction
November 4, 2004	Community College of Denver, Denver

**II. STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

**That the Commission approve the 2004 meeting schedule.**

**Appendix A**

**STATUTORY AUTHORITY**

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

**TOPIC: PERFORMANCE FUNDING SYSTEM FOR FY 2004-2005**

**PREPARED BY: JAMES JACOBS**

**I. SUMMARY**

A performance funding system was initially developed and implemented for the FY 2000-01 budget process. Drawing upon the experiences associated with the performance funding systems over the past four years together with suggestions from the governing board representatives, institutions, various groups and individuals that have assisted CCHE staff throughout this time, the performance funding system for the FY 2004-05 budget process was developed. A goal of achieving performance levels within the upper quartile of the performance levels of comparable institutions has been established as part of a multi-year plan for achieving the goal. Also, the number of points that can be earned for performance exceeding the benchmark and/or for improvement from last year's level of performance has been increased. The Academic Council, governing board CFOs, and the Quality Indicator Advisory Committee – comprised of both governing board academic officers and institutional research/data staff, a faculty representative of the Colorado Faculty Advisory Council, and a student representative of the Colorado Student Association – all contributed to the development of the performance funding system. The system has the support of these groups. The performance funding system complies with the statutory directives regarding the allocation of general fund (see Statutory Authority, Appendix A).

**II. BACKGROUND**

The Colorado General Assembly seeks to have each institution of higher education working toward achieving "...a high quality, efficient, and expeditious undergraduate education..."(23-13-104, CRS). The State Auditor, in a June 1996 performance audit of CCHE, recommended that the Commission should improve oversight by "...creating monitoring and assessment mechanisms so that demonstrated progress toward the achievement of statewide goals can be linked to the governing boards' future funding levels."

The audit further recommended that the Commission "...in concert with the new legislative directives, should revise the current accountability program by instituting the use of performance indicators that measure the achievement of statewide goals and provide useful performance information to Colorado citizens."

In 1996, the first statute regarding quality indicators/performance measures was adopted. While CCHE analyses of quality indicators/performance measures had been conducted since 1996, ultimate adoption of a funding system using quality indicators/performance measures occurred in 1999 and implemented as part of the FY 2000-01 budget process. Two years of performance funding followed. During the past two years, CCHE staff has worked with

governing board, institutional, faculty, and student representatives to refine and improve the performance funding system based on the experiences of the first three years and the expectation that continuous improvement in performance will occur with the ultimate goal of achieving performance levels within the upper quartile of the performance levels of appropriate comparison groups of institutions.

### **III. STAFF ANALYSIS**

Seven quality indicators/performance measures will be used in the performance funding system for FY 2004-05. Some of them have components making the indicator/measure multi-faceted and more comprehensive in scope (Attachment A):

1. Graduation rates, both from the institution of initial enrollment and within the overall Colorado system of higher education.
2. Freshmen retention and persistence.
3. Support and success of minority students as measured by graduation, retention, and persistence rates.
4. Scores/passing rates on tests and examinations (four-year institutions) and percent of technical graduates employed (two-year institutions).
5. Institutional support (administrative) expenditures per SFTE and as a percent of the general operating budget.
6. Undergraduate class size.
7. Faculty instructional workload.

Two additional quality indicators, identified by each institution, may be provided by each governing board for its institutions. These indicators are not used in the performance funding system.

Performance benchmarks exist for each indicator/component. Continuing the approach incorporated in previous years, the benchmarks are specific to each institution (some institutions may have the same benchmark) and, for the majority of the indicators/components, are based upon performance levels of a national comparison group of institutions having similar role and mission. For those indicators/components where no performance level for a national comparison group of institutions can be identified or for which reliable recent data are unavailable, the institution's own historic performance for the last two years is used ([Attachment A](#)). The benchmarks incorporated in this year's

performance funding system represent a second step in a multi-year plan to achieve performance levels within the upper quartile of comparable institutions.

Institutions can earn base points for performance up to the benchmark and bonus points for performance exceeding the benchmark. Suggestions following the experience in 2002 were to increase the proportionate amount of a total score which could be earned from bonus points. This was viewed as an additional incentive for institutions to strive for performance exceeding the benchmark. Similar suggestions were made regarding improvement points since one of the primary purposes of the quality indicator system is continuous improvement in performance. The scoring of institutional performance related to each indicator/component in terms of base, bonus, and improvement points is outlined in *Quality Indicators/Performance Measures, Benchmarks, Base, Bonus, and Improvements Points, and the Scoring Process of the Performance Funding System for FY 2004-05* ([Attachment B](#)).

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

**That the Commission adopt the performance funding system for FY 2004-05.**

**Appendix A**

**STATUTORY AUTHORITY**

**23-1-105** Duties and powers of the commission with respect to appropriations.

(2) The commission shall make annual systemwide funding recommendations, after consultation with the governing boards of institutions, for the state-supported institutions of higher education to the general assembly and the governor. In making its recommendations, the commission shall consider each governing board's and each institution's level of achievement of the statewide expectations and goals specified in section 23-13-104, as measured by data collected through the quality indicator system established in section 23-13-105.

(3.7)(a) For fiscal year 1999-2000 and for fiscal years thereafter, the commission, in collaboration with the governor, the speaker of the house of representatives, the president of the senate, the majority and minority leaders of the house of representatives and the senate, the chairpersons of the education committees of the house of representatives and the senate, and the joint budget committee may recommend that the general assembly appropriate moneys to provide incentives and rewards to those state-supported institutions of higher education that have achieved or are making satisfactory progress toward achieving the statewide expectations and goals specified in section 23-13-104. The group shall base its recommendation on data collected through the quality indicator system and annually reported pursuant to section 23-13-105. Any moneys appropriated pursuant to this subsection (3.7) shall be in addition to any moneys that may be appropriated as base funding.

(c) Beginning with the recommendations made by the commission for fiscal year 2000-01, and for each year thereafter, the commission shall make a recommendation to the joint budget committee concerning whether an amount equal to or less than the amount appropriated to a governing board under this subsection (3.7) for the previous fiscal year should be included to increase the amount appropriated to the governing board as base funding for the coming fiscal year.

**23-13-107** Funding incentives to achieve the statewide expectations and goals.

(1) Beginning in the fiscal year 1999-2000, the commission shall annually review each governing board's and each institution's performance based on data received through the quality indicator system and determine whether the governing board or institution has achieved or is making satisfactory progress toward achieving the statewide expectations and goals. For each fiscal year, the commission may make the following recommendations:

- (a) If the commission determines that a governing board or institution is not making satisfactory progress toward achieving one or more of the statewide expectations and goals, it may recommend to the joint budget committee that the governing board be required to set aside up to one percent of its general fund appropriation for specific application to improving its performance on the statewide expectations and goals. If the joint budget committee adopts the commission's recommendation, the amount to be set aside shall be specified in a footnote to the general appropriations bill.
  
- (b) If the commission determines that a governing board or institution has achieved or is making satisfactory progress toward achieving the statewide expectations and goals, it may recommend to the joint budget committee that the governing board or institution receive additional funding as a reward for achievement.

## PERFORMANCE FUNDING SYSTEM FOR FY 2003-04

3-Oct-02

INDICATOR/MEASURE/COMPONENT	USED IN PERF. FUNDING?		BENCHMARK	POINTS		
	YES	NO		MAX. BASE	MAX. BONUS	MAX. IMPROVE
<b>1. GRADUATION RATES</b>						
a. 4-year graduation within the same institution rate: CSU, MSCD, UCB, UCCS, UCD, UNC	X		102% of predicted rate for institution +/-2%	70	21	21
b. 4-year graduation within Colorado system rate: CSU, MSCD, UCB, UCCS, UCD, UNC	X		Most recent two years. If increasing, 102% of highest rate. If decreasing, 102% of average rate.	30	9	9
c. 5-year graduation within the same institution rate: CSU, MSCD, UCB, UCCS, UCD, UNC	X		102% of predicted rate for institution +/-2%	70	21	21
d. 5-year graduation within Colorado system rate: CSU, MSCD, UCB, UCCS, UCD, UNC	X		Most recent two years. If increasing, 102% of highest rate. If decreasing, 102% of average rate.	30	9	9
e. 6-year graduation within the same institution rate: CSU, MSCD, UCB, UCCS, UCD, UNC	X		102% of predicted rate for institution +/-2%	70	21	21
f. 6-year graduation within Colorado system rate: CSU, MSCD, UCB, UCCS, UCD, UNC	X		Most recent two years. If increasing, 102% of highest rate. If decreasing, 102% of average rate.	30	9	9
g. 4-year graduation within the same institution rate: ASC, FLC, MSC, USC, WSC	X		102% of predicted rate for institution +/-2%	70	21	21
h. 4-year graduation within Colorado system rate: ASC, FLC, MSC, USC, WSC	X		Most recent two years. If increasing, 102% of highest rate. If decreasing, 102% of average rate.	30	9	9
i. 5-year graduation within the same institution rate: ASC, FLC, MSC, USC, WSC	X		102% of average rate for national comparison group +/-2%	70	21	21
j. 5-year graduation within Colorado system rate: ASC, FLC, MSC, USC, WSC	X		Most recent two years. If increasing, 102% of highest rate. If decreasing, 102% of average rate.	30	9	9
k. 6-year graduation within the same institution rate: ASC, FLC, MSC, USC, WSC	X		102% of average rate for national comparison group +/-2%	70	21	21
l. 6-year graduation within Colorado system rate: ASC, FLC, MSC, USC, WSC	X		Most recent two years. If increasing, 102% of highest rate. If decreasing, 102% of average rate.	30	9	9
m. 3-year graduation within the same institution rate: two-year institutions	X		Most recent two years. If increasing, 102% of highest rate. If decreasing, 102% of average rate.	210	63	63
n. graduation within 3-years within Colorado system rate: two-year institutions	X		Most recent two years. If increasing, 102% of highest rate. If decreasing, 102% of average rate.	90	27	27
<b>2. FRESHMEN RETENTION AND PERSISTENCE RATES</b>						
a. retention in the same institution rate: CSU, MSCD, UCB, UCCS, UCD, UNC	X		102% of predicted rate for institution +/-2%	210	63	63
b. persistence within Colorado system rate: CSU, MSCD, UCB, UCCS, UCD, UNC	X		Most recent two years. If increasing, 102% of highest rate. If decreasing, 102% of average rate.	90	27	27
c. retention in the same institution rate: ASC, FLC, MSC, USC, WSC	X		102% of predicted rate for institution +/-2%	210	63	63
d. persistence within Colorado system rate: ASC, FLC, MSC, USC, WSC	X		Most recent two years. If increasing, 102% of highest rate. If decreasing, 102% of average rate.	90	27	27
e. retention in the same institution rate: two-year institutions	X		Most recent two years. If increasing, 102% of highest rate. If decreasing, 102% of average rate.	210	63	63
f. persistence within Colorado system rate: two-year institutions	X		Most recent two years. If increasing, 102% of highest rate. If decreasing, 102% of average rate.	90	27	27
<b>3. SUPPORT AND SUCCESS OF MINORITY STUDENTS</b>						
a. freshmen retention within the same institution rate: CSU, MSCD, UCB, UCCS, UCD, UNC	X		102% of predicted rate for institution +/-2%	105	31	31
b. freshmen persistence within Colorado system rate: CSU, MSCD, UCB, UCCS, UCD, UNC	X		Most recent two years. If increasing, 102% of highest rate. If decreasing, 102% of average rate.	45	14	14
c. 6-year graduation within the same institution rate: CSU, MSCD, UCB, UCCS, UCD, UNC	X		102% of predicted rate for institution +/-2%	105	31	31
d. 6-year graduation within Colorado system rate: CSU, MSCD, UCB, UCCS, UCD, UNC	X		Most recent two years. If increasing, 102% of highest rate. If decreasing, 102% of average rate.	45	14	14
e. freshmen retention within the same institution rate: ASC, FLC, MSC, USC, WSC	X		102% of predicted rate for institution +/-2%	105	31	31
f. freshmen persistence within Colorado system rate: ASC, FLC, MSC, USC, WSC	X		Most recent two years. If increasing, 102% of highest rate. If decreasing, 102% of average rate.	45	14	14
g. 6-year graduation within the same institution rate: ASC, FLC, MSC, USC, WSC	X		102% of predicted rate for institution +/-2%	105	31	31
h. 6-year graduation within Colorado system rate: ASC, FLC, MSC, USC, WSC	X		Most recent two years. If increasing, 102% of highest rate. If decreasing, 102% of average rate.	45	14	14
i. Freshmen retention within the same institution rate: two-year institutions	X		Most recent two years. If increasing, 102% of highest rate. If decreasing, 102% of average rate.	105	31	31
j. freshmen persistence within Colorado system rate: two-year institutions	X		Most recent two years. If increasing, 102% of highest rate. If decreasing, 102% of average rate.	45	14	14
k. 3-year graduation within the same institution rate: two-year institutions	X		Most recent two years. If increasing, 102% of highest rate. If decreasing, 102% of average rate.	105	31	31
l. graduation within 3-years within Colorado system rate: two-year institutions	X		Most recent two years. If increasing, 102% of highest rate. If decreasing, 102% of average rate.	45	14	14
<b>4A. SCORES/PASSING RATES ON TESTS AND EXAMINATIONS: four-year institutions</b>						
<b>4B. TECHNICAL GRADUATES EMPLOYED: two-year institutions</b>						
	X		Most recent two years. If increasing, highest rate/score. If decreasing, average rate/score.	300	60	60
	X		90%	300	60	60
<b>5. INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT/ADMINISTRATION EXPENDITURES</b>						
a. institutional support/administrative expenditures per SFTE	X		102% of average \$/SFTE for national comparison group +/-2%	150	45	45
b. institutional support/administrative expenditures as percent of operating budget	X		102% of average % of budget for national comparison group +/-2%	150	45	45
<b>6. UNDERGRADUATE CLASS SIZE</b>						
a. percent of sections enrolling < 20 students: four-year institutions	X		102% of ave. pct. For national comparison group +/-2% based on (1)public, (2)size, (3)univ/college	150	45	45
b. percent of sections enrolling > 49 students: four-year institutions	X		102% of ave. pct. For national comparison group +/-2% based on (1)public, (2)size, (3)univ/college	150	45	45
c. percent of sections enrolling < 15 students: two-year institutions	X		Most recent two years. If increasing, 102% of highest rate. If decreasing, 102% of average rate.	150	45	45
d. percent of sections enrolling > 34 students: two-year institutions	X		Most recent two years. If increasing, 102% of average rate. If decreasing, 102% of lowest rate.	150	45	45
<b>7. FACULTY INSTRUCTIONAL WORKLOAD</b>						
	X		102% of average workload for national comparison group +/-2%	300	90	90
<b>8. &amp; 9. ROLE AND MISSION-RELATED INDICATORS/MEASURES IDENTIFIED BY INSTITUTION AND APPROVED BY CCHE STAFF (Optional)</b>						
CCHE, 9/03		X				

**QUALITY INDICATORS/PERFORMANCE MEASURES, BENCHMARKS, BASE, BONUS, AND IMPROVEMENT POINTS, AND THE SCORING PROCESS FOR THE FY 2004-05 PERFORMANCE FUNDING SYSTEM**

**October 2003**

1. Institutional performance is measured on seven overall quality indicators/performance measures.
2. Each of the overall measures #1 - #7 has a maximum of 300 base points. Individual components comprising an overall measure have a proportion of the base points for the overall measure associated with the component.
3. Depending on the extent of the improvement in institutional performance on those overall measures or components utilized in the FY 2003-04 performance funding system, the earning of improvement points is possible. Improvement is measured utilizing the actual performance levels recorded in the FY 2003-04 quality indicator system. A maximum of thirty percent (30%) of the base points associated with the overall measure or component can be earned as improvement points. Improvement points are in addition to base points and bonus points. For each 0.1% - 0.5% range of improvement, one (1) improvement point is earned up to the maximum number of improvement points associated with the particular overall measure or component.
4. Bonus points are earned for performance exceeding the benchmark. Bonus points are in addition to base points and improvement points. The maximum number of bonus points that can be earned for any overall measure or component is thirty percent (30%) of the maximum number of base points for the overall measure or component.
5. Measure #1 incorporates six components related to four-year institutions and two components related to two-year institutions for graduation. The "graduation within the same institution rate" components for the four-year institutions each has a maximum of 70 base points, 21 bonus points, and 21 improvement points. The "graduation with the Colorado system rate" components for the four-year institutions each has a maximum of 30 base points, 9 bonus points, and 9 improvement points. For the two-year institutions, the "graduation within the same institution rate" has a maximum of 210 base points, 63 bonus points, and 63 improvement points while the "graduation within the Colorado system rate" has 90 base points, 27 bonus points, and 27 improvement points.
6. Measure #2 incorporates two components of freshmen retention and persistence. The "retention" component involves a maximum of 210 base points, 63 bonus

points, and 63 improvement points while the “persistence” component involves 90 base points, 9 bonus points, and 9 improvement points.

7. Measure #3 incorporates four components for support and success of minority students. The measure includes “retention,” “persistence,” “graduation within the same institution,” and “graduation within the Colorado system” rates. There are a total of 300 base points, 90 bonus points, and 90 improvement points.
8. Measure #4A incorporates a differing number of tests or examinations taken by students depending on the four-year institution. The amount of base, bonus, and improvement points associated with each test or examination for each four-year institution depends on the number of tests or examinations comprising the overall measure and whether the test or examination was incorporated in the FY 2003-04 performance funding system. Each four-year institution will identify the tests or examinations to comprise this measure. All the tests or examinations reported by the institution in the FY 2002-03 *Performance Funding Report*, CCHE, February, 2002 and the *Quality Indicator System Report*, CCHE, December 2002, published in January 2003, will be used for each four-year institution with the exception of tests or examinations that do not have at least twenty (20) test-takers for the most recent two years.
9. Measure #4B for two-year institutions has a maximum of 300 base points, 90 bonus points, and 90 improvement points and measures the number of employed technical graduates.
10. Measure #5 evaluates institutional support and administrative expenditures and has two components, each with a maximum of 150 base points. The “expenditures per SFTE” has 45 bonus points and 45 improvement points. The “expenditures as percent of budget” has 45 bonus points. As this measure was introduced last year, improvement points of 45 points are now included.
11. Measure #6 measures undergraduate class size and incorporates two components, each with a maximum of 150 base points, 45 bonus points, and 45 improvement points.
12. Measure #7 gauges faculty instructional workloads and has a maximum of 300 base points and 90 bonus points. As this measure was introduced last year, improvement points of 90 points are now included.
13. Institutional performance on each overall measure or individual component is determined by the earning of points by the institution for performance related to the benchmark for the overall measure or component. If insufficient data exists for any overall indicator or component for any institution, that overall measure or component does not “count” in determining the grand total points earned by that institution. The grand total possible points an institution can earn is adjusted to reflect the “missing” overall measure or component. In determining this

adjustment, the institution shall neither be advantaged nor disadvantaged in terms of its relationship to institutions that do earn points for the overall indicator or component.

14. Each institution's actual performance on each overall measure or component is compared to the benchmark to determine the percent of performance achieved.
15. The percent of performance achieved is multiplied by the maximum number of base points associated with the overall measure or component to determine the base points earned for the overall measure or component.
16. Total points earned by an institution for an overall measure or component may be comprised of three parts:
  - a. base points earned,
  - b. bonus points earned, which may not exceed 30% of the maximum number of base points, and
  - c. improvement points earned, which may not exceed 30% of the maximum number of base points.
17. The institution's grand total points earned are divided by 2,100 (seven overall measures x 300 base points) to determine the percent of grand total base points earned. It is possible for an institution's total points earned to exceed 2,100 points and thus its percent of total base points earned to exceed 100%.
18. A role & mission weighting factor for each institution is calculated by dividing the institution's FY 2003-04 general fund base – with governing board/system central administration general fund costs and “charge backs” included on a total funds basis and less one-time funds – by the total of these general fund amounts for all the institutions (excluding the Colorado School of Mines, UC-Health Sciences Center, CSU Veterinary Medicine program, and CSU agencies).
19. The percent of grand total base points earned is converted to the weighted percent of grand total base points earned by multiplying the percent of grand total base points earned by the role and mission weighting factor.
20. The sum of the weighted percent of grand total base points earned by all the institutions governed by a governing board determines the governing board performance funding percent.

**TOPIC: PROPOSED FINANCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY POLICY**

**PREPARED BY: RICHARD W. SCHWEIGERT**

**I. SUMMARY**

In response to financial problems in both the public and private sectors, many organizations are reexamining the financial monitoring and oversight of their businesses. Since the beginning of the new millennium in the United States, we have witnessed numerous bankruptcies in companies that failed to monitor their true financial condition. Many boards, committees, associations, commissions, etc., are calling for better financial education and fiduciary accountability. As a result many board members need to become better educated about the total financial condition of organizations that they supervise.

Currently, the Commission on Higher Education has a Commission policy, Section II, Part B (1.00) that states: “the governing boards of the institutions of higher education have the fiduciary and operational responsibilities to manage appropriated and other funds in accordance with Colorado statutes, Commission policies, and other applicable laws, rules, and restrictions...” While this is a good policy, it may be too broad and vague to ensure that higher education board members meet their fiduciary responsibility.

To make the policy more specific, and ensure that supervisory boards in higher education review the true financial condition of schools they oversee, it is recommended that the fiscal policy statement be enhanced. A stronger policy will increase the financial accountability of the complete higher education system.

**II. BACKGROUND**

The staff of the Commission in conjunction with the institutions is developing standardized financial reporting requirements for all of higher education. This project started as an outreach by new board members at one of the state colleges for more detailed financial information. The board found that administrators of the school presented only state appropriated funds as the true financial picture of the school. Immediately, several board members asked the Commission help to develop a structure that presented the total financial condition of the school. As a result, the board was not reviewing financial information that represented more than 30 percent of their institution's total cash flow. Furthermore, basic concepts of separating balance sheet items from income statements were not followed as reserve accounts were treated as income. In fact, most colleges only produce balance sheet statements once a year.

The other concern common in government, is a major problem. The institutions operate as if they are on their own with cash-funded activities; when schools' budgets can be ten, twenty, even fifty percent cash funded, this lack of oversight can be misguided.

In the case of Metropolitan State College of Denver (see [attached](#) pages) staff mixed income sheet, balance sheet, and fund balance information. The top page of the attachment, in the three-circled areas, shows how a fund balance (balance sheet statement item) and was placed into revenues (income statement item) and revised a total revenue/expense budget of \$82.9 million. Since the school's total budget is \$119.4 million, the board reviewed only about 70 percent (a percent that is lower than most schools that have student housing and food service).

The Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) has recognized the problem and has adopted new standards. Accounting standard number thirty-nine (39) from GASB will require schools to include Foundations "affiliated" with the school to be included in their consolidated annual financial reports. The reasoning is that Foundations are such an integral part of the schools, they cannot be treated as off-budget entities which do not reflect the true interaction with the organization that controls them.

### **III. STAFF ANALYSIS**

This policy will recognize the need for standardized financial reporting across the higher education system. It is important to create such a policy in response to the ever-increasing accounting requirements from national organizations intent on ensuring healthy businesses across this country. It is also important to make higher education institutions examine their financial reporting processes to make sure they meet the same tests as those placed on other private and public sector entities.

A policy that requires consolidated Income and Balance sheet statements on an on-going basis will help board members of the various schools meet their fiduciary responsibility. It will allow them to understand and review the Total Financial Condition of the school. They will be able to make decisions based upon the effect on the bottom line financial performance of the school. They also will be able to compare the performance of their school to other public and private sector businesses. Most important, board members will be able to assess problems with a complete look at the condition of the school using real time financial information.

Board members across the higher education system will meet their fiduciary responsibilities by reviewing accounting standards-based information. The financial statements should be required to tie back to the annual Statewide Financial Audit from the State Auditor's Office for each school. This connection will provide an independent, third-party verification of the financial condition of the school. It will also provide the board members with an independent financial check of their school.

**IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

**That the Commission on Higher Education adopt the proposed policy on financial reporting requirements.**

**Appendix A**

**STATUTORY AUTHORITY**

C.R.S. 23-1-105 (1). The commission shall prescribe uniform financial reporting policies, including policies for counting and classifying full-time equivalent students, for the institutions and governing boards within the state-supported system of higher education.

## Section II

### Part A

#### 1.0 Introduction (rewrite)

The Finance Section's responsibilities include developing the annual combined operating budget request for the public colleges and universities; *developing, and implementing standardized financial statements for colleges and universities*; coordinating the budget process with the governing boards; developing allocation recommendations for General Fund and tuition appropriations; developing, publishing and monitoring tuition and fee policies and related reports; and preparing fiscal notes on proposed legislation.

### Part B

#### 1.10 Financial Reporting Requirements

The Commission has statutory responsibility to create a uniform financial reporting policy for use by governing boards and institutions of higher education. This policy shall apply to all public institutions. The purpose of this policy is to ensure uniform financial reporting and review of institutions true financial condition by governing boards.

The Commission requires that institutions of higher education produce uniform consolidated financial statements. These include income, balance sheet, and other financial statements required by the Commission. The financial statements shall accurately reflect the institutions true financial condition. The consolidated income statement will include other information columns as required by the needs of the Commission and governing boards. The Commission also requires that a consolidated balance sheet statement be produced with every income statement.

The Commission reserves the right from time to time to revise the format of the consolidated financial reports to meet the needs of the Commission and the governing boards.

The income and balance sheet statements produced by institutions of higher education for governing boards shall at least annually, reconcile to the Financial Audit of the institution performed by the Colorado State Auditor's Office.

The Commission recommends each governing board of an institution of higher education include in their policies a schedule for board members to review the consolidated financial statements. Each governing board shall be required to annually certify to the Commission in writing that the governing board has reviewed the information produced under this section.

All consolidated financial statements required by this section shall be produced in accordance with relevant requirements of the Governmental Accounting Standards

Board (GASB), the State Controllers Office, the State Auditor's Office, the Higher Education Accounting Standards Committee, the department, and any other official entity which has authority to set accounting practices for higher education.

Consolidated financial accounting statements shall be produced by the institutions of higher education at least four times per year. **They are however encouraged to produce them monthly.** The schedule for the production of these documents shall be set by each governing board, and should be in accordance with their current financial review process. The Colorado Community College and Occupational Education System shall produce these statements for each community college institution under their control. A copy of the statements shall be shared with the Commission.

**TOPIC: REVISION OF ADMISSION STANDARDS POLICY**

**PREPARED BY: CAROL FUTHEY**

**I. SUMMARY**

At its June 2003 meeting, the Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) discussed revisions to the Admissions Standards Policy applicable to Colorado public four-year institutions. This agenda item updates the Commission on staff activities in response to questions emerging from that meeting and requests approval of the revised policy ([Attachment A](#)).

Staff efforts have focused on the four broad areas of the policy proposed for revision:

- A. addition of a precollegiate curriculum requirement for high school graduates in spring 2008 and later to increase probability of student success upon enrollment in a Colorado public four-year institution;
- B. specification of varied freshmen admission window sizes, including a “floor” to window admissions, based on the role and mission and subsequent admission tiering of the four-year institutions;
- C. inclusion of all first-time undergraduates admitted by an institution as subject to freshmen admission standards, regardless of when degree-seeking intent is declared by the student at the same institution; and
- D. adjustment of admission standards for transfer students to reflect the admission tiering similar to that of the freshmen standards.

The recommendations are the result of extensive discussions concerning the policy’s ramifications with numerous groups, since the policy was introduced for discussion. CCHE staff have engaged in numerous conversations about the potential implications of the precollegiate curriculum proposal with various representatives from the K-12 sector. Staff also have met with presidents and academic vice presidents of the governing boards, building on the earlier work of a committee comprised of representatives from the academic, admissions, and institutional research areas. In responding to various concerns, staff attempted to balance the particular institutional interests within the context of a policy as it affects all twenty-eight institutions of higher education. Finally, the technical appendix to the policy ([Attachment T.A.](#)) has been updated as have the admissions index calculations described therein.

**II. BACKGROUND**

The Commission is directed by statute to “. . . establish . . . and implement academic admission standards for first-time freshmen and transfer students at all state-supported

baccalaureate and graduate institutions of higher education in the state.” C.R.S. 23-1-113 (1) (a). The current admission standards were first established in 1987. Some minor adjustments to the policy have occurred since then, but no comprehensive review of the appropriateness of the standards to current state priorities or Commission policies has been undertaken until now. Over the past few years, the Commission has discussed admission standards in the context of the development or implementation of various legislative directives (e.g., SB 03-304) and Blue Ribbon Panel initiatives. At various times, the Commission indicated that a comprehensive review of its admission policy was needed. The introduction of a significantly-revised admissions standards policy applicable to four-year public institutions in Colorado in June 2003 was an initial response to those concerns, and this agenda item elaborates and clarifies points based on that discussion.

### III. STAFF ANALYSIS

#### A. **Addition of a Precollegiate Curriculum**

The proposed precollegiate curriculum for Colorado’s four-year public institutions consists of a minimum of 15 academic units, summarized in Table A, and detailed more specifically in the accompanying policy. If adopted, these requirements would be effective with students graduating from high school in spring 2008. Thus the five-year transition to the curricular requirements applies to students entering the eighth grade in AY 2003-04. The recommended core requirement for graduates in 2010 and later increases to 18 units with the addition of a fourth year of mathematics and two units of a foreign language.

**Table A. PROPOSED PRECOLLEGIATE CURRICULUM FOR COLORADO**

	<b>English Units</b>	<b>Math Units</b>	<b>Natural Science Units</b>	<b>Social Studies Units</b>	<b>Other</b>
Beginning with spring 2008 high school graduates	4	3 (Algebra I and higher)	3 (two of which must be lab-based)	3 (one of which must be U.S. history or world civilization)	2 units of academic electives
For spring 2010 and later high school graduates	4	4 (Algebra I and higher)	3 (two of which must be lab-based)	3 (one of which must be U.S. history or world civilization)	2 units of foreign language; 2 units of academic electives

Note 1: Academic electives include additional courses from core area as well as foreign languages (2 units must be from the same language), computer science, art, music, journalism, drama, honors, advanced placement, and international baccalaureate courses.

Note 2: An academic unit, often referred to as a Carnegie unit, is equivalent to one full year of credit in a specific subject.

Colorado public higher education has an obligation to define and communicate the expected academic competencies needed for students to succeed in that environment. The need for a statewide consensus on college readiness becomes

especially critical, given the level of student mobility reflected in transfer patterns across institutions.

Research overwhelming shows that if a high school student successfully completes a particular set of courses in high school—a precollegiate curriculum—that their chance of success in college increases dramatically when compared to students who have not completed such a set of courses. Regardless of socio-economic status, race, gender, or high school program, the proportion of students receiving their bachelor's degree tends to increase with the completion of a rigorous pattern of high school course-taking. When such a set of courses is combined with grade point averages from NCES' National Educational Longitudinal Study (NELS) second follow-up high school transcript data, the predictive validity of baccalaureate attainment reached nearly 50%. In other words, curriculum and grades explain 25% more than the index by itself.

By coupling the current CCHE admissions index with a precollegiate curriculum, institutions will be better able to identify students with a stronger likelihood of persisting to degree completion. Currently, the University of Colorado institutions that admit first-time freshmen require completion of high school coursework according to its Minimum Academic Preparation Standards (MAPS), but students may be admitted with limited curricular deficiencies. Colorado State University and the Colorado School of Mines also specify high school curricular standards for their incoming freshmen, while the remaining four-year colleges and universities encourage completion of varying forms of a core curriculum. The current policy revisions propose shifts from admitting students with deficiencies (if necessary) or encouraging them to be better prepared to formally outlining academic preparation for regular (vs. window) admission to all Colorado public four-year institutions.

Another dimension to the curricular requirement is its relationship to the remediation that many students experience upon entry into higher education. Admission to college is based on the assumption that students are academically proficient, but assessment of recent Colorado public high school graduates indicates otherwise. A recent CCHE report on remedial needs of students graduating from high school in 2001 (or were age 19 or younger) found that 23.4% of those entering public higher education were assigned to at least one developmental course for the following year. Inadequate preparation not only lessens the likelihood that a student is retained through graduation but also extends the time and cost to degree completion.

If Colorado is to reduce remediation, move up from its ranking of 27<sup>th</sup> in college participation by high school freshmen, and increase students' probability for success through more intensive academic preparation, it also is essential that meaningful dialog, policy-making, and collaborative programming occur between

K-12 and higher education. Since the June Commission meeting, staff have met with numerous representatives from the K-12 sector to discuss the proposed curricular addition to the admissions policy. In addition to informal conversations with principals and teachers, CCHE staff have met with staff from the Colorado Department of Education and members of the State Board of Education and made a presentation at the annual meeting of the Colorado Association of School Executives. In each case, the responses to the precollegiate curriculum recommendation have been favorable. Discussions also have been initiated with members of the business community, and a grant proposal has been submitted by the Governor’s office to support pilot projects associated with the precollegiate curriculum in several school districts.

At the governing board and institution levels, a number of programs are offered that meet many of the same objectives as the precollegiate recommendation of the admissions standards policy. Some of the programs represent long-term commitments by higher education to partner with K-12 in supporting student precollegiate preparation and transition to a college or university. Table B summarizes some of the programs and courses delivered by higher education to K-12; additional details illustrating the offerings are provided in [Attachment B](#).

**Table B. EXAMPLES OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMMING  
 SUPPORTING PRECOLLEGIATE PREPARATION  
 DELIVERED BY COLORADO PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION**

<b>Governing Board</b>	<b>Institution</b>	<b>Number of Courses</b>	<b>Number of Sections</b>	<b>Unduplicated Headcount</b>	<b>School District(s) Served</b>
Board of Governors	Colorado State University—Ft. Collins	10	23	540	6
	Colorado State University—Pueblo	20	120	1,780	6
Board of Regents	Univ of Colorado—Colorado Springs	9	14	83	9
	Univ of Colorado—Denver	35	217	3,072	22
Board of Trustees	Adams State College	5	6	38	5
Board of Trustees	Mesa State College	23	29	527	4
Comm Coll of Colorado	Pueblo Comm College	1	3	26	1

Note: Governing boards additionally offer non-credit programming not listed above.

While a significant number of students are served through these activities, note that these enrollments are a subset of the total number of high school students registered through PSEO, FastTrack, other concurrent enrollments delivered either on campus, in high schools, or via distance education. Virtually every four- and two-year institution enrolls a notable number of high school students. For FY2003, more than 21,000 students were reported to CCHE as enrolled either through PSEO or FastTrack (11,937 students submitted by four-year institutions;

two-year schools reported 9,501 high school students). This total represents approximately 8.3% of the state's FY2003 undergraduate headcount. In each instance, these opportunities are offered for the purpose of making higher education courses available to high school students and enabling them to get a "head start" on college.

Finally, as K-12 and higher education seek ways to facilitate students' successful transition from secondary to postsecondary education, discussions also need to focus on alternative ways by which students can meet the requirements of the precollegiate curriculum. While academic preparation may be measured by completion of the precollegiate coursework, other options for a student to demonstrate that s/he has the competencies necessary for college-readiness need to be recognized. This requires that the precollegiate curriculum be translated into specific knowledge and skills for college admissions and placement and that appropriate statewide competency-based assessments be identified. In 1997, faculty at Colorado's public colleges and universities articulated the expectations that they believed an entering undergraduate needed to succeed in college. Titled "Ready and Able," the document needs review and possible update to create an alignment with the precollegiate curriculum recommended for addition to the CCHE Admissions Standards Policy.

Assessment options may include statewide end-of-course tests based on valid instruments and accompanying pass scores. A second needed effort is to evaluate how the knowledge and skills associated with the precollegiate curriculum align with the Colorado Model Content Standards. Collaboration of higher education with K-12 will be needed to bring the two into alignment. Subsequent research then needs to be conducted to validate that the competency-based options lead to a successful transition to college. Until then, a demanding precollegiate curriculum is the best option for linking secondary and postsecondary requirements.

**Staff Recommendations:**

1. The Commission revise its admission standards policy so that all resident and out-of-state first-time undergraduate applicants to baccalaureate programs at Colorado's four-year public institutions of higher education as outlined in the attached policy must, prior to enrollment, complete a precollegiate curriculum to qualify for regular (vs. window) admission. Effective with high school graduates in spring 2008 and later, the impact of the curricular requirements on student admissions is to be evaluated during FY2010 and findings reported to the Commission by June 2010.
2. Specific precollegiate course requirements may be fulfilled by successfully completing assessments of comparable knowledge and competencies to be approved by the Colorado Commission on Higher Education by July 1, 2006.

3. CCHE and higher education governing boards continue discussions with the K-12 sector and with business and community groups on expanding linkages that result in broader student access to elements of the precollegiate curriculum prior to entering higher education.
4. CCHE and institutional staff develop appropriate fields for reporting student academic preparation in the SURDS Undergraduate Applicant File beginning in FY2008.

## **B. Specifications for Freshmen Admissions Window Sizes**

Statute directs the Commission to establish admission standards for first-time freshmen and transfer students and specifies the criteria to be used for each. Statute also states: “In lieu of such criteria, additional criteria may be used for up to twenty percent of the admitted freshmen (and transfer) students.” C.R.S. 23-1-113 (1) (b) & (c). This way of gaining admittance for “...up to twenty percent of the admitted freshmen (and transfer) students” is referred to being admitted through the window.

### **1. Freshman Admissions Window Size**

The Commission has discussed, on several occasions, establishing the size of the window for first-time freshmen at a percent less than the maximum 20% allowed by statute for some of the four-year institutions. Both the Colorado School of Mines (CSM) and the University of Colorado-Boulder (UC-B) have established a 10% window size, through a performance contract in the case of CSM and implementation of the “Quality for Colorado” plan for UCB upon approval by CCHE, the legislature, and the Governor. As a comprehensive graduate research university, staff believe that Colorado State University-Fort Collins also should strive to achieve an operational window for its first-time freshmen admits of 10% over a six-year phase-in period as shown in Table C.

The three other institutions in the selective admission category—University of Colorado-Colorado Springs (UCCS), University of Colorado-Denver (UCD), and the University of Northern Colorado (UNC)—have utilized the freshmen window in differing percents over the past few years. As selective admission institutions, staff believe that the window size for the selective institutions should not be as limited as for the comprehensive graduate research institutions, and the window size may vary by institution. Similar to FY2010 being an evaluation year for the comprehensive graduate research universities, it also should be an evaluation year for these selective institutions.

**Table C. Projected Window Size for Freshmen Admission Standard for Colorado Public Four-Year Institutions**

Admission Category/Institution	Freshmen Admission Standard Window Size for --					
	FY 2007--Evaluation Year for Assessing Impact of Window Changes			FY 2010--Evaluation Year for Assessing Impact of Precollegiate Curriculum		
	FY 2005	FY 2006		FY 2008	FY 2009	
Highly Selective: CO Sch of Mines	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
Selective:						
CO State Univ	20%	18%	16%	14%	12%	10%
Univ of CO - Boulder*	18%	16%	14%	12%	10%	10%
Univ of CO - Colo Springs	20%	20%	19%	18%	17%	15%
Univ of CO - Denver	20%	20%	19%	18%	17%	15%
Univ of Northern CO	20%	20%	19%	18%	17%	15%
Moderately Selective						
Adams State Coll	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%
CO State Univ - Pueblo**	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%
Fort Lewis Coll	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%
Mesa State Coll	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%
Western State Coll	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%
Modified Open: Metro State Coll of Denver	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%

\*Quality for Colorado plan includes annual tuition increases requiring approval by CCHE, legislature, and the Governor. If approved, the window size will be reduced commensurate with reaching 10% by FY2009.

\*\*Effective July 2003; formerly University of Southern Colorado

Like the selective admission category institutions, the five institutions in the moderately selective admission category—Adams State College (ASC), Colorado State University-Pueblo (CSU-P), Fort Lewis College (FLC), Mesa State College (MSC), and Western State College (WSC), as well as the one modified open admission category institution, Metropolitan State College of Denver (MSCD)—have utilized the freshmen window in differing percents over the past few years. While not open admission institutions, these six institutions provide access to a broad spectrum of students. Four of these institutions (ASC, FLC, MSC, and WSC) also serve as regional educational providers, and thus are primary access points for students from a designated region of the state. Staff conclude that retaining a 20% percent window is appropriate for these institutions.

## 2. Freshmen Admissions Window Floor

A second consideration related to the admissions exceptions involves establishing a floor, or lower index limit, for the freshmen window. Currently, institutions admit varying proportions of students more than ten points below the freshmen admissions index assigned to that college or university (Table D).

**Table D. STUDENTS ELIGIBLE FOR FRESHMEN ADMISSION STANDARDS WHOSE INDEX EXCEEDED A TEN-POINT WINDOW FLOOR BY INSTITUTION, FY 2001 - 2003**

Selectivity	Institution	FY2001			FY2002			FY2003		
		# Students Eligible for Freshmen Standards	# Students with Adm Index Exceeding Ten-Point Window Floor	% Students with Adm Index Exceeding Ten-Point Window Floor	# Students Eligible for Freshmen Standards	# Students with Adm Index Exceeding Ten-Point Window Floor	% Students with Adm Index Exceeding Ten-Point Window Floor	# Students Eligible for Freshmen Standards	# Students with Adm Index Exceeding Ten-Point Window Floor	% Students with Adm Index Exceeding Ten-Point Window Floor
Highly Selective:	CSM	1,582	76	4.8	1,414	100	7.1	1,839	109	5.9
Selective:	CSU	8,597	112	1.3	9,262	120	1.3	9,579	125	1.3
	UCB	13,299	399	3.0	14,646	278	1.9	15,330	322	2.1
	UCCS	1,777	30	1.7	1,822	22	1.2	2,012	26	1.3
	UCD	1,247	57	4.6	1,140	62	5.4	1,335	49	3.7
	UNC	5,531	94	1.7	5,285	196	3.7	5,059	142	2.8
Moderately Selective:	ASC	1,436	89	6.2	1,353	14	1.0	1,524	18	1.2
	FLC	2,670	112	4.2	2,822	73	2.6	2,783	36	1.3
	Mesa	2,388	399	16.7	1,444	72	5.0	1,613	79	4.9
	USC	1,698	63	3.7	1,547	67	4.3	1,736	87	5.0
	WSC	1,338	52	3.9	1,601	78	4.9	1,685	83	4.9
Modified Open:	Metro	2,824	181	6.4	3,195	227	7.1	3,217	180	5.6
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>44,387</b>	<b>1,664</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>45,531</b>	<b>1,309</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>47,712</b>	<b>1,255</b>	<b>2.6</b>

Note: Data include students with known admission indices under the floor and those with no index due to missing data.

Research by several of the four-year public institutions, as well as CCHE staff, reveal that students entering with an index score more than ten points below the institution's minimum have a lower likelihood of being academically successful (Table E). Each study points to the conclusion that entering freshmen with an index more than ten points below the institution's minimum for meeting standards have lower retention and graduation rates. Thus it seems appropriate to set a floor for window admits that is no more than ten points below the index for meeting the institution's freshmen standards.

**Table E. ACADEMIC SUCCESS BY ADMISSION STANDARD STATUS**

Measure	Cohort Size	Percent of Students Successful --
<b>Academic Success by Admission Standard Status</b>		
<b>First-Year Retention Rate Entering Summer/Fall 2000*</b>		
Met Institutional Admission Standard	13,589	82.7%
Did Not Meet Institutional Admission Standard	3,050	78.3%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>16,639</b>	
<b>Six-Year Graduation Rate Entering Summer/Fall 1995*</b>		
Met Institutional Admission Standard	7,631	57.6%
Did Not Meet Institutional Admission Standard	6,148	47.5%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>13,779</b>	
<b>Academic Success by Admission Standard Status and Within 10 Point Range of Window Score</b>		
<b>First-Year Retention Rate Entering Summer/Fall 1998 - 2000*</b>		
If exceeded or within 10 points below Institutional Admission Standard and -- Completed precollegiate curriculum		87.8%
Did not complete precollegiate curriculum		82.8%
If more than 10 points below Institutional Admission Standard and -- Completed precollegiate curriculum		83.1%
Did not complete precollegiate curriculum		74.8%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>23,049</b>	
<b>Six-Year Graduation Rate Entering Summer/Fall 1993 - 1995*</b>		
If exceeded or within 10 points below Institutional Admission Standard and -- Completed precollegiate curriculum		61.0%
Did not complete precollegiate curriculum		48.7%
If more than 10 points below Institutional Admission Standard and -- Completed precollegiate curriculum		50.3%
Did not complete precollegiate curriculum		37.7%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>18,904</b>	

\*Based on students who were first-time, full-time during initial term of enrollment.

Because the purpose of the window is to enable institutions to admit promising students who do not meet the freshmen admissions index, staff recognize that institutions may need limited flexibility to extend admission to a student beyond the ten-point floor. Staff recommend, therefore, that institutions be able to admit up to 1% of its admitted students (included as part of its specified window percentage) who are more than ten points below its admissions window.

Finally, staff have updated the policy's technical appendix ([Attachment T.A.](#)) to include the precollegiate curriculum requirements and insure that standardized test and high school performance values are in line with current normative information for the freshmen admission index calculation. Briefly, the admissions index is based on a high school performance subindex and a standardized test score subindex. Each component is based on variables that require periodic realignment (e.g., high school rank equated with grade point average; ACT realigned with SAT). In addition, each subindex requires periodic recentering to align a score of 50 with the average for all recent

applicants. Due to the large amount of missing data in the SURDS Undergraduate Applicant File, ACT national norms rather than Colorado averages were used for updating the test score component. Additionally, a provision for students who either come from high schools that do not provide performance data or were home-schooled was developed, thereby shifting nearly all of those students from window to the regular admission category.

The changes not only underscore the need to update the relationships for each index component on a regular basis, but also result in some future admitted students being assigned a different index calculation than s/he would have under the current calculation. The net effect is summarized in Table F, showing the distribution of Fall 2002 admits for all four-year public institutions using the current admission index model at selected levels and comparing it with the distribution resulting from updating the calculations. For example, the current index calculations result in 71.5% of admitted students statewide meeting or exceeding an index of 92, while the updated calculations result in 76.9% of admits meeting or exceeding the admissions index for the University of Colorado-Colorado Springs.

**Table F. COMPARISON OF DISTRIBUTION OF FRESHMEN ADMITS AT COLORADO PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS FOR SELECTED ADMISSIONS INDEX LEVELS, FY 2003**

<b>Freshmen Admissions Index</b>	<b>Institution at Specified Admissions Index</b>	<b>Cumulative % of Admits Statewide Meeting or Exceeding Current Index at Selected Levels</b>	<b>Cumulative % of Admits Statewide Meeting or Exceeding Updated Index at Selected Levels</b>
110	Colorado School of Mines	35.5	46.4
103	University of Colorado--Boulder	51.0	60.3
101	Colorado State University	54.7	64.2
94	University of Northern Colorado	67.9	74.3
93	University of Colorado--Denver	69.4	75.1
92	University of Colorado--CO Spr	71.5	76.9
82	Colorado State Univ--Pueblo	84.3	86.7
80	Adams State College		
80	Fort Lewis College		
80	Mesa State College		
80	Western State College		
76	Metro State Coll of Denver	87.0	88.5

While the shifts are not uniform across the index categories, generally speaking, there is a shift upward in the distribution of students to a higher admissions index categories that may qualify some freshmen for admission to an institution on a regular, rather than a window, basis. This shift occurs

across all racial/ethnic groups and reflects a broadening of access to public higher education.

The possibility of an enrollment shift with its attendant funding implications, however, is just one possible outcome that warrants consideration by the Commission. The number of students qualifying for financial aid, especially merit-based, could increase at the more selective institutions as more students qualify for admission. The proportion of students needing remediation at less selective institutions also could rise, placing greater pressures on academic support services at those schools. Finally, if the shift in admits results in greater enrollments at the more selective institutions as argued, resources not only shift across institutions, but the state's financial commitment also grows as more students could be reported by institutions with a higher funding level per FTE student.

One needs to be mindful, as well, that these possible changes will not occur in isolation, and that some dynamics, such as those resulting from changes in the current admissions policy, may offset some of this potential shift:

1. As described above, while more admits may qualify for regular admission at the more selective institutions, the goal of raising the quality at these same institutions by shrinking the admissions window and enforcing a "floor" to the window will limit the number of students that can be admitted by institutions such as UCB and CSU.
2. A student's selection of a college or university is affected by numerous factors (e.g., program offerings, location, cost, size of institution, private vs. public, etc.). Institutional selection is not simply a matter of an admissions index score.
3. Resource considerations, in the form of space availability and the state's funding per FTE student as examples, also will limit the number these institutions can enroll, as will UCB's reliance on a larger share of out-of-state students than other Colorado public four-year institutions.
4. Institutionally-initiated goals to improve quality have resulted in several of the institutions voluntarily raising their admissions index, thereby influencing student access separately from any Commission decisions.
5. As student preparation improves with addition of the precollegiate curriculum requirements, the potential impact on all institutions' admissions index will need to be assessed.
6. Projections for the number of Colorado high school graduates indicates growth, but what is unknown is how this expanded demand for higher education and its accompanying demographic changes will distribute itself across institutions or index levels.

**Staff Recommendations:**

1. The Commission revise its admission standards policy so that:
  - a. the upper limit for the window size for first-time freshmen admits for each of the indicated fiscal years be set as in Table C; and
  - b. the lower limit of the window be set at ten points below the institution's freshmen admissions index, with the exception of one percent of admitted students to be included as part of the institution's window percentage.

The above limits are based on those students subject to the freshmen admissions standards. The effects of these changes, to be implemented in FY2005, shall be evaluated during FY2007 and findings reported to the Commission by June 2007.

2. The Commission implement the revisions to the freshmen admission index calculation, effective FY2005.
3. As part of an on-going monitoring, CCHE and governing board staff shall develop an annual academic performance report (e.g., retention rates, average gpa) on first-time undergraduates by admissions index, including those whose index is more than 10 points below the institutional standard. To provide baseline data, the first report on freshmen entering in summer/fall 2003 shall be reported to the Commission in spring 2005.
4. As part of the FY2007 review referenced in #1 above, the admission index assigned to each institution be reevaluated. Until then, CCHE staff shall monitor potential enrollment shifts across index categories by institution annually and assess the possible fiscal impact.

**C. Students Subject to Freshmen Admission Standards**

The following statement is included in the current admission standards policy: ". . . the Extended Studies Program should not be used by institutions as a route into campus degree programs for students who otherwise would be required to provide admission credentials and be evaluated according to the standards specified in this policy." See section 6.02.09 of current policy.

At the present time, CSU-Fort Collins and UNC offer freshmen applicants who do not meet the admission standards the opportunity to enroll through what is known, respectively, as the CSU Start-Up Program and the UNC Challenge Program. Students who elect to enroll in these programs do so as non-degree-seeking and are currently not subject to the freshmen admission standards. These students pay the cash cost associated with the courses and are not eligible for federal financial aid. They often enroll in the same on-campus courses in which admitted freshmen

enroll, live in the residence halls, and in many ways participate in campus activities and programs as if they were admitted degree-seeking freshmen.

For the most part, there is no difference between admitted freshmen that meet admission standards and non-degree seeking freshmen in CSU's Start-Up and UNC's Challenge Programs who do not meet admission standards. These students generally remain in the Challenge or Start-Up Programs for two semesters and earn 24 or more credits. They usually then apply for admission as degree-seeking students who, because they have earned more than 12 credits, are no longer subject to the freshmen admission standards that they did not meet previously, but rather, are evaluated using the current transfer admission standards requiring only a 2.0 g.p.a.

Staff believe that all students should be subject to admission standards at the time they seek admission unless they qualify under one of the exceptions specified in policy (see Section 5.02 of the proposed policy). More specifically, staff believe that students who do not meet the freshmen admission standards, but are offered admission through such programs as CSU's Start-Up Program or UNC's Challenge Program, should be subject to freshmen admission standards. That is, all freshmen enrolled in such programs should be included in the number admitted utilizing the freshmen window.

**Staff Recommendation:**

The Commission revise its admission standards policy so that all entering undergraduate students admitted to Colorado's four-year state-supported institutions of higher education for first-time undergraduate enrollment either must meet the freshmen admission standards or be counted as a freshmen window admit, effective FY2005.

**D. Transfer Standards GPA**

Transfer standards currently are tied to the grade point average earned by the student according to the number of credit hours being transferred. In cases where the student transfers 30 or more credit hours, for example, the grade point average required to meet the transfer standard is 2.0 g.p.a. Experience shows that this minimum g.p.a. is much too low for all the four-year institutions. By increasing the g.p.a. standard and aligning it with the role and mission of the institutions (i.e., comprehensive graduate research, selective, moderately selective, modified open), consistency is achieved among similar institutions and students are made more aware of the expectations associated with the institution to which s/he is transferring.

Staff analyses of the FY2002 cohort of admitted students transferring more than 12 credits found that every student seeking to transfer to an institution with the

same or lower admission category would be accommodated, assuming a transfer admission window of 20%. Similarly, every student desiring to transfer to one of the comprehensive graduate research universities or to CSM would be accommodated, assuming a transfer admission window of 20% (Table G). Staff know of no reason why future cohorts of transfer students transferring more than 12 credits will be significantly different from FY 2002 cohort and conclude that the transfer admission standards for undergraduates transferring more than 12 credit hours from another institution be established as shown in Table G.

**Table G. Minimum Grade Point Average Requirements for Students Transferring from Another Institution with More Than Twelve Collegiate Semester Credit Hours\*\*\*\***

Receiving Institution	GPA*	Transfer Window Size
Highly Selective: CSM	2.70	20%
Selective: UCB CSU UCCS UCD UNC	2.70 2.50 2.40 2.40 2.40	20% 20% 20% 20% 20%
Moderately Selective: ASC CSU-Pueblo** FLC Mesa WSC	2.30 2.30 2.30 2.30 2.30	20% 20% 20% 20% 20%
Modified Open: Metro***	2.30	20%
Open Admission: Community & Local Community District Colleges and all other institutions		n/a

\*The same transfer standards apply to the two-year programs at these institutions

\*\*Effective July 2003; formerly University of Southern Colorado

\*\*\*Applies to admitted students 19 years of age and younger.

\*\*\*\*Students transferring within an institution (i.e., changing from non-degree-seeking to degree-seeking status) will be subject to freshmen admission standards, regardless of the number of transfer hours.

**Staff Recommendation:**

The Commission revise its admission standards policy so that the grade point averages listed in Table G are requirements to qualify for regular (vs. window) admission to a specific institution for transfer students with more than 12 credits as defined in the attached policy, effective FY2005.

**IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

**That the Commission approve the attached document as the admission standards policy, effective fiscal year 2005, with subsections implemented according to the specified dates.**

**Appendix A**

**STATUTORY AUTHORITY**

“Establish state policies that differentiate admission and program standards and that are consistent with institutional role and missions as described in statute and further defined in paragraph (c) of this subsection (1). C.R.S. 23-1-108 (1) (e)

Commission directive – admission standards for baccalaureate and graduate institutions of higher education

The Commission shall commence immediately to establish and the governing boards shall implement academic admission standards for first-time freshmen and transfer students at all state-supported baccalaureate and graduate institutions of higher education in the state. The standards shall be established by the Commission, after consultation with the governing boards of institutions, and the first step of implementation shall be completed by the governing boards by the beginning of the fall term of 1986. C.R.S. 23-1-113 (1) (a)

The standards established shall use at least two of the following three criteria for first-time admitted freshmen students: Standardized test scores, high school grade point average, and high school class rank. The criteria established shall be consistent with the role and mission established for each state-supported institution of higher education. In lieu of such criteria, additional criteria may be used for up to twenty percent of the admitted freshmen. Students who meet the minimum criteria for admission shall not be guaranteed admission to the institution to which they have applied, but they shall be eligible for consideration.

C.R.S. 23-1-113 (1) (b)

The standards established shall use college grade point average. In lieu of such criterion, additional criteria may be used for up to twenty percent of the admitted transfer students. The academic admission standards and policies established for transfer students shall be consistent with the student transfer agreements established by the Commission pursuant to section 23-1-108 (7). C.R.S. 23-1-113 (1) (c).

No other admission standards shall be imposed by any agency or committee of the executive or legislative branch of state government. C.R.S. 23-1-113 (1) (d).

**SECTION I****PART F ADMISSIONS STANDARDS POLICY****1.00 Introduction**

Admissions standards are established, pursuant to statute, for undergraduate applicants for admission at each public institution of higher education in Colorado. The original policy was adopted by the Commission in 1986, implemented the following year, and established state-level admission standards for both first-time freshmen and transfer students at each of the Colorado baccalaureate public institutions. The standards represent minimum requirements at four-year public institutions and not for the state's community colleges, which are open admissions. Institutions are allowed to admit up to the percent determined by the Commission of the undergraduate applicants on criteria other than the CCHE freshmen index or transfer grade point average through admissions "windows." Meeting the CCHE admission standards does not guarantee admissions as institutions consider a broad range of factors in making admissions decisions.

The current policy reflects a significant addition for applicants who will be high school graduates beginning in spring 2008. In addition to defining institutional admissions indices for first-time freshmen and grade point averages for entering undergraduate transfers, the standards are expanded to require a strong precollegiate curriculum so that students seeking admission to four-year public colleges and universities are ready to progress successfully in higher education. The course-preparation requirements are based on research known to increase a student's likelihood for success in postsecondary education, particularly at baccalaureate-granting institutions. The Commission adopted recommendations concerning the secondary school curriculum in 1983 that strongly encouraged institutions and governing boards to follow these or more rigorous recommendations. That action, however, did not require such standards as part of its admissions standards policy. The current policy articulates and requires the curriculum that will enable the CCHE admission standard of completion of a specified precollegiate curriculum to be met by first-time entering undergraduates who graduate from high school in spring 2008 or later.

The policy is comprised of seven sections:

- 1.00 Introduction
- 2.00 Statutory Authority
- 3.00 Policy Goals
- 4.00 Precollegiate Curriculum
- 5.00 CCHE Undergraduate Admission Standards Index and Transfer GPA
- 6.00 Penalties for Not Meeting the Standards
- 7.00 Enrollment Limits on Admission Standards

To ensure that the Admission Standards Policy continues to meet state goals and priorities, the Commission will review the policy every three years to determine if changes are appropriate. Additionally, institutions shall report all undergraduate freshmen and transfer applicants, including those for summer terms, to the Commission on the Student Unit Record Data System (SURDS) Undergraduate Applicant File. Included with this policy is a technical appendix describing the methodology used to calculate the CCHE admissions indices and supporting documentation for data submissions. These data will be used to monitor the

compliance of institutions with the Commission's standards and to evaluate the impact of the policy on institutions and students annually.

## **2.00 Statutory Authority**

There are a number of sections of the law that are applicable to the establishment of the Commission's policy on admission standards. These are listed below.

23-1-108 (1) (e) Establish state policies that differentiate admission and program standards and that are consistent with institutional role and missions as described in statute and further defined in paragraph (c) of this subsection (1);

23-1-113 Commission directive -- admission standards for baccalaureate and graduate institutions of higher education.

(1) (a) The Commission shall commence immediately to establish and the governing boards shall implement academic admission standards for first-time freshmen and transfer students at all state-supported baccalaureate and graduate institutions of higher education in the state. The standards shall be established by the Commission, after consultation with the governing boards of institutions, and the first step of implementation shall be completed by the governing boards by the beginning of the fall term in 1986.

(b) The standards established shall use at least two of the following three criteria for first-time admitted freshmen students: Standardized test scores, high school grade point average, and high school class rank. The criteria established shall be consistent with the role and mission established for each state-supported institution of higher education. In lieu of such criteria, additional criteria may be used for up to twenty percent of the admitted freshmen. Students who meet the minimum criteria for admission shall not be guaranteed admission to the institution to which they have applied, but they shall be eligible for consideration.

(c) The standards established shall use college grade point average. In lieu of such criterion, additional criteria may be used for up to twenty percent of the admitted transfer students. The academic admission standards and policies established for transfer students shall be consistent with the student transfer agreements established by the Commission pursuant to section 23-1-108 (7).

(d) (I) No other admission standards shall be imposed by any agency or committee of the executive or legislative branch of state government.

(II) This paragraph (d) is repealed, effective June 30, 1988.

(2) The Commission shall make an annual report to the General Assembly detailing the specific admission requirements in the categories of students described in subsection (1) of this section at each campus and institution of higher education. Such reports shall be due not later than January 1 of each year, beginning January 1, 1986.

23-1-108 (1) (c) Determine the role and mission of each state-supported institution of higher education within statutory guidelines;

23-20-101 (1) (a) The Boulder campus of the University of Colorado shall be a comprehensive graduate research university with selective admission standards . . . .

(b) The Denver campus of the University of Colorado shall be a urban comprehensive undergraduate and graduate research university with selective standards . . . .

(c) The Colorado Springs Campus of the University of Colorado shall be a comprehensive university with selective admission standards . . . .

23-31-101 . . . Colorado State University shall be a comprehensive graduate research university with selective admission standards . . . .

23-40-101. . . The University of Northern Colorado shall be a comprehensive baccalaureate and specialized graduate research university with selective admission standards . . . .

23-41-105 . . . The School of Mines shall be a specialized baccalaureate and graduate research institution with high admission standards . . . .

23-55-101 . . . Colorado State University-Pueblo which shall be a regional, comprehensive institution with moderately selective admission standards.

23-51-101 . . . Adams State College, which shall be a general baccalaureate institution with moderately selective admission standards.

23-52-102 . . . Fort Lewis College, which shall be a general baccalaureate institution with moderately selective admission standards.

23-53-101 . . . Mesa State College, which shall be a general baccalaureate institution with moderately selective admission standards.

23-54-101 . . . Metropolitan State College, which shall be a comprehensive baccalaureate institution with modified open admission standards; except that non-traditional students, as defined by the Colorado Commission on Higher Education after consultation with the Board of Trustees of the Consortium of State Colleges, who are at least twenty years of age shall only have an admission requirement of a high school diploma, a GED high school equivalency certificate, or the equivalent thereof.

23-56-101 . . . Western State College of Colorado shall be a general baccalaureate institution with moderately selective admission standards.

23-60-201 . . . A state system of community and technical colleges . . . offers a broad range of general, personal, vocational, and technical education programs. No college shall impose admission requirements upon any student.

23-72-121.5 . . . Aims Community College and Colorado Mountain College shall be two-year local district colleges with open admission standards.

### **3.00 Policy Goals**

Through this policy, the Commission intends to:

1. establish admission standards based on student performance and differentiated institutional role and mission while ensuring broad access to undergraduate programs with minimum duplication;
2. set clear performance expectations and communicate those expectations to prospective students;

3. reaffirm the principle that the opportunity to be admitted to a state-supported institution of higher education in Colorado must be earned, while assuring that the opportunity to enter the state-supported system of higher education is provided for Colorado residents; and
4. encourage diversity by supporting the admission of applicants from underrepresented groups, applicants with special talents, and applicants with disabilities.

#### **4.00 Precollegiate Curriculum**

Effective with applicants who graduate from high school in spring 2008 or later, in-state and out-of-state freshmen must meet both the institution's index standard and have completed the required precollegiate curriculum (if applicable) to meet CCHE's freshmen admission standard. The requirement also applies to other students subject to the freshmen admission standard, if the year of high school graduation is spring 2008 or later. Freshmen who have not completed the required precollegiate curriculum will not meet the CCHE admission standard for any four-year college or university (except students age 20 or older at Metropolitan State College of Denver), regardless of the student's index score. The 15 units, based on research by American College Testing (ACT), identify secondary course-taking that significantly enhances students' academic success in postsecondary education.

English	4 Units
Mathematics	3 Units
Natural Science	3 Units
Social Science	3 Units
Academic Electives*	2 Units
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>15 Units</b>

\*Foreign languages (2 units must be from same language) and others listed in section 4.01.

Note: An academic unit, often referred to as a Carnegie unit, is equivalent to one full school year of credit in a specific subject.

#### **4.01 Precollegiate Curriculum Academic Requirements**

Fifteen academic units/credits are required according to the distribution below. Students must receive a passing grade in each course to fulfill the requirement.

English: Acceptable courses include at least two units that emphasize writing or composition skills as well as literature, speech, and debate. Also acceptable are honors, advanced placement, and/or international baccalaureate courses. Examples of unacceptable courses are business English, ESL English, school publications, yearbook, drama, and journalism.

Mathematics: Acceptable courses include algebra I, intermediate algebra, geometry, algebra II, pre-calculus, or trigonometry, or comparable coursework. A computer science course with a prerequisite of at least algebra I is permissible as fulfilling a mathematics requirement. Also acceptable are honors, advanced

placement, and/or international baccalaureate courses. It is recommended that prospective students take a mathematics course in twelfth grade. Examples of unacceptable courses are pre-algebra, general math, business math, accounting, and consumer math.

**Natural Science:** Acceptable courses include biology, chemistry, physics, earth science or comparable coursework. Also acceptable are honors, advanced placement, and/or international baccalaureate courses. Examples of unacceptable are general science, outdoor education, environmental studies, and physical science. To meet the precollegiate curriculum, the student must complete at least two courses with laboratory work.

**Social Science:** Acceptable courses include U.S. history, world civilization, state and/or international history, civics, principles of democracy, geography, economics, psychology, sociology, and comparable coursework. Also acceptable are honors, advanced placement, and/or international baccalaureate courses. Examples of unacceptable courses are family living, marriage and family, and consumer education. To meet the precollegiate curriculum, the student must complete at least one course in U.S. history and/or world civilization.

**Academic Electives:** Acceptable courses may come from any academic area listed above or foreign languages (2 units must be from same foreign language), computer science, art, music, journalism, or drama. Also acceptable are honors, advanced placement, and/or international baccalaureate courses.

**TOTAL: 15 Units**

See section 4.05 for precollegiate curriculum requirements beginning in spring 2010.

#### 4.02 Approved Alternatives for Fulfilling Precollegiate Curriculum Requirements

- 4.02.01 Successful completion of college-level academic courses taken in high school via programs such as Postsecondary Enrollment Options (PSEO) or Fast Track may be counted toward satisfying the precollegiate curriculum requirements.
- 4.02.02 Precollegiate courses taken prior to ninth grade may be counted as meeting the precollegiate core if the content is equivalent to high school courses (e.g., foreign language I and algebra I). Successful completion of a high school course at the second-year level will satisfy this requirement, regardless of whether the courses were taken before the ninth grade.
- 4.02.03 Specific precollegiate course requirements may be fulfilled by successfully completing assessments of comparable knowledge and competencies approved by the Colorado Commission on Higher Education.

#### 4.03 Students Required to Meet Precollegiate Curriculum Requirements

- 4.03.01 Completion of the precollegiate curriculum is required to meet the admission standard by all entering undergraduates admitted to Colorado's four-year public colleges and universities for first-time undergraduate enrollment since high school graduation, effective with spring 2008 graduates and later. The requirement also applies to other students subject to the freshmen admission standard if the year of high school graduation is spring 2008 or later. See section 5.04.04 for curricular requirements that apply to transfer students who graduate in spring 2008 or later.
- 4.03.02 Students who drop out of high school, earn a GED, and apply to a four-year institution are subject to the same requirements as other students. If a student's transcript does not meet the precollegiate curriculum requirements, s/he may be admitted through the institution's window. See section 5.05 for explanation of the admission window.
- 4.03.03 Home schooled students are subject to the same requirements as other students.
- 4.03.04 Students admitted to degree and certificate of completion programs offered through the Colorado Statewide Extended Campus Program.
  - 4.03.04.01 Persons who wish to enroll in a degree or certificate of completion program offered either through the Statewide Extended Campus Program, the Off-Campus State-Funded Program or under the authority as a Regional Education Provider shall meet exactly the same institutional requirements for admission that are applied to students enrolling on-campus.
  - 4.03.04.02 Students who have not been formally admitted to an institution and who wish to enroll in any off-campus course not offered as part of a complete off-campus degree program may enroll through the Statewide Extended Campus Program. The sponsoring institution/campus may implement policies regarding enrollment of non-matriculated off-campus students.
  - 4.03.04.03 Students enrolling for courses through the Statewide Extended Campus Program, upon deciding to complete a degree, apply for admission, and, if accepted, are matriculated and become degree candidates. When they apply for admission they shall meet the same admission standards as are applied to students enrolling on-campus who have previously completed the same number of credits. (A non-matriculated student with credits earned through the Statewide Extended Campus Program could be formally admitted to the institution, depending upon the number of credits actually earned, either as a new freshman student or as a transfer student.)
  - 4.03.04.04 A student who has been formally admitted to the institution may enroll in courses through the Statewide Extended Campus Program and apply the credits toward a degree, but should be advised to consult with the institution to ensure that the credits earned would fulfill degree requirements.

#### 4.04 Students Exempt from Precollegiate Curriculum Requirements

The following students are exempt from the precollegiate curriculum requirements:

- 4.04.01 Any student who graduates from high school prior to spring 2008.
- 4.04.02 Concurrently enrolled students are exempt from the precollegiate curriculum requirements until they are formally admitted by an institution.
- 4.04.03 Students entering a baccalaureate-degree program with 30 or more college-level semester credit hours and a minimum grade point average that meets or exceeds that specified in Table 2 unless transferring within the same institution.
- 4.04.04 Students applying for a certificate or two-year degree program at a four-year institution.
- 4.04.05 Students who have a foreign (non-U.S.) transcript.
- 4.04.06 Students who have earned a baccalaureate degree.
- 4.04.07 Nontraditional applicants to Metropolitan State College of Denver. More specifically, first-time freshmen and transfer students who are at least 20 years of age on or before September 15 for admission in a summer or fall term on or before February 15 for admission in a winter or spring term are considered non-traditional by statute.
- 4.04.08 Students who are non-degree-seeking summer only.
- 4.04.09 Students participating in a formal national, international, or Colorado Consortium exchange program with a planned enrollment for one year or less.
- 4.04.10 Students who are non-degree-seeking without a baccalaureate degree and are age 20 or older. When non-degree-seeking undergraduates apply for formal admission to enroll in the same institution and become degree-seeking students (i.e., transfer within an institution), however, these applicants are then subject to the precollegiate curriculum requirement, regardless of age if s/he graduated in spring 2008 or later.

#### 4.05 Precollegiate Curriculum Requirements Effective for Spring 2010 Graduates

Beginning with students graduating from high school in spring 2010, in addition to the requirements of section 4.00, a student must complete a fourth unit of mathematics of the same or greater academic rigor as described in section 4.01, and two units of the same foreign language will be required. Electives may include foreign language for more than two years. Total academic course units total 18.

#### 4.06 Compliance with Precollegiate Curriculum Requirement

Beginning with students graduating in spring 2008 and reported as admitted students in summer/fall 2008 (FY2009) who have not completed the precollegiate curriculum requirements will be counted as window admits unless exempt from precollegiate curricular requirements (see section 5.05). Institutions shall report the status of student completion of

the precollegiate curriculum requirement via the SURDS Undergraduate Applicant File. These data will be used to monitor the compliance of institutions with the Commission's standards and to evaluate the policy's impact on students.

## **5.00 CCHE Undergraduate Admission Standards Index and Transfer GPA**

### **5.01 Background**

In 1987, pursuant to statute, the Commission established state-level admission standards for first-time entering undergraduates and transfer students at each of Colorado's baccalaureate-granting public institutions. The standards established by the Commission in 1987 for an entering freshman were based on the calculation of an admissions index. The index has two components: a student's high school performance (i.e., high school grade point average (g.p.a.) or class rank) and performance on a standardized test. For an undergraduate transferring from another institution, the standard's criterion was a specific grade point average.

Prior to the adoption of this revised policy by the Commission, at least 80% of an institution's fiscal year admits had to meet the appropriate CCHE freshman or transfer standard. Each institution was allowed to admit students who do not meet the CCHE admissions standards up to a number not exceeding 20% of the admitted pool of students. This pool, often referred to as "the admissions window," provides institutional flexibility in admitting promising students who meet institutionally established criteria but not the Commission's numerical standards. In addition, some students explicitly are exempt from the CCHE standards.

### **5.02 Applicants Exempt from CCHE Admission Standards Index or Transfer GPA**

The following types of undergraduate applicants are exempt from the Commission's freshmen and transfer admission standards.

#### **5.02.01 Degree-seeking applicant:**

5.02.01.01 Applicants who have a foreign (non-U.S.) transcript. The Commission directs the individual institutions to evaluate to the best of their ability, the foreign credentials presented by the student to assure that they are of an equivalent level to those students admitted under the Commission's standards.

5.02.01.02 Applicants who have completed a baccalaureate degree.

5.02.01.03 Applicants to Metropolitan State College of Denver who are age 20 or older. More specifically, first-time freshmen and transfer students who are at least 20 years of age on or before September 15 for admission in a summer or fall term on or before February 15 for admission in a winter or spring term are considered non-traditional.

5.02.01.04 Applicants to the two-year role and mission component of a four-year institution (See section 5.04.02)

5.02.02 Non-degree-seeking applicant:

- 5.02.02.01 Applicants who are still enrolled in high school and applying for enrollment for a term prior to high school graduation.
- 5.02.02.02 Applicants for the summer session only.
- 5.02.02.03 Applicants to the two-year role and mission component of a four-year institution.
- 5.02.02.04 Applicants without a baccalaureate degree who are age 20 or older. When non-degree-seeking undergraduates apply for formal admission to enroll in the same institution and become degree-seeking students (i.e., transfer within an institution), however, these applicants are subject to freshmen admission standards, regardless of age.
- 5.02.02.05 Applicants participating in a formal national, international, or Colorado Consortium exchange program with a planned enrollment for one year or less.

5.03 Freshman Standards

The freshman standard applies to all in-state and out-of-state new freshmen applicants and to transfer applicants with 12 or fewer college credit hours, except freshmen and transfer applicants who meet one of the admissions standards index exemptions listed in section 5.02. The freshmen standard also applies to students transferring within an institution and to new non-degree admits under age 20 (except summer). The Commission has developed a single scale for evaluating the achievement records of applicants that incorporates measures of standardized test scores, high school class rank, and high school grade point average.

More specifically, grade point average and class rank were found to be closely related and a correspondence was defined. It was used to create the Commission's High School Performance Index, with a mean and median of 50 and a standard deviation of 10. Similarly, standardized test scores from the ACT and SAT were used to create the Commission's Standardized Test Index. The Commission's Admissions Index was computed by adding the Commission's High School Performance Index and the Commission's Standardized Test Index. This creates a scale with a mean of 100. This scale is used in the freshmen admission standard. See technical appendix for more complete information (Attachment T.A.).

5.03.01 The specific minimum index score at each Colorado public four-year institution is summarized in Table 1.

**Table 1. CCHE Index Score for First-time Freshmen**

Institution	Freshmen Admissions Index
Adams State College*	80
Colorado School of Mines	110
Colorado State University	101
Colorado State University--Pueblo**	82
Fort Lewis College	80
Mesa State College*	80
Metropolitan State College of Denver***	76
University of Colorado--Boulder	103
University of Colorado--Colorado Springs	92
University of Colorado--Denver	93
University of Northern Colorado	94
Western State College	80

\*Applies to students admitted to four-year programs only.

\*\*Formerly the University of Southern Colorado. Index of 82 effective with fall 2003, index of 84 expected for fall 2004, and index of 86 for fall 2005 in accordance with change in role, mission, and name change (HB-01-1406).

\*\*\*Applies to admitted students 19 years of age and younger.

5.03.02 Students may be admitted at Adams State College or Mesa State College in either a two-year or a four-year program. Those admitted to a four-year program as first-time freshmen must meet the freshmen admission standards.

5.03.03 The GED test is a test of equivalency for the high school diploma. Students without a high school diploma who receive a score of 550 or greater on the 2002 version (55 or greater on the 1988 version) are considered to have met the Commission standards for the high and selective institutions. Students receiving 450 or greater on the 2002 version (45 or greater on the 1988 version) meet the Commission standards for the moderately selective and modified open institutions. This route to admission is not to be used by students with a diploma.

5.03.04 Calculation for Students Whose School Does Not Issue a GPA or High School Rank (Including Home Schooled). Students graduating from a school that does not issue a g.p.a. or rank, as well as those who are home schooled, will be assigned a proxy grade point average of 3.30, based on the statewide average high school g.p.a. of applicants to Colorado public four-year higher education. Institutions may not use this option when high school performance data are available but not provided by the student.

#### 5.04 Transfer Standards

The transfer standard applies to all degree-seeking undergraduate transfer applicants with more than 12 college credit hours who do not meet one of the exemptions listed in section 5.02 and are not covered by the freshmen standard. No single scale comparable to that for the freshmen standard has been developed for transfer admission standards, but rather, the standards are based on grade point average from previous collegiate work, transfer hours, and high school record.

- 5.04.01 To meet the CCHE transfer admissions standards, students must meet one of the following conditions. A student must:
  - 5.04.01.01 be enrolled in a CCHE-approved statewide guaranteed transfer agreement (business, engineering, education (early childhood or elementary), or nursing) and meet the minimum academic qualifications outlined therein; or
  - 5.04.01.02 transferred from a different institution and earned more than 12 collegiate semester credit hours with a GPA at or above the minimum shown in Table 2.
- 5.04.02 Students may be admitted at Adams State College or Mesa State College in either a two-year or a four-year program. Students admitted into the two-year programs must meet the Commission's transfer admission standards in order to pass from the two-year programs to the four-year programs.
- 5.04.03 The specific institution grade point average required to meet the CCHE Transfer Standards at each public education is summarized in Table 2.

**Table 2. Minimum Grade Point Average Requirements for Students Transferring from Another Institution with More Than Twelve Collegiate Semester Credit Hours\*\*\*\***

Receiving Institution	GPA*	Transfer Window Size
Highly Selective: CSM	2.70	20%
Selective: UCB	2.70	20%
CSU	2.50	20%
UCCS	2.40	20%
UCD	2.40	20%
UNC	2.40	20%
Moderately Selective: ASC	2.30	20%
CSU-Pueblo**	2.30	20%
FLC	2.30	20%
Mesa	2.30	20%
WSC	2.30	20%
Modified Open: Metro***	2.30	20%
Open Admission: Community & Local Community District Colleges and all other institutions		n/a

\*The same transfer standards apply to the two-year programs at these institutions

\*\*Effective July 2003; formerly University of Southern Colorado

\*\*\*Applies to admitted students 19 years of age and younger.

\*\*\*\*Students transferring within an institution (i.e., changing from non-degree-seeking to degree-seeking status) will be subject to freshmen admission standards, regardless of the number of transfer hours.

#### 5.04.04 Precollegiate Curriculum

Transfer applicants with under 30 college-level semester credit hours and students transferring within the same institution must also demonstrate academic preparation comparable to the precollegiate curriculum to meet the transfer standard, if they graduated from high school in spring 2008 or later. Such preparation can be demonstrated by completing the precollegiate curriculum in high school and/or by successfully completing (with a grade of C- or higher) a college-level course in each core area (English, mathematics, natural sciences, and social sciences) where the high school unit requirements have not been fulfilled.

#### 5.05 Students Not Meeting Institution's Admissions Standards (Window Admissions)

The purpose of the admissions window is to provide the institution greater flexibility in recognizing promising students who do not meet the CCHE admission standards. The maximum allowable percentage of admitted students who are not required to meet the CCHE admission standards within a specific fiscal year is referred to as the admissions window. Separate windows exist for the freshmen and transfer standards. The allowable percentage is determined by the Commission (see Tables 2 and 3).

**Table 3. Projected Window Size for Freshmen Admission Standard for Colorado Public Four-Year Institutions**

Admission Category/Institution	Freshmen Admission Standard Window Size for --					
	FY 2007--Evaluation Year for Assessing Impact of Window Changes			FY 2010--Evaluation Year for Assessing Impact of Precollegiate Curriculum		
	FY 2005	FY 2006		FY 2008	FY 2009	
Highly Selective: CO Sch of Mines	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
Selective:						
CO State Univ	20%	18%	16%	14%	12%	10%
Univ of CO - Boulder*	18%	16%	14%	12%	10%	10%
Univ of CO - Colo Springs	20%	20%	19%	18%	17%	15%
Univ of CO - Denver	20%	20%	19%	18%	17%	15%
Univ of Northern CO	20%	20%	19%	18%	17%	15%
Moderately Selective						
Adams State Coll	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%
CO State Univ - Pueblo**	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%
Fort Lewis Coll	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%
Mesa State Coll	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%
Western State Coll	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%
Modified Open:						
Metro State Coll of Denver	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%

\*Quality for Colorado plan includes annual tuition increases requiring approval by CCHE, legislature, and the Governor. If approved, the window size will be reduced commensurate with reaching 10% by FY2009.

\*\*Effective July 2003; formerly University of Southern Colorado

The window applies to the entire pool of admitted students, including those students who transfer within an institution by changing from non-degree to degree-seeking status if they have not previously been subject to freshmen admission standards. Students with missing data are included as part of the window percentage since such students do not meet the CCHE admission standards. Since the CCHE admission standards specified in this policy apply equally to both resident and non-resident students, no differentiation is made by tuition status in the calculation of the window.

Institutions may admit students with index scores below its specified minimum score including those with missing indices as a window admit, but the proportion of freshmen standard admits with an index more than ten points below the minimum is limited to one percent. This percentage of admits exceeding the ten-point range is included as part of the window size specified for each institution.

Effective with applicants who graduated from high school in spring 2008 or later, freshmen must meet both the institution's index standard and have completed the required precollegiate curriculum (if applicable) to meet an institution's freshmen admission standard. Freshmen who have not completed the required precollegiate curriculum will not meet the CCHE admission standard for any four-year college or university (except student age 20 or older at Metropolitan State College of Denver), regardless of the student's index score. Institutions may admit students who have not completed the required precollegiate curriculum, but these students will be counted as window admits.

## 5.06 Admission Not Guaranteed

Applicants who meet the appropriate Commission admission standard for an institution are not guaranteed admission to that institution. Institutions may make admission decisions based on other criteria resulting in admission standards more rigorous than the Commission admission standards.

## 5.07 Reporting of Data

Institutions shall report all undergraduate freshmen and transfer applicants, including those for summer terms, to the Commission on the SURDS Undergraduate Applicant File. These data will be used to monitor the compliance of institutions with the Commission's standards and to evaluate the impact of the policy on institutions and students. An institution must keep up at least one, full, prior year of files and records to document admissions decisions.

Each year the Commission staff will collect data on enrollment, transfer, and freshmen admission standards for all institutions and will prepare a report for Commission consideration. The Commission then will formally review the report and reconsider the question of whether the ultimate standards designated under the policy should be retained or modified and whether the implementation schedule should continue on track.

## 6.00 Penalties for Not Meeting the Standards

If an institution should admit more than the CCHE-determined window percent for either the freshmen or transfer standard in any fiscal year, the Commission shall assess a financial penalty against the governing board. Such penalty shall be based on the number of admitted students, regardless of residency, exceeding the window percent limitation. The penalty will be calculated by doubling the number of admitted students exceeding the window percent and then multiplying the amount of state support applicable in the fiscal year in which the institution exceeded the window percentage. The penalty is binding and may not be appealed.

If an institution exceeds the CCHE-determined window percent for two consecutive years, the Commission, in addition to the financial penalty, may adjust the institution's index score by lowering it to the next index level or the point at which the institution would comply with the standards, whichever is lower.

## 7.00 Enrollment Limits on Admission Standards

### 7.01 Standards for Out-of-State Students Must Equal or Exceed Those For In-State Students

SB 93-136 added the following language to 23-1-113 (1) (a):

Effective July 1, 1993, the academic admission standards established for determining admission of students who do not have in-state status, as determined pursuant to section 23-7-103, shall equal or exceed those established for determining admission of in-state students.

The admission standards policy applies equally to both in-state and out-of-state students, no differentiation is made by tuition status and the CCHE-determined window percent apply to the pool of all accepted students. It is possible, however, for an institution to use its available window "slots" to give preferential treatment to applicants according to student residency.

Such a practice would violate the intent of the statutory language. Therefore, the following procedures will be carried out yearly in order to monitor compliance with the intent of this requirement.

7.01.01 Separate Window Calculations for In-State and Out-of-State Accepted Students

Each fiscal year, after final Undergraduate Applicant data has been submitted and edited, separate window calculations will be made by Commission staff for students reported as in-state and out-of-state. Institutions whose in-state window percent is less than the out-of-state percent (by at least 0.5 percent) will be subject to further analysis. If this further review is not indicated by this comparison, then the institution will be considered to be in compliance.

7.01.02 Acceptance Decisions by Admission Index Range

The acceptance decisions made by institutions who do not meet the criteria identified in 7.01.01 will be analyzed by in-state and out-of-state applicant for significant differences.

Within each category, the number of total applicants and the percent offered admission will be calculated for both in-state and out-of-state applicants. If the percent of in-state applicants offered admission is greater than the percent of out-of-state applicants in almost every case, then the institution will be considered to be in compliance with the intent of the statutory language. One or two exceptions will not necessarily be considered as evidence of lack of compliance as long as these exceptions do not indicate a clear preference for out-of-state applicants, especially in the ranges around the institution's cutoff score.

7.01.03 Consequence for Not Complying With Statutory Intent

If the data for an institution does not show compliance with the analysis described in both 7.01.01 and 7.01.02, then staff will formally request an explanation and corrective action from the institution's governing board, and a discussion item for Commission review will be prepared.

7.02 Not less than 55 percent of the incoming freshman class at each state-supported institution of higher education shall be in-state students.

SB 93-136 added the following directive to statute (amended by SB 94-218):

23-1-113.5. Commission directive - resident admissions. It is the intent of the general assembly that all state-supported institutions of higher education operate primarily to serve and educate the people of Colorado. The general assembly therefore directs the commission to develop admission policies to ensure that, beginning with the fall term of 1994 and for the fall term of each year thereafter, not less than fifty-five percent of the incoming freshman class at each state-supported institution of higher education are in-state students as defined in section 23-7-102 (5). Commencing with the fall term of 1995, this requirement shall be met if the percentage of in-state students in the incoming freshman class for the then current fall term and the two previous fall terms averages not less than fifty-five percent. Such fifty-five percent requirement shall also apply to the up to twenty percent of incoming freshmen students admitted based on criteria other than

standardized test scores, high school class rank, and high school grade point average pursuant to section 23-1-113 (1) (b).

7.02.01 Use of the Fall Term, SURDS Enrollment File

Fall term data from the Student Unit-Record Data System (SURDS) Enrollment File will be used to test compliance.

7.02.02 Calculation of the In-State Percentage for First-Time Freshmen

This statutory language applies to all public institutions, including state system community colleges and local district colleges. The in-state percentage will be calculated from the selection of all students on the Fall Enrollment File who meet the following conditions: credit hours - resident instruction greater than zero (in other words, students with only extended studies or sponsored program credit hours will be excluded from this calculation); student level less than 19; and registration status equal 1. The percent will be calculated as the total number meeting the above condition divided into those from this group that are reported as having in-state tuition status. It should be noted that this calculation includes all enrolled students, including those who were admitted through an institution's admission window, with the exception of Native American students attending Fort Lewis College, who are excluded from this calculation. Beginning with fall 1995, the average of the most recent three fall term percentages will be used to test compliance. This percentage will be calculated as the total in-state over the three years divided by the total enrollment.

7.02.03 Consequence for Not Complying With 55 Percent Restriction

If the data for an institution shows an in-state percent less than 55 percent for first-time freshmen, then staff will formally request an explanation and corrective action from the institution's governing board, and a discussion item for Commission review will be prepared.

7.03 Reports to the Commission

Upon receipt and final editing of the data specified in sections 7.01, Commission staff shall prepare an analysis of the data and prepare a report for the Commission. Any institutions failing to meet the statutory language shall be identified and a subsequent discussion item from the institution and/or its board shall be prepared for Commission action.

**Attachment B**

**ACADEMIC PROGRAMMING SUPPORTING PRECOLLEGIATE PREPARATION  
DELIVERED BY COLORADO PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION  
TO K-12 SCHOOL DISTRICTS, ACADEMIC YEAR 2002-03**

<b>Governing Board: Board of Regents</b>			<b>Institution: University of Colorado – Colorado Springs</b>		
<b>Program Name</b>	<b>Course Title</b>	<b>Number of Sections</b>	<b>College Credit Awarded (Y = Yes; N = No)</b>	<b>Unduplicated Headcount</b>	<b>School District(s) Served</b>
CU Succeed	Elementary Functions of Calculus	4	Y	49	Harrison D2, Academy D20
Project Lead The Way	Digital Electronics	1	Y	1	Academy D20
	Introduction to Engineering Design	2	Y	9	Faith Christian, Academy D20
	Principles of Engineering	1	Y	5	Faith Christian
MathOnline	Calculus I	1	Y	1	Falcon District 49
	Calculus II	1	Y	6	Academy District 20, Cheyenne Mountain District 12, Roaring Fork RE-1, Jefferson County School District, Lewis Palmer District 38
	Calculus III	2	Y	8	Cheyenne Mountain District 12, Jefferson County School District, Lewis Palmer District 38, home-school in New Jersey
	Introduction to Linear Algebra	1	Y	1	Cheyenne Mountain District 12
	Introduction to Differential Equations	1	Y	3	Cheyenne Mountain District 12, Lewis Palmer District 38
<b>Totals</b>	<b>Courses: 9</b>	<b>Sections: 14</b>		<b>Headcount: 83</b>	<b>Districts Served: 9</b>

**ACADEMIC PROGRAMMING SUPPORTING PRECOLLEGIATE PREPARATION  
DELIVERED BY COLORADO PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION  
TO K-12 SCHOOL DISTRICTS, ACADEMIC YEAR 2002-03**

Governing Board: Board of Regents			Institution: University of Colorado at Denver		
Program Name	Course Title	Number of Sections	College Credit Awarded (Y = Yes; N = No)	Unduplicated Headcount	School District(s) Served
CU-Succeed Silver and Gold Program	General Biology I	12	Y	99	Jefferson County, Denver, Douglas, Adams 12, Boulder Valley, Adams 50,
	General Biology II	8	Y	78	Jefferson County, Boulder Valley, Adams 12, Denver
	General Chemistry I	7	Y	81	Jefferson County, Adams 50, Adams 1-Mapleton
	General Chemistry II	5	Y	51	Jefferson County, Colorado Springs 11, Adams 50
	Intro to Environmental Sciences	2	Y	20	Littleton 6
	Intermediate French I	6	Y	31	Adams 12, Jefferson, Steamboat Springs RE-2, Douglas, Thompson R-2
	Intermediate French II	2	Y	8	Thompson R-2
	Intermediate German I	1	Y	10	Adams 12
	World Regional Geography	2	Y	31	Jefferson County
	Intro to Human Geography	2	Y	15	Boulder Valley, Colorado Springs 11
	Western Civilization I	2	Y	33	Adams 12
	Western Civilization II	3	Y	37	Adams 12, Mapleton, Colorado Springs 11, Denver, Steamboat Springs RE-2
	U..S.History to 1876	7	Y	162	Colorado Springs 11, Denver, Adams 12
	U.S. History Since 1876	6	Y	120	Colorado Springs 11, Denver, Adams 12
	Humanistic Tradition: Modes of Expression	2	Y	61	Adams 12
	Algebra for Social Science and Business	1	Y	22	Douglas County
	College Algebra	22	Y	406	Jefferson County, Clear Creek RE-1, Adams-Arapahoe 28J, Englewood, Fountain-Ft. Carson 8, Adams 50, Mapleton
	College Trigonometry	15	Y	303	Jefferson County, Fountain-Ft. Carson 8, Mapleton,
	Pre-calculus Mathematics	10	Y	99	Jefferson County, Colorado Springs 11, Pueblo
	Analytical Geometry/Calculus I	33	Y	420	Jefferson County, Adams 12, Littleton 6, Colorado Springs 6, Douglas County, Englewood, Adams 50, Mapleton, Pueblo 60, St. Vrain
	Analytical Geometry/Calculus II	8	Y	126	Jefferson County, Adams 12, Boulder Valley
	Calc and Anal Geometry III-A	1	Y	11	Cherry Creek
	Calc & Anal. Geometry III-B	1	Y	11	Cherry Creek
	Introductory Statistics	14	Y	343	Jefferson County, Roaring Fork, Fountain-Ft. Carson 8, Adams 12, Douglas County, Cherry Creek
	Elementary Differential Equations	1	Y	20	Cherry Creek
	Introduction to Physics	1	Y	30	Adams 12
	College Physics I	4	Y	62	Thompson R-2, Jefferson County, Colorado Springs 11, Pueblo
	College Physics II	3	Y	22	Jefferson County, Thompson R-2

**ACADEMIC PROGRAMMING SUPPORTING PRECOLLEGIATE PREPARATION  
DELIVERED BY COLORADO PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION  
TO K-12 SCHOOL DISTRICTS, ACADEMIC YEAR 2002-03**

<b>Governing Board: Board of Regents</b>			<b>Institution: University of Colorado at Denver (continued)</b>		
<b>Program Name</b>	<b>Course Title</b>	<b>Number of Sections</b>	<b>College Credit Awarded (Y = Yes; N = No)</b>	<b>Unduplicated Headcount</b>	<b>School District(s) Served</b>
	Intro to Political Science: Quest for Freedom and Justice	4	Y	32	Roaring Fork, Clear Creek RE-1
	American Political System	2	Y	23	Clear Creek RE-1, Adams-Arapahoe 28J
	Introduction to Psychology I	11	Y	101	Jefferson County, Adams 12
	Second Year Spanish I	7	Y	63	Jefferson County, Thompson R-2, Adams
	Introduction to Psychology II	1	Y	33	Jefferson County
	Second Year Spanish I	7	Y	63	
	Second Year Spanish II	4	Y	45	
<b>Totals</b>	<b>Courses: 35</b>	<b>Sections: 217</b>		<b>Headcount: 3,072</b>	<b>Districts Served: 22</b>

**ACADEMIC PROGRAMMING SUPPORTING PRECOLLEGIATE PREPARATION  
DELIVERED BY COLORADO PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION  
TO K-12 SCHOOL DISTRICTS, ACADEMIC YEAR 2002-03**

Governing Board: Board of Governors			Institution: Colorado State University		
Program Name	Course Title	Number of Sections	College Credit Awarded (Y = Yes; N = No)	Unduplicated Headcount	School District(s) Served
Mathematics	Math 160 Calculus	1	Y	111	Berthoud; Loveland; Poudre; Thompson Valley
	Math 160 Calculus	1	Y	51	Berthoud; Loveland; Poudre; Thompson Valley
	NS696V – Change Agents: Teachers analyzing lessons in study teams	2	Y	13	Poudre
	ED464 – Methods & Materials for Teaching Mathematics	1	Y	17	Poudre
	Colorado State Lesson study Pilot	1	N	100	Statewide
Physics	College Physics Laboratory	1	Y	20	Poudre
	Little Shop of Physics: Hands-On Science Programs	Weekly Programs	N	15,000	Statewide
	Workshops for K-12 Students	Throughout acad. year	N	1,000	Statewide
	Physics Teaching Experience	15	N	1,000	Local Region (approx. 15 schools); mostly Poudre
Anthropology	Human Evolution	1	N		Poudre High School
	Human Evolution & Neanderthals	1	N		Poudre High School honors students and their teachers- 10 <sup>th</sup> and 11 <sup>th</sup> grades
English	English 10, Fort Collins HS	1	N	25	Poudre
	English 12, Fort Collins HS	1	N	25	Poudre
	Creative Writing, Centennial HS	1	N	20	Poudre
	4th graders, Dunn Elementary	2	N	40	Poudre Valley
	International Baccalaureate	1	N	1	Poudre Valley; FC High School
Kids In College (KIC)	Summer Program (4 <sup>th</sup> through 8 <sup>th</sup> graders). See the website: <a href="http://www.cahs.colostate.edu/kic/">www.cahs.colostate.edu/kic/</a> ; See specific topics below; all are hands-on learning.				
	Making Multimedia	3	N	28	Poudre; Thompson
	Advanced Making Multimedia	1	N	12	Poudre; Thompson
	Robotics	1	N	14	Poudre; Thompson
	Robotics	2	N	25	Poudre
	Little Shop of Physics	3	N	25	Poudre; Thompson
	Little Shop of Physics	6	N	37	Poudre; Thompson
	Spreadsheets and Graphics	1	N	7	Poudre; Thompson
	Digital Photography	1	N	8	Poudre; Thompson
	Digital Photography	1	N	6	Poudre; Thompson
	Drawing in Perspective	1	N	10	Poudre; Thompson
	Drawing in Perspective	2	N	11	Poudre; Thompson
	Sign Language	1	N	5	Poudre
	Cool Kitchen Chemistry	1	N	5	Poudre
	Web Design	1	N	6	Poudre; Thompson
	Weather Research	1	N	8	Poudre
Continuing Educ	General Chemistry I Lecture	1	Y	8	Poudre
	General Chemistry I Lab	1	N	8	Poudre
	Calculus for Phys Sci I Lecture	5	Y	85	Poudre
	Calculus for Phys Sci II Lab	5	N	65	Poudre
	Chemistry II Lecture	1	Y	7	Poudre
	Chemistry II Lab	1	N	7	Poudre
	Calculus for Phys Sci II Lecture	2	Y	28	Poudre
<b>Totals</b>	<b>Courses—Credit: 10 Noncredit: 28</b>	<b>Sections—Credit: 23 Noncredit: 34+</b>		<b>Headcount— Credit: 540</b>	<b>Districts Served—Credit: 6 Noncredit: Statewide</b>

**ACADEMIC PROGRAMMING SUPPORTING PRECOLLEGIATE PREPARATION  
DELIVERED BY COLORADO PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION  
TO K-12 SCHOOL DISTRICTS, ACADEMIC YEAR 2002-03**

<b>Governing Board: Board of Governors</b>			<b>Institution: Colorado State University – Pueblo</b>		
<b>Program Name</b>	<b>Course Title</b>	<b>Number of Sections</b>	<b>College Credit Awarded (Y = Yes; N = No)</b>	<b>Unduplicated Headcount</b>	<b>School District(s) Served</b>
Senior-to-Sophomore	Principles of Biology	11	Y	229	Pueblo 60; Pueblo 70; Fountain 8; Fremont Cty-RE1
	Principles of Biology Lab	11	Y	229	Pueblo 60; Pueblo 70; Fountain 8; Fremont Cty-RE1
	Intro to Microbiology	1	Y	8	Pueblo 60
	Intro to Microbiology Lab	1	Y	8	Pueblo 60
	Human Physiology & Anat.	2	Y	27	Pueblo 60
	Human Phys. & Anat. Lab	2	Y	27	Pueblo 60
	Chemistry & Society	1	Y	9	Pueblo 60
	Chemistry & Society Lab	1	Y	9	Pueblo 60
	Principles of Chemistry	2	Y	20	Pueblo 60; Pueblo 70
	Princ. Of Chemistry Lab	2	Y	20	Pueblo 60; Pueblo 70
	Earth Science	1	Y	8	Pueblo 60
	Earth Science Lab	1	Y	8	Pueblo 60
	Precalculus Math	4	Y	16	Pueblo 60
	Light, Energy & Atom	2	Y	22	Pueblo 60
	Light, Energy & Atom Lab	2	Y	22	Pueblo 60
	Principles of Macroecon	2	Y	18	Pueblo 60
	Principles of Microecon	2	Y	23	Pueblo 60
	Civil Drafting	1	Y	1	Pueblo 60
	PC Productivity & the Net	6	Y	90	Pueblo 60; Pueblo 70; Fremont Cty-RE1
	Intro. To Chicano Studies	1	Y	1	Pueblo 60
	Introduction to Drafting	2	Y	31	Pueblo 60; Fremont Cty-RE1
	Computer Aided Drafting	3	Y	37	Pueblo 60; Pueblo 70; Fremont Cty-RE1
	Lifeguard Training	2	Y	10	Pueblo 60; Pueblo 70;
	Composition I	16	Y	308	Pueblo 60; Pueblo 70; Fremont Cty-RE1; Fremont Cty-RE2; Colorado Springs 11; Fountain 8
	Composition II	5	Y	90	Pueblo 60; D11 (27)
	Introduction to Literature	8	Y	149	Pueblo 60; Pueblo 70; Fremont Cty-RE1
	U.S. History I	3	Y	82	Pueblo 60; Pueblo 70; Fountain 8
	U.S. History II	2	Y	48	Pueblo 60; Fountain 8
	Beginning Spoken French	3	Y	5	Pueblo 60
	Beginning Spoken Italian	2	Y	6	Pueblo 60
	Newswriting	1	Y	1	Pueblo 60
	Theory I	1	Y	10	Pueblo 60
	Theory I Lab	1	Y	10	Pueblo 60
	Philosophical Literature	1	Y	5	Pueblo 60
	American National Politics	2	Y	37	Fountain 8
	Intro. To Sociology	2	Y	78	Pueblo 60
	Beginning Spanish I	5	Y	53	Pueblo 60; Fremont Cty-RE1
	Speaking & Listening	3	Y	8	Pueblo 70; Fremont Cty-RE1
	Beginning Sign Language	1	Y	11	Pueblo 70
	Intro. To Sign Language	1	Y	13	Pueblo 70
<b>Totals</b>	<b>Courses: 40</b>	<b>Sections: 20</b>		<b>Headcount: 1,780</b>	<b>Districts Served: 6</b>

**ACADEMIC PROGRAMMING SUPPORTING PRECOLLEGIATE PREPARATION  
 DELIVERED BY COLORADO PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION  
 TO K-12 SCHOOL DISTRICTS, ACADEMIC YEAR 2002-03**

<b>Governing Board: Adams State College Board of Trustees</b>			<b>Institution: Adams State College</b>		
<b>Program Name</b>	<b>Course Title</b>	<b>Number of Sections</b>	<b>College Credit Awarded (Y = Yes; N = No)</b>	<b>Unduplicated Headcount</b>	<b>School District(s) Served</b>
Achieve	Bus Computer Applications I	2	Y	4	Centauri High School
	Bus Computer Applications I	1	Y	5	Creede Jr-Sr High School
	Communication Arts I	1	Y	14	Del Norte High School
	Communication Arts I	1	Y	11	Monte Vista Sr High School
	Communication Arts I	1	Y	4	Mountain Valley Jr-Sr High School
<b>Totals</b>	<b>Courses: 5</b>	<b>Sections: 6</b>		<b>Headcount: 38</b>	<b>Districts Served: 5</b>

**ACADEMIC PROGRAMMING SUPPORTING PRECOLLEGIATE PREPARATION  
DELIVERED BY COLORADO PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION  
TO K-12 SCHOOL DISTRICTS, ACADEMIC YEAR 2002-03**

<b>Governing Board: Mesa State College Board of Trustees</b>			<b>Institution: Mesa State College</b>		
<b>Program Name</b>	<b>Course Title</b>	<b>Number of Sections</b>	<b>College Credit Awarded (Y = Yes; N = No)</b>	<b>Unduplicated Headcount</b>	<b>School District(s) Served</b>
	BIOL 141, Human Anatomy & Physiology	1	Y	21	Delta School District
	BIOL 141L, Human Anatomy & Physiology Lab	1	Y	21	Delta School District
	MATH 113, College Algebra	2	Y	63	Delta School District
	ENGL 111, English Composition	3	Y	76	Delta School District
	ENGL 112, English Composition	3	Y	67	
	POLS 101, American Government	1	Y	15	Delta School District
	MATH 119, Precalculus Mathematics	1	Y	14	Delta School District
	MATH 130, Trigonometry	2	Y	68	Delta School District
	ENGL 111, English Composition	1	Y	12	Montrose School District
	ENGL 261, Survey of American Literature I	1	Y	28	Montrose School District
	ENGL 262, Survey of American Literature II	1	Y	34	Montrose School District
	MATH 119, Precalculus Mathematics	1	Y	25	Montrose School District
	MATH 130, Trigonometry	1	Y	23	Montrose School District
	POLS 101, American Government	1	Y	10	Montrose School District
	MATH 113, College Algebra	1	Y	1	Ouray County School District
	MATH 151, Calculus I	1	Y	7	Ouray County School District
	MATH 119, Precalculus Mathematics	1	Y	7	Ouray County School District
	MUSA 220, Music Appreciation	1	Y	3	Ouray County School District
	MATH 152, Calculus II	1	Y	1	Ouray County School District
	ENGL 111, English Composition	1	Y	7	Ridgway County School District
	MATH 113, College Algebra	1	Y	8	Ridgway County School District
	ENGL 150, Introduction to Literature	1	Y	8	Ridgway County School District
	MATH 130, Trigonometry	1	Y	8	Ridgway County School District
<b>Totals</b>	<b>Courses: 23</b>	<b>Sections: 29</b>		<b>Headcount: 527</b>	<b>Districts Served: 4</b>

**ACADEMIC PROGRAMMING SUPPORTING PRECOLLEGIATE PREPARATION  
 DELIVERED BY COLORADO PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION  
 TO K-12 SCHOOL DISTRICTS, ACADEMIC YEAR 2002-03**

<b>Governing Board: Colorado Community Colleges System</b>			<b>Institution: Pueblo Community College</b>		
<b>Program Name</b>	<b>Course Title</b>	<b>Number of Sections</b>	<b>College Credit Awarded (Y = Yes; N = No)</b>	<b>Unduplicated Headcount</b>	<b>School District(s) Served</b>
Senior to Sophomore	Intro to Economics	3	Y	26	Pueblo District 60
<b>Totals</b>	<b>Courses: 1</b>	<b>Sections: 3</b>		<b>Headcount: 26</b>	<b>Districts Served: 1</b>

## Technical Appendix to the Admissions Standards Policy (Updated: October 2, 2003)

Each four-year public institution must report all formal applicants for admission to a bachelor's degree program on the SURDS Undergraduate Applicant File (UAF). The purpose of this document is to explain procedures used in calculating eligibility for admission standards, meeting the precollegiate curriculum, and the admission index. This update replaces calculations associated with previous versions of admissions standards policies.

### 1.0 Background

In May 1985, the Commission began to develop the Student Unit Record Data System (SURDS) to support the development of statewide admission standards. A committee of governing board representatives met with Commission staff, and the final data format was approved by the Commission at the November 1, 1985 Commission meeting. The data elements, as well as a full description of the Undergraduate Applicant File, are provided in the SURDS Data Dictionary.

In January 2003, the Commission began to review both the admission policy and the calculations of the admission standards. A committee of governing board representatives met with Commission staff throughout the spring to bring forward updates and revisions to the admissions policy and technical appendix.

### 2.0 Definitions

**Admission to a bachelor's degree program:** Admission directly to a baccalaureate degree-granting program or to a major/program from which students in good academic standing may move to a baccalaureate degree-granting program at the same institution without submitting another application or meeting additional academic criteria.

**Eligible:** A student covered by an admission standard as specified in the policy.

**Exempt:** A student not covered by an admission standard as specified in the policy.

**First-time freshman:** First-time students in undergraduate degree programs (student levels 11-15).

**First-time student:** A student attending post-secondary education for the first-time after high school at the undergraduate level. Includes students entering with advanced standing (college credits earned before graduation from high school).

**Formal applicant:** An individual who has fulfilled the institution's publicly-listed requirements for application. These may include a written application, submission of high school and/or college transcripts, an application fee, scores on college entrance tests, etc.

**Freshmen admissions index:** Sum of the high school performance index and the standardized test index.

**Freshman standard:** Standard applied to all formal applicants who have been admitted to the institution with 12 or fewer credit hours unless exempted as specified in section 5.02. The

freshman standard also applies to internal transfers and non-degree-seeking students under the age of 20 unless exempted as specified in section 5.02.

**High school performance index:** Concorded index score based on either a student's high school grade point average or high school rank, whichever index is higher.

**Internal transfer:** A student moving from non-degree-seeking status to degree-seeking status within the same institution where the non-degree status included terms after high school graduation.

**First-time non-degree:** First-time students not in a degree program (student level 19).

**Standardized test index:** Concorded index score based on either a student's ACT composite score or the sum SAT math and SAT verbal scores, whichever index is higher. In cases where students report multiple ACT or SAT scores, the highest composite score should be used. Subscores used to calculate the composite must be from a single administration.

**T-score distribution:** A method to normalize a distribution where the mean is equal to 50 and the standard deviation is 10.

**Transfer standard:** Standard applied to all formal undergraduate transfer applicants who have been admitted to the institution with more than 12 hours who do not meet one of the exemptions listed in section 5.02 and are not covered by the freshman standard. Does not apply to those who move from non-degree seeking status to degree-seeking status within a single institution.

**Transfer student:** A student entering the reporting institution for the first time but known to have previously attended a postsecondary institution at the same level (undergraduate). The student may transfer with or without credit.

### 3.0 Exemptions to Standards

Exemptions to Precollegiate curriculum, Freshmen Index and Transfer Standards:

1. Students applying to a 2-year institution or to a certificate program or 2-year program at a 4-year institution. For these students at 4-year institutions, the degree-level field must be 01-03 or 11-13, depending on which program the student is enrolled.
2. Students who will be concurrently enrolled in high school.
3. Students with a foreign transcript. These students are indicated in the Undergraduate Applicant File with a transcript type of 1.
4. Students who have already attained a baccalaureate degree. These students are indicated in the Undergraduate Applicant File with a previous degree type of 6 or greater, or with a student level of 20 or greater.
5. Nontraditional applicants to Metropolitan State College of Denver. More specifically, first-time freshmen and transfer students who are at least 20 years of age on or before September 15 for admission in a summer or fall term on or before February 15 for admission in a winter or spring term are considered non-traditional.

6. Non-degree-seeking applicants to the summer session only.
7. Non-degree-seeking applicants without a baccalaureate degree who are age 20 or older (on or before September 15 for admission in a summer or fall term on or before February 15 for admission in a winter or spring term) as specified in sections 4.04.09 and 5.02.02.04 of the policy.
8. Non-degree-seeking applicants participating in an exchange program as specified in sections 4.04.08 and 5.02.02.05 of the policy. Not reported in SURDS.

**Exemption to Precollegiate curriculum only:**

The year of high school graduation field in the Undergraduate Applicant File is less than 2008. If the field is unknown or blank...

**4.0 Precollegiate Curriculum**

Institutions shall report attainment of each curriculum area in the Undergraduate Applicant File beginning with summer term of 2007.

**5.0 CCHE Freshmen Admission Index Updates**

Upon conclusion of the spring Undergraduate Applicant File submission for FY 2003, updated concordances (Tables 1 - 4) for subsequent submissions were produced by Commission staff for the standardized test score index and the high school performance index using an equipercentile methodology (Kolen, M. J. & Brennan, R. L., 1995). To insure the populations were as homogeneous as possible, only 2002 high school graduates were examined. Statewide, 12,553 students were reported with both ACT and SAT scores and 31,919 students were reported with both high school grade point average and high school rank.

Standardized t-score distributions were calculated for ACT scores using a mean score of 20.8 and a standard deviation of 4.8. These data were based on national norm groups provided by ACT. Standardized t-score distributions were calculated for high school GPAs using the applicant data provided in the Undergraduate Applicant File for FY 2003. The mean was 3.23 with a standard deviation of .56. Statewide distributions are shown in Table 5.

These processes are to be evaluated with the policy review in FY2007 and again, in FY2010, once the precollegiate curriculum requirement is implemented, in order to account for any shift in the population data, and to review the validity of the policy.

Standardized test index: ACT scores for the entire population will be standardized into an index using a t-score distribution so that the resulting scale will have a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10. Where ACT scores are not available, concorded ACT from actual SAT scores will populate missing data. If records are still missing ACT scores, these will not be used in producing the t-score distribution.

High School performance index: High school GPAs for the entire population will be standardized into an index using a t-score distribution so that the resulting scale will have a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10. Where high school GPAs are not

available, concorded high school GPAs from reported high school ranks will populate missing data. If records are still missing high school GPAs, these will not be used in producing the t-score distribution.

## **6.0 CCHE Freshmen Admission Index Calculation**

The Freshmen Admission Index is calculated by summing the student's standardized test t-score with the student's high school performance t-score as shown in Table 6. Where students provide both an ACT and an SAT, the score producing the higher index will be used. Where students provide both a high school GPA and a high school rank, the score producing the higher index will be used.

The floor for each institution will be calculated by subtracting 10 points from the admission standard listed in Table 1 of the policy.

### **6.0.1 Calculation for Students Whose School Did Not Issue a GPA (Including Home Schooled)**

Students reported in the Undergraduate Applicant File who graduated from a school that did not issue a gpa, as well as those who are home schooled, will be assigned a proxy grade point average of 3.30, based on the average high school GPA of unduplicated applicants in Fiscal Year 2003 who had graduated from high school in 2002. Institutions may not use this option when high school performance data are available but not provided by the student.

**Table 1. EQUIPERCENTILE DISTRIBUTION BASED ON FY2003 DATA - HS GRADS 2002  
N=12,553**

<b>ACT</b>	<b>Percentile</b>	<b>Matching SAT</b>	<b>Previously Assigned SAT</b>	<b>STINDEX</b>	<b>Previous STINDEX</b>
11	0.0%	400-490	400-590	30	23
12	0.1%	500-540	600-620	32	26
13	0.2%	550-600	630-660	34	27
14	0.7%	610-680	670-720	36	31
15	1.4%	690-740	730	38	32
16	2.8%	750-790	740-760	40	34
17	4.9%	800-830	770-820	42	37
18	7.8%	840-870	830-850	44	38
19	12.2%	880-920	860-900	46	41
20	17.1%	930-960	910-930	48	42
21	23.8%	970-1000	940-990	50	45
22	31.4%	1010-1040	1000-1020	53	47
23	40.0%	1050-1070	1030-1050	55	48
24	49.2%	1080-1110	1060-1080	57	50
25	58.4%	1120-1150	1090-1120	59	52
26	66.9%	1160-1190	1130-1160	61	54
27	75.2%	1200-1230	1170-1190	63	56
28	82.4%	1240-1270	1200-1230	65	59
29	87.9%	1280-1300	1240-1270	67	61
30	92.6%	1310-1340	1280-1310	69	64
31	95.8%	1350-1390	1320-1370	71	67
32	97.6%	1400-1430	1380-1410	73	70
33	99.0%	1440-1480	1420-1510	75	74
34	99.8%	1490-1540	1520-1560	78	79
35	100.0%	1550-1590	1570-1590	80	83
36	100.0%	1600	1600	82	86

**Table 2. EQUIPERCENTILE DISTRIBUTION BASED ON FY2003 DATA - HS GRADS 2002**  
**N=31,919**

<b>HS GPA</b>	<b>Percentile</b>	<b>Matching Rank</b>	<b>Previously Assigned Rank</b>	<b>HSINDEX</b>	<b>Previous HSINDEX</b>
LO - 1.3	0.1%	0-1	.1-3.0	15	19
1.4-1.5	0.3%	2-3	3.1-6.0	19	23
1.6	0.6%	4	6.1-8.0	21	25
1.7	1.0%	5-6	8.1-10.0	22	27
1.8	1.4%	7-8	10.1-14.0	24	29
1.9	2.1%	9-10	14.1-17.0	26	30
2.0	3.0%	11-12	17.1-21.0	28	32
2.1	4.3%	13-15	21.1-26.0	30	34
2.2	5.9%	16-18	26.1-30.0	31	36
2.3	7.9%	19-22	30.1-36.0	33	38
2.4	10.2%	23-26	36.1-40.0	35	39
2.5	12.8%	27-30	40.1-46.0	37	41
2.6	15.9%	31-34	46.1-51.0	39	42
2.7	19.2%	35-38	51.1-56.0	40	44
2.8	23.2%	39-43	56.1-61.0	42	45
2.9	27.7%	44-48	61.1-66.0	44	47
3.0	32.8%	49-53	66.1-70.0	46	48
3.1	38.2%	54-58	70.1-75.0	48	50
3.2	43.8%	59-62	75.1-79.0	49	51
3.3	49.7%	63-67	79.1-82.0	51	53
3.4	55.9%	68-72	82.1-86.0	53	55
3.5	62.3%	73-76	86.1-89.0	55	56
3.6	68.8%	77-81	89.1-91.0	57	58
3.7	75.1%	82-85	91.1-93.0	58	60
3.8	81.6%	86-89	93.1-96.0	60	62
3.9	87.5%	90-92	96.1-98.0	62	65
4.0	100.0%	93-100	98.1-99.9	64	68

Table 3. ACT/SAT CONVERSION TABLE FROM FY 2003 DATA

ACT			SAT EQUIVALENTS TO ACT VALUES			
SCORES	FREQ	CUM FREQ	LOW	HIGH	FREQ	CUM FREQ
4	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	0	0	0	0	0	0
10	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	2	2	400	490	5	5
12	8	10	500	540	5	10
13	25	35	550	600	21	31
14	55	90	610	680	55	86
15	91	181	690	740	102	188
16	176	357	750	790	198	386
17	257	614	800	830	217	603
18	360	974	840	870	337	940
19	556	1,530	880	920	623	1,563
20	611	2,141	930	960	686	2,249
21	841	2,982	970	1000	818	3,067
22	957	3,939	1010	1040	1,000	4,067
23	1,080	5,019	1050	1070	832	4,899
24	1,162	6,181	1080	1110	1,184	6,083
25	1,146	7,327	1120	1150	1,144	7,227
26	1,071	8,398	1160	1190	1,193	8,420
27	1,048	9,446	1200	1230	1,057	9,477
28	903	10,349	1240	1270	939	10,416
29	690	11,039	1280	1300	582	10,998
30	582	11,621	1310	1340	585	11,583
31	404	12,025	1350	1390	459	12,042
32	228	12,253	1400	1430	237	12,279
33	174	12,427	1440	1480	166	12,445
34	95	12,522	1490	1540	82	12,527
35	28	12,550	1550	1590	19	12,546
36	3	12,553	1600	1600	7	12,553

Table 4. GPA/RANK CONVERSION TABLE FROM FY 2003 DATA

HS GPA			RANK EQUIVALENTS TO GPA VALUES			
SCORES	FREQ	CUM FREQ	LOW	HIGH	FREQ	CUM FREQ
0.1	0	0	0	0	0	0
0.2	0	0	0	0	0	0
0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
0.4	0	0	0	0	0	0
0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0
0.6	1	1	0	0	0	0
0.7	0	1	0	0	0	0
0.8	1	2	0	0	0	0
0.9	0	2	0	0	0	0
1.0	2	4	0	0	0	0
1.1	3	7	0	0	0	0
1.2	10	17	0	0	0	0
1.3	12	29	0	1	46	46
1.4	20	49	2	3	0	46
1.5	50	99	2	3	79	125
1.6	90	189	4	4	52	177
1.7	115	304	5	6	145	322
1.8	151	455	7	8	184	506
1.9	219	674	9	10	216	722
2.0	284	958	11	12	231	953
2.1	427	1,385	13	15	430	1,383
2.2	501	1,886	16	18	444	1,827
2.3	649	2,535	19	22	660	2,487
2.4	708	3,243	23	26	787	3,274
2.5	856	4,099	27	30	811	4,085
2.6	987	5,086	31	34	899	4,984
2.7	1,036	6,122	35	38	1,040	6,024
2.8	1,277	7,399	39	43	1,345	7,369
2.9	1,447	8,846	44	48	1,563	8,932
3.0	1,609	10,455	49	53	1,701	10,633
3.1	1,745	12,200	54	58	1,730	12,363
3.2	1,765	13,965	59	62	1,462	13,825
3.3	1,898	15,863	63	67	2,075	15,900
3.4	1,985	17,848	68	72	2,084	17,984
3.5	2,028	19,876	73	76	1,762	19,746
3.6	2,079	21,955	77	81	2,400	22,146
3.7	2,073	24,028	82	85	2,010	24,156
3.8	2,028	26,056	86	89	2,029	26,185
3.9	1,887	27,943	90	92	1,609	27,794
4.0	3,976	31,919	93	100	4,125	31,919

**Table 5. ADMISSION INDEX SCORES FROM  
FY 2003 DATA**

<b>Score</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Number at or above</b>	<b>Percent at or Above</b>
146	10	10	0.02%
144	48	58	0.13%
142	153	211	0.46%
140	20	231	0.50%
139	290	521	1.14%
138	24	545	1.19%
137	346	891	1.94%
136	10	901	1.97%
135	609	1,510	3.29%
133	807	2,317	5.05%
132	28	2,345	5.11%
131	853	3,198	6.97%
130	47	3,245	7.08%
129	1,071	4,316	9.41%
128	114	4,430	9.66%
127	1,182	5,612	12.24%
126	244	5,856	12.77%
125	1,243	7,099	15.48%
124	356	7,455	16.26%
123	1,249	8,704	18.98%
122	441	9,145	19.94%
121	1,212	10,357	22.59%
120	604	10,961	23.91%
119	1,101	12,062	26.31%
118	812	12,874	28.08%
117	1,045	13,919	30.36%
116	1,041	14,960	32.63%
115	790	15,750	34.35%
114	1,323	17,073	37.24%
113	676	17,749	38.71%
112	1,461	19,210	41.90%
111	501	19,711	42.99%
110	1,566	21,277	46.40%
109	393	21,670	47.26%
108	1,400	23,070	50.31%
107	744	23,814	51.94%
106	1,040	24,854	54.20%
105	970	25,824	56.32%
104	666	26,490	57.77%
103	1,177	27,667	60.34%
102	416	28,083	61.25%

**Table 5. ADMISSION INDEX SCORES FROM  
FY 2003 DATA**

<b>Score</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Number at or above</b>	<b>Percent at or Above</b>
101	1,356	29,439	64.20%
100	170	29,609	64.58%
99	1,247	30,856	67.29%
98	356	31,212	68.07%
97	963	32,175	70.17%
96	587	32,762	71.45%
95	588	33,350	72.73%
94	706	34,056	74.27%
93	381	34,437	75.10%
92	818	35,255	76.89%
91	206	35,461	77.34%
90	805	36,266	79.09%
89	278	36,544	79.70%
88	627	37,171	81.07%
87	269	37,440	81.65%
86	512	37,952	82.77%
85	307	38,259	83.44%
84	368	38,627	84.24%
83	361	38,988	85.03%
82	256	39,244	85.59%
81	341	39,585	86.33%
80	187	39,772	86.74%
79	282	40,054	87.35%
78	148	40,202	87.68%
77	250	40,452	88.22%
76	111	40,563	88.47%
75	207	40,770	88.92%
74	76	40,846	89.08%
73	145	40,991	89.40%
72	78	41,069	89.57%
71	125	41,194	89.84%
70	80	41,274	90.02%
69	124	41,398	90.29%
68	62	41,460	90.42%
67	86	41,546	90.61%
66	56	41,602	90.73%
65	68	41,670	90.88%
64	80	41,750	91.05%
63	81	41,831	91.23%
62	39	41,870	91.32%
61	89	41,959	91.51%

**Table 5. ADMISSION INDEX SCORES FROM  
FY 2003 DATA**

<b>Score</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Number at or above</b>	<b>Percent at or Above</b>
60	41	42,000	91.60%
59	88	42,088	91.79%
58	29	42,117	91.85%
57	111	42,228	92.10%
56	10	42,238	92.12%
55	111	42,349	92.36%
54	4	42,353	92.37%
53	132	42,485	92.66%
52	1	42,486	92.66%
51	45	42,531	92.76%
50	71	42,602	92.91%
49	30	42,632	92.98%
48	114	42,746	93.23%
46	115	42,861	93.48%
44	104	42,965	93.70%
42	100	43,065	93.92%
40	72	43,137	94.08%
39	33	43,170	94.15%
38	36	43,206	94.23%
37	33	43,239	94.30%
36	31	43,270	94.37%
35	23	43,293	94.42%
34	23	43,316	94.47%
33	23	43,339	94.52%
32	12	43,351	94.55%
31	17	43,368	94.58%
30	18	43,386	94.62%
28	10	43,396	94.64%
26	5	43,401	94.65%
24	5	43,406	94.67%
22	12	43,418	94.69%
21	5	43,423	94.70%
19	8	43,431	94.72%
15	4	43,435	94.73%
Missing	2,417	45,852	100.00%

**Table 6. CALCULATION OF THE CCH ADMISSION INDEX**

	SAT ACT	489-500 31-44 Bottom	500-524 540-600	610-650 680-740	650-750 750-830	750-800 830-870	800-840 870-910	840-880 910-950	880-920 950-1000	920-960 1000-1040	960-1000 1040-1070	1000-1050 1070-1110	1050-1100 1110-1150	1100-1150 1150-1190	1150-1200 1190-1230	1200-1250 1230-1270	1250-1300 1270-1310	1300-1350 1310-1350	1350-1400 1350-1390	1400-1450 1390-1440	1450-1500 1440-1490	1500-1550 1490-1540
HS Rank	HS GPA	38	31	26	21	17	13	10	6	4	3	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
6-1	2.0-2.3	45	47	51	53	55	57	59	61	63	65	68	70	72	74	76	78	80	82	84	86	88
2-3	1.4-1.5	49	51	53	55	57	59	61	63	65	67	69	71	73	75	77	79	81	83	85	87	89
4	1.6	51	53	55	57	59	61	63	65	67	69	71	73	75	77	79	81	83	85	87	89	91
5-6	1.7	52	54	56	58	60	62	64	66	68	70	72	74	76	78	80	82	84	86	88	90	92
7-8	1.8	54	56	58	60	62	64	66	68	70	72	74	76	78	80	82	84	86	88	90	92	94
9-10	1.9	56	58	60	62	64	66	68	70	72	74	76	78	80	82	84	86	88	90	92	94	96
11-12	2.0	58	60	62	64	66	68	70	72	74	76	78	80	82	84	86	88	90	92	94	96	98
13-15	2.1	60	62	64	66	68	70	72	74	76	78	80	82	84	86	88	90	92	94	96	98	100
16-18	2.2	61	63	65	67	69	71	73	75	77	79	81	83	85	87	89	91	93	95	97	99	101
19-22	2.3	63	65	67	69	71	73	75	77	79	81	83	85	87	89	91	93	95	97	99	101	103
23-26	2.4	65	67	69	71	73	75	77	79	81	83	85	87	89	91	93	95	97	99	101	103	105
27-29	2.5	67	69	71	73	75	77	79	81	83	85	87	89	91	93	95	97	99	101	103	105	107
31-34	2.6	69	71	73	75	77	79	81	83	85	87	89	91	93	95	97	99	101	103	105	107	109
35-38	2.7	70	72	74	76	78	80	82	84	86	88	90	92	94	96	98	100	102	104	106	108	110
39-43	2.8	72	74	76	78	80	82	84	86	88	90	92	94	96	98	100	102	104	106	108	110	112
44-48	2.9	74	76	78	80	82	84	86	88	90	92	94	96	98	100	102	104	106	108	110	112	114
49-53	3.0	76	78	80	82	84	86	88	90	92	94	96	98	100	102	104	106	108	110	112	114	116
54-58	3.1	78	80	82	84	86	88	90	92	94	96	98	100	102	104	106	108	110	112	114	116	118
59-62	3.2	80	82	84	86	88	90	92	94	96	98	100	102	104	106	108	110	112	114	116	118	120
63-67	3.3	81	83	85	87	89	91	93	95	97	99	101	103	105	107	109	111	113	115	117	119	121
68-72	3.4	83	85	87	89	91	93	95	97	99	101	103	105	107	109	111	113	115	117	119	121	123
73-76	3.5	85	87	89	91	93	95	97	99	101	103	105	107	109	111	113	115	117	119	121	123	125
77-81	3.6	87	89	91	93	95	97	99	101	103	105	107	109	111	113	115	117	119	121	123	125	127
82-85	3.7	89	91	93	95	97	99	101	103	105	107	109	111	113	115	117	119	121	123	125	127	129
86-89	3.8	90	92	94	96	98	100	102	104	106	108	110	112	114	116	118	120	122	124	126	128	130
90-92	3.9	92	94	96	98	100	102	104	106	108	110	112	114	116	118	120	122	124	126	128	130	132
93-100	4.0	94	96	98	100	102	104	106	108	110	112	114	116	118	120	122	124	126	128	130	132	134

**TOPIC:                   FY 2004-2005 OPERATING BUDGET REQUEST TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

**PREPARED BY:       BRIDGET MULLEN AND RICH SCHWEIGERT**

**I.       SUMMARY**

This item represents the staff recommendations to the Commission for its FY 2004-2005 operating budget request, which is due to the General Assembly on November 1, 2003. In addition, the Commission should be aware that the Office of State Planning and Budgeting (OSPB) has recently revised its assumptions about the expected Denver-Boulder CPI for FY 2004-05. OSPB is now projecting a 2.1 percent revised down from 2.8 percent. A number of budget requests presented in this document use the Denver-Boulder CPI as the basis for the requested increases. Any further revisions to the Denver-Boulder CPI estimates by OSPB will alter the increases requested in this budget document.

**II.      BACKGROUND**

According to sections 23-1-105 (2) and (3), CRS, the Commission has the responsibility and authority to develop a comprehensive annual budget recommendation from the state's colleges and universities to the Governor's office and the Joint Budget Committee (JBC) of the General Assembly. This recommendation is due to the JBC on November 1 of each year, in advance of the upcoming fiscal year that begins July 1.

This agenda item lists all of the decision items developed by Commission staff, any base adjustments, and requests for new funding submitted by the state-supported institutions of higher education. Additionally, this item includes recommendations from CCHE staff as to whether the Commission should support, reject, or modify decision items in its November 1 budget submission.

**III.     STAFF ANALYSIS**

**1.      Financial Aid**

**Summary of Request:**

For FY 2005, the Colorado Commission on Higher Education is requesting \$29.2 million in additional General Funds for the state's need-based, merit-based, work-study and categorical financial aid programs. Due to the significant decrease in state

revenues in FY 2003, during their last legislative session, the General Assembly reduced General Fund support for financial aid by \$15 million, from \$91 million to \$76 million. Without a dramatic increase in state support in the upcoming fiscal year, access to Colorado’s public institutions will be significantly reduced especially for residents with lower incomes. The Commission has made access to higher education a priority. The FY 2005 request includes restoration of financial aid to FY 2003 appropriation levels, a 2.1 percent inflationary increase and an 8 percent increase for need, merit and work-study to offset increases in resident tuition. The table below details FY 2003 and FY 2004 appropriations and the FY 2005 funding request for all state-supported student financial aid programs.

<b>Financial Aid Program</b>	<b>FY 2003 Appropriation</b>	<b>FY 2004 Appropriation</b>	<b>FY 2005 Request</b>	<b>% Change FY 04 to 05</b>
<b>Need-Based</b>	\$43,550,101	\$38,002,682	\$47,701,515	26%
<b>GOS</b>	\$8,000,000	\$8,000,000	\$16,168,000	102%
<b>Merit-Based</b>	\$14,874,498	\$6,877,309	\$16,164,258	135%
<b>Work-Study</b>	\$16,612,357	\$15,030,062	\$16,927,988	13%
<b>Categorical</b>	\$7,983,044	\$8,230,701	\$8,355,509	2%
<b>Total</b>	\$91,020,000	\$76,140,754	\$105,317,270	38%

**Staff Recommendation:**

Staff recommends **approval** of the request for a \$29.2 million increase in state-funded student financial aid programs as outlined above. The restoration of student aid levels as well as an increase in funding to offset tuition and inflationary increases will allow the CCHE to continue to expand educational opportunities for Coloradans who might otherwise not pursue a postsecondary education.

**2. Enrollment Funding**

**Summary of Request:**

For FY 2005, the CCHE is requesting \$26,937,367 in General Fund support for enrollment funding at Colorado’s institutions of higher education. The majority of the funding initiative, \$25,033,000, is requested as the first phase of a three-year funding initiative to catch-up funding for currently unfunded resident enrollments and for future expected resident enrollment growth. In the past, the General Assembly has funded institutions based upon inflation and enrollment growth. For the past two years, General Fund support for enrollment growth is lagging by more than \$44 million and is estimated to be more than \$68 million at the end of FY 2005. Resident student enrollment projections through FY 2007 show that higher education

campuses will grow by almost 6.5 percent. Coupled with 14 percent growth over the last three fiscal years, higher education resident enrollment will have expanded by more than 20 percent by FY 2007. It is imperative that we begin to catch-up funding for this growth.

In addition, annual inflationary increases in General Fund support are provided to the Colorado State University - Veterinary Medicine program, the three extension agencies within the CSU system (Cooperative Extension, Agricultural Experiment Station and the Colorado State Forest Service) and the University of Colorado – Health Sciences Center. The annual inflationary increase is given in place of operational increases received through performance funding and enrollment funding because of capped enrollments at the CSU – Veterinary Medicine school and at the University of Colorado – Health Sciences Center and no student enrollment at the CSU extension agencies. For FY 2005, the CCHE is requesting \$1,904,367 in General Fund support for these high-cost programs. This amount is based on current inflationary estimates and will be amended upon further revisions to the Denver-Boulder CPI for FY 2005.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Staff recommends **approval** of the request for an increase of \$26,937,367 General Fund for projected enrollment funding and an inflationary increase for high-cost programs at Colorado State University and the University of Colorado – Health Sciences Center. The budget reductions from the past two fiscal years coupled with the unfunded enrollment growth are challenging the schools' infrastructure. At some point, tuition and fees will not cover the marginal costs of educating an additional resident student and enrollments will be forced to slow down to meet fiscal realities. The multi-year request provides funding flexibility and allows both the Executive and Legislative branches the opportunity to incorporate higher education enrollment funding demands into future budget projections.

**3. Funding for Area Vocational Schools**

**Summary of Request:**

There are four area vocational schools in the state and while each school is affiliated with a local school district, the schools' primary mission is postsecondary vocational training. These institutions are the primary provider of adult postsecondary vocational and technical training. The General Fund support these institutions receive is their primary source of funding. Historically, the state has provided support for the area vocational schools through incremental increases based on inflation. Over the past two fiscal years, the area vocational schools have experienced a 28 percent

decrease in state support while maintaining student enrollments. For FY 2004, a 2.1 percent inflationary increase for the four area vocational schools totals \$178,616. This amount is based on current inflationary estimates and will be amended upon further revisions to the estimated Denver-Boulder CPI for FY 2005.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Staff recommends **approval** of the estimated 2.1 percent inflationary increase for the four area vocational schools in Colorado.

**4. Funding for the Colorado School of Mines**

**Summary of Request:**

With the establishment of the Colorado Compact Institution Program in 2001, the Colorado School of Mines negotiated an institutional performance agreement with the state. As a result of this agreement, the Colorado School of Mines receives a block grant of General Fund plus an annual inflationary adjustment to the grant as measured by the Denver-Boulder CPI. The estimated funding increase for FY 2005 is \$360,948. This amount is based on current inflationary estimates and will be amended upon further revisions to the estimated Denver-Boulder CPI for FY 2005.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Staff recommends **approval** of the estimated 2.1 percent inflationary General Fund increase for the Colorado School of Mines pursuant to the performance agreement signed February 2002 between the Trustees of the Colorado School of Mines and the Colorado Commission on Higher Education.

**5. Performance Funding**

**Summary of Request:**

For FY 2005, the CCHE is requesting \$8,403,309 in General Funds to support an estimated 2.1 percent performance-based funding increase to participating institutions of higher education. The 2.1 percent increase is based on the estimated Denver-Boulder CPI for FY 2005 and calculated from the FY 2004 adjusted funding base. Any revisions to the CPI estimate may result in a revision to the performance funding request. Appropriations received for performance funding are distributed among the institutions based on their Quality Indicator System (QIS) scores. CCHE staff and the governing boards have developed a number of performance indicators and statewide goals ranging from faculty productivity measures to graduation rates and

persistence of new students in continuing their education. The table below shows the proposed FY 2005 performance funding allocation by governing board.

<b>Governing Board</b>	<b>Performance Funding</b>
University of Colorado	\$2,168,894
Colorado State University System	\$1,646,208
Colorado School of Mines	N/A
University of Northern Colorado	\$690,752
Fort Lewis College	\$142,856
State Colleges	\$568,904
Metropolitan State College	\$766,382
Community Colleges of Colorado	\$2,227,717
Local District Junior Colleges	\$191,595

**Staff Recommendation:**

Staff recommends approval of the FY 2005 performance-funding request. The performance funding mechanism seeks to promote accountability and provides incentives to encourage institutions to achieve a level of service that meets the expectations of Colorado students, parents, taxpayers and legislators.

**6. Colorado State University Agencies – General Fund Enhancement**

**Summary of Request:**

As the state's land grant university, Colorado State University conducts research through its three agencies: Cooperative Extension, the Agricultural Experiment Station and the Colorado State Forest Service. These agencies conduct problem-solving research on issues that affect rural Colorado, agriculture and natural resource conservation and development. Historically, funding to the agencies has been dependent on the overall General Fund increase appropriated to Higher Education. CSU is requesting \$2 million in General Fund support for the three agencies for FY 2005. The request contains eight separate funding initiatives.

**Staff Recommendation:**

After review of all the funding initiatives presented by the CSU agencies, staff recommends **approval** of \$1 million increased General Fund support for the following CSU agencies initiatives:

- **\$400,000** to support **water issues** in Colorado – water supply, conservation and quality; drought; water use in agricultural and urban environments.

- **\$200,000 for food safety initiatives** – strategies to detect and prevent problems from food-borne illnesses.
- **\$300,000 for fire management coordination** – Coordination among local, state and federal entities in responding to wildfires.
- **\$100,000 to support fuel mitigation** – Reduce wildfire hazards by reducing fuels.

These programs will help to answer important questions and provide solutions to a number of issues facing Colorado including water quantity and quality, food safety and fire management.

## 7. **Additional Cash Funds Spending Authority for Governing Boards**

### **Summary of Request:**

Cash fund spending authority allows for the collection and receipt of tuition and fee revenues. Annually the Commission requests additional cash spending authority for changes in inflation and enrollment. Inflationary adjustments allow institutions to keep pace with changes in the Denver-Boulder CPI. Student enrollment is also a factor in determining the institutions' cash appropriations because as enrollment increased additional cash spending authority is necessary for the collection of the additional revenue. The amount of \$51,078,605 Cash Funds is requested as a preliminary estimate for additional FY 2005 cash fund spending authority for the universities and colleges. The projected increases for resident and non-resident tuition revenue, other than tuition revenue and non-exempt auxiliary revenue are based on an estimated 2.1 percent inflationary increase and enrollment increases of 5.2 percent for residents and 2.0 percent for non-residents. The request also incorporates a 4.2 percent resident and non-resident tuition increase for the Colorado School of Mines.

In addition to the inflationary increase requested above, the Commission is asking for an increase in the Enrollment/Cash Funds Contingency line of \$30 million. Annually, the Governor and the General Assembly receive requests from the institutions, recommended by the CCHE, for additional cash spending authority for various tuition initiatives above inflation. Last year, the Commission approved differential tuition initiatives for the University of Colorado – Boulder and University of Colorado – Health Sciences Center. This year, schools across the system have submitted more than fifteen different requests.

### **Staff Recommendation:**

Staff recommends **approval** of the increase in additional cash spending authority for Governing Boards equal to \$51,087,605. This figure is a preliminary estimate and may need to be revised based on changes in enrollment or inflation.

Staff also recommends **approval** to request an increase of CCHE's Enrollment/Cash Funds Contingency line of \$30 million, to allow the Commission to evaluate and streamline the approval process of various tuition initiatives at the public institutions. Providing the Commission with the flexibility to enter into negotiations with institutions on the financial need proposed in tuition differential decision items will help both the schools and consumers. The Commission is well situated to understand the financial needs of an institution while balancing the need to keep tuition costs affordable for Colorado citizens. With an increase in the contingency funding line in the department, multiple decision items for tuition differentials will not have to be forwarded to the legislature for consideration. Increases in tuition can be handled by the Commission and approved or denied following adoption of the long bill when tuition requests can reflect General Fund appropriations. Schools will then seek Commission approval, to use spending authority from the contingency line to cover revenues generated by higher tuition.

**8. Provide Matching State Funds to Meet Federal Requirements of the Carl Perkins Act**

**Summary of Request:**

The State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education is responsible for the supervision of all occupational programs in the state. The board receives funding from both the state, through the Colorado Vocational Act, and the federal government, through the Carl Perkins Act, to implement and support vocational programs throughout the state. The programs focus on competency-based applied learning and occupational-specific skills. To continue to receive the federal funding from the Carl Perkins Act, the state is required to match the award by 5 percent. Current appropriations do not meet this matching requirement.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Staff **does not recommend** approval of the additional General Fund support dedicated to the Administrative Cost line of the Colorado Vocational Act equal to the required 5 percent federal match for the Carl Perkins Act. Given the limited growth in General Fund spending for FY 2004, staff believe that priorities should be given to fund student enrollment and that additional administrative spending is not prudent at this time. The additional funding necessary to meet these requirements for FY 2005 is \$231,772 and since the Colorado Vocational Act supports both secondary and

postsecondary enrollments, perhaps funding within the K-12 system or Amendment 23 revenue could be used to meet the additional federal match requirement.

**9. Increased Funding for the Colorado Vocational Act**

**Summary of Request:**

The annual appropriation for the Colorado Vocational Act is used to help school districts offset the relatively high cost of offering vocational programs. The State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education is responsible for the supervision of all occupational programs in the state both secondary and postsecondary and thus receives the annual appropriation. While the Colorado Vocational Act prescribes a formula for calculating eligible cost reimbursement to school districts, the state has never fully funded the total eligible reimbursement. The SBCCOE is asking for additional funding from Cash Funds Exempt funds to fully fund the total eligible reimbursement to the school districts in the amount of \$1,098,060.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Staff **recommends** an increase in Cash Funds Exempt support for the Colorado Vocational Act to reimburse the state's school districts. In their request for additional funds, data presented by SBCCOE show that secondary vocational programs have increased from 1,018 in FY 1998 to 1,284 in FY 2002 (the latest data available at this time) and secondary vocational enrollment has increased by 9,391 or a 12.7 percent increase in headcount during that same time period. In addition, performance reports indicate that of the students who have participated in vocational programs and actively sought jobs within their vocations, 79 percent obtained positions in fields related to their training. Given that participation in vocational programs has increased over recent years, an increase in funding would ensure that high quality vocational education programs continue to be available to all secondary and postsecondary students who want, need and can benefit from participating such vocational programs.

**10. Provide Additional General Fund Support for High Cost Programs Offered at Institutions within the State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education**

**Summary of Request:**

The Community Colleges of Colorado System is requesting a one-time General Fund adjustment to help offset the high costs of operating nursing programs. The increased support would enable the system to expand current nursing programs. Although nursing FTE has not grown significantly at Colorado's community colleges over the last three years due to enrollment caps caused by the inability of colleges to support additional growth due to the cost/revenue differential, many colleges have large waiting lists for qualified nursing applicants. With an additional \$2.4 million in General and Cash funds, the system estimates that they can expand nursing enrollment by 231 resident FTE, or 20 percent above the FY 2002 actual resident FTE. From the additional \$2.4 million, \$0.45 million will be generated from tuition revenue and \$1.95 million from additional General Fund support.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Staff **does not recommend** a General Fund base adjustment for specific high cost academic programs. From a policy perspective, all institutions offer a mix of low, medium and high cost academic programs and the General Fund rate per FTE represents that mix of costs. In addition, nursing enrollments as a percentage of total enrollments at the community colleges is small, representing less than 5 percent of the student population.

Staff does recommend that the Community College System further study the increased marginal costs of operating high cost programs and, in the absence of General Fund, determine if a tuition differential would be appropriate to offset these additional costs.

**11. Tuition Relief for the Community Colleges of Colorado**

**Summary of Request:**

Beginning in FY 2005, the Community Colleges of Colorado are seeking a reduction in tuition rates charged to resident students and an increase in General Fund subsidy per resident FTE to offset the loss of cash revenue. The board is proposing a five-year phase-in of the tuition reduction. The recommendation is to reduce the share of total instructional costs paid by resident students to no more than 30 percent over a five-year period. This change would require a reduction in resident tuition rates of

approximately \$14.30 per credit hour. Total savings to a full-time student would be \$429 per year at the end of the five-year phase-in. In return for the loss of cash revenue, the board is seeking almost \$18.0 million in General Fund support. Year one of the proposal would require \$2.5 million in General Fund to offset lost tuition revenues as a result of the buy down.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Staff **does not recommend** the tuition relief proposal at this time. Although Colorado ranks 17<sup>th</sup> nationally for community college resident full-time tuition and mandatory student fee rates and exceeds the national average by \$160, a majority of students enrolling at the Community Colleges are part-time. The system claims that without a “buy down” of resident tuition access to its institutions will continue to hamper access. The exact opposite is happening. Resident enrollments at the community colleges has increased by nearly 17 percent over the past two fiscal years, significantly exceeding enrollments at all other public institutions of higher education, including the local district schools which serve as a primary competitor. Given the current statewide budget situation and lack of available General Funds for FY 2005, staff believes that a tuition buy down is not appropriate at this time.

**12. University of Northern Colorado – Tuition and Fee Restructuring**

**Summary of Request:**

The University of Northern Colorado is requesting approval to integrate the technology fee, academic program fee and a portion of the student activity fee currently charged to students as a portion of mandatory student fees into the institution’s base tuition rate. By reclassifying the student fees to tuition, the institutions’ “Other Than Tuition” appropriation will be decreased and their “Tuition” appropriation will be increased by \$2 million in FY 2005. There will not be an increase in the amount a student pays to the institution rather a reclassification of current charges. The institution believes that the proposal will make the cost of education clearer to students and parents and at the same time simplify the university’s cost structure. If approved, mandatory student fees and base tuition increases would change by the following amounts.

FY 2004 Full-Time Resident and Non-Resident Tuition and Fees

Tuition	Resident Undergraduate	Non-Resident Undergraduate	Resident Graduate	Non-Resident Graduate
Current Tuition	\$2,520	\$11,646	\$2,980	\$12,396
Proposed Tuition	\$2,733	\$11,859	\$3,193	\$12,609
Current Fee Total	\$722	\$722	\$722	\$722
Proposed Fee Total	\$509	\$509	\$509	\$509
\$ Change Tuition	\$213	\$213	\$213	\$213
% Change Tuition	8.5%	1.8%	7.1%	1.7%
\$ Change Fees	(\$213)	(\$213)	(\$213)	(\$213)
% Change Fees	(30%)	(30%)	(30%)	(30%)

**Staff Recommendation:**

Staff recommends **approval** of the proposed student fee reclassification.

**IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

**That the Commission accepts the staff recommendations for the FY 2004-2005 operating budget request to the General Assembly.**

## Appendix A

### STATUTORY AUTHORITY

23-1-105, CRS The commission shall prescribe uniform financial reporting policies, including policies for counting and classifying full-time equivalent students, for the institutions and governing boards within the state-supported system of higher education.

(2) The commission shall make annual system wide funding recommendations, after consultation with the governing boards of institutions, for the state-supported institutions of higher education to the general assembly and the governor. In making its recommendations, the commission shall consider each governing board's and each institution's level of achievement of the statewide expectations and goals specified in section [23-13-104](#), as measured by data collected through the quality indicator system established in section [23-13-105](#).

(3) The commission shall establish, after consultation with the governing boards of institutions, the distribution formula of general fund appropriations and the distribution formula of appropriations of cash funds received as tuition income by the general assembly to each governing board under the following principles:

- (a) To reflect the different roles and missions of institutions, consistent with legislative intent;
- (b) To reflect institutional costs which are fixed and those which vary, based upon the character of programs and the number of students enrolled;
- (c) To reflect an emphasis on decentralized financial decision-making and stability of funding;
- (d) To reflect the governing board's and the institution's level of achievement of the statewide expectations and goals specified in section [23-13-104](#), as measured by data from the quality indicator system established pursuant to section [23-13-105](#).

(3.5) Repealed.

(3.7) (a) For fiscal year 1999-2000 and for fiscal years thereafter, the commission, in collaboration with the governor, the speaker of the house of representatives, the president of the senate, the majority and minority leaders of the house of representatives and the senate, the chairpersons of the education committees of the house of representatives and the senate, and the joint budget committee may recommend that the general assembly appropriate moneys to provide incentives and rewards to those state-supported institutions of higher education that have achieved or are making satisfactory progress toward achieving the statewide expectations and goals specified in section [23-13-104](#). The group shall base its recommendation on data collected through the quality indicator system and annually reported pursuant to section [23-13-105](#). Any moneys appropriated pursuant to this subsection (3.7) shall be in addition to any moneys that may be appropriated as base funding.

(b) The commission shall distribute any moneys appropriated pursuant to this subsection (3.7) to each governing board based on the level of achievement of the statewide expectations and goals specified in section [23-13-104](#) by the institutions managed by each governing board, as measured by data received through the quality indicator system established in section [23-13-105](#). Moneys appropriated under this subsection (3.7) shall be included in the general appropriations bill in the line item appropriation for each governing board with a lettered note explanation of the percentage appropriated pursuant to this subsection (3.7).

(c) Beginning with the recommendations made by the commission for fiscal year 2000-01, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the commission shall make a recommendation to the joint budget committee concerning whether an amount equal to or less than the amount appropriated to a governing board under this subsection (3.7) for the previous fiscal year should be included to increase the amount appropriated to the governing board as base funding for the coming fiscal year.

(4) The commission may seek, receive, and disburse federal, state, and private grants, gifts, and trusts for statewide or multiinstitutional purposes.

(5) The commission, after consultation with the governing boards of institutions, shall establish policies for the public system of higher education for determining student residency status for tuition classification purposes within statutory guidelines established in article 7 of this title.

(6) and (7) Repealed.

(8) The funding recommendations made by the commission for state-supported institutions of higher education pursuant to subsection (2) of this section and by the executive director for the divisions of the department of higher education and for programs pursuant to subsection (6) of this section shall be made to the governor and the general assembly as a part of the budget request for the department of higher education and shall be submitted in accordance with the budget procedures of part 3 of article 37 of title 24, C.R.S., and in conformance with section [24-75-201.1](#), C.R.S.

(9) to (11) Repealed.

**TOPIC: PRIORITIZATION OF CAPITAL PROJECTS FY 04-05**

**PREPARED BY: JOAN JOHNSON/GAIL HOFFMAN**

**I. SUMMARY**

The availability of funds for capital construction in the state of Colorado, either in higher education or in other state agencies, is bleak for the second year in a row. CCHE received a total of 44 capital construction requests; 10 of those requests were for projects with state funding. As we requested institutions and governing boards limit what they sent forward only to health and life/safety issues only, the CCHE capital assets staff is recommending that 8 of those 10 projects be forwarded to the Legislature's Capital Development Committee for possible inclusion in the FY 04-05 budget. The total amount of state funding requested for these eight projects is \$15,929,035 for FY 04-05. Out-year costs in state funds are \$14,203,691.

**II. BACKGROUND**

In FY 2001-02, the Legislature's Long Appropriation Bill included a total of \$273.8 million for higher education capital construction and controlled maintenance projects. \$159.7 million was in state funds, \$18.7 million in cash funds, \$92.4 million in cash funds exempt and \$3 million in federal funds. After rescissions, the state ended up spending a total of \$62 million in state funds for the fiscal year.

For FY 02-03, the Legislature budgeted \$11 million in state funds and \$84.5 million in cash funds for higher education capital and controlled maintenance projects. For the current fiscal year, FY 03-04, only \$519,779 in state funds (CSM – Green Center, Phase I, A&E) was included in the Long Bill for higher education capital projects. This was the only project, other than the “no choice” ones, which was funded in this year's budget. \$363.3 million in cash funds exempt for higher education capital projects was also part of the budget approved by the Legislature.

**III. STAFF ANALYSIS**

The various facilities staffs at all the Colorado higher education institutions, as well as the 11 governing boards, made sincere attempts this summer to take a long, hard look at their capital needs and to only forward to CCHE the projects which met the health and life/safety criteria. There are two projects forwarded by the CU system which the capital assets staff does not believe meet the above criteria for inclusion on a prioritized list.

The two CU system projects are the Law School at CU/Boulder and a new Science/Engineering Building at the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs (UCCS). Although we said in our instructions to the institutions that **loss of accreditation** could be considered in the health and life/safety category, the CCHE capital assets staff does not believe the CU Law School is in any danger of losing its accreditation by the American Bar Association if it doesn't build a new building right now. The American Bar Association told us that, to the best of their knowledge, no law school had ever lost its accreditation because of facility concerns.

In addition, David Getches, CU law school's new dean, told the *Colorado Daily* on August 1, 2003: "... the law school's accreditation is watertight and that he has little fear of it being removed."

We asked the staff of State Buildings to do an assessment of the Fleming Law Building and they reported the building had a FCI (Facility Condition Index) of 85 (which is good). There continue to be problems with the library (as there have been since 1996 when the subject of building a new law school building first came up). However, the building is in relatively good shape, the mechanical systems are in good working order and, generally speaking, the building is sound. In addition, CU has indicated it does not intend to demolish the Fleming Law Building once a new facility is built but will renovate it for use by either the Law School or other programs on the CU/Boulder campus.

One aside on the Law School building is that the total state funds requested for the building are \$21,172,574 – \$1.17 million over the \$20 million cap in state funds the Commission placed on the project on August 28, 2002. It also should be noted that the Law School building received a prior appropriation of \$1,542,347 in state funds, which has already been spent and should be credited to the cost of completing the project when it resumes.

The new Science/Engineering Building at the UCCS campus has a cost of \$45 million - \$22.5 million in state funds and \$22.5 million in cash funds. Although the Board of Regents has approved the program plan, CCHE capital assets staff did not receive the program plan until September 16. The Regents did not approve the financing plan for the building until September 18, and we understand that UCCS has revised its thinking and is planning on a multi-phase project with Phase I being totally cash funded. We will be bringing this and other cash-funded program plans to the Commission for action at the November 2003 meeting.

Projects received that the Commission has reviewed before include:

- Colorado School of Mines – Green Center Project, Phase II (program plan approval needed for Phase II) - \$6,597,268 (construction and final phase). See [Attachment A](#) for a review of Phase II.

- CSU-Pueblo – H.P.E.R. Renovation (the Massari Gym, etc.), Phase I - \$2,209,315 Out-year costs: \$8,109,206
- UNC – Building/Infrastructure Renewal Project - \$635,825, Phase I; out-year costs: \$6,084,485
- CSU – Regulated Materials Handling Facility - \$2,491,304 (program plan approval needed). See [Attachment B](#) for staff review.
- Aurora Community College – Telephone Switch & Life Safety Upgrades - \$245,100
- Community College of Aurora – Campus Maintenance Facility - \$116,051

New projects to be prioritized include:

- CSU – Veterinary Hospital Mechanical & Fire Sprinklers - \$3,225,172 (program plan approval needed). [Attachment C](#) is the staff review of this building renewal project.
- Lowry – Asbestos Removal - \$400,000 (program plan waiver needs approval). [Attachment D](#) is a discussion of the program plan waiver request.

[Attachment E](#) is the list of prioritized projects, with a brief description of each.

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

**That the Commission approves the program plans and waivers for the following projects:**

- 1. Colorado School of Mines – Green Center, Phase II**
- 2. CSU – Regulated Materials Handling Facility**
- 3. CSU – Veterinary Hospital Mechanical & Fire Sprinklers**
- 4. Lowry – Asbestos Removal (waiver); and**

**That the Commission forward the following projects in priority order to the Legislature’s Capital Development Committee for funding consideration in FY 04-05:**

- 1. Colorado School of Mines – Green Center – Phase II: \$6,597,268;**
- 2. CSU – Pueblo – H.P.E.R. Renovation – Phase I: \$2,209,315**
- 3. UNC – Building/Infrastructure Renewal Project – Phase I: \$635,825**
- 4. CSU – Regulated Materials Handling Facility - \$2,491,304**
- 5. Arapahoe Community College – Telephone Switch & Life Safety Upgrades - \$245,100**

6. **Community College of Aurora – Campus Maintenance Facility, \$116,051**
7. **Lowry – Asbestos Removal - \$400,000**
8. **CSU – Veterinary Hospital Mechanical & Fire Sprinklers, \$3,225,172**

**TOTAL FUNDING: \$15,920,035 and**

**That the Commission urges Colorado State University to explore alternative methods of funding their proposed Regulated Materials Handling Facility, as we believe this is a very important project that should not be delayed.**

**Appendix A**

**STATUTORY AUTHORITY**

(23-1-106(1), C.R.S.) It is declared to be the policy of the general assembly not to authorize or to acquire sites or initiate any program or activity requiring capital construction for state-supported institutions of higher education unless approved by the commission.

(6) The commission shall request, annually, from each governing board a five-year projection of capital development projects. Such projection shall include the estimated cost, the method of funding, a schedule for project completion, and the governing board-approved priority for each project. The commission shall determine whether a proposed project is consistent with role and mission and master planning of the institution and conforms to standards recommended by the commission.

(7) (A) The commission annually shall establish a unified five-year capital improvements program coordinated with education plans and shall transmit to the office of state planning and budgeting, the governor, and the general assembly, consistent with the executive budget timetable, a recommended priority of funding of capital construction projects for the system of public higher education. The commission shall annually transmit the recommended priority of funding of capital construction projects to the capital development committee no later than November 1 of each year.

(b) Except as provided in subsection (5) of this section, it is the policy of the general assembly to appropriate funds only for projects approved by the commission.

**PROGRAM PLAN EVALUATION FY 2004-05**  
**Colorado Commission on Higher Education**

<b>Project:</b> Green Center – Decontamination and Repair Project, Phases 1 and 2 (Computer Center Addition to Center for Technology and Learning Media -CTLM)	<b>Institution:</b> Colorado School of Mines
<b>Original Submittal Date:</b> February 25, 2002	<b>Revision Date:</b> August 2003 Budget documents only; update on progress toward fulfilling CCHE condition given to CCHE at about same time.
<b>Total Project Cost:</b> \$7,117,047	<b>Total Square Footage</b>
<b>Anticipated Project Completion Date:</b> August 2005	<b>New Construction:</b> 19,758 gross square feet (gsf) <b>Remodel:</b> 1,800 gsf
<b>Total Construction Cost:</b> \$5,470,410	<b>Cost per Square Foot</b>
<b>New Construction:</b> \$4,236,760	<b>New Construction:</b> \$214.43 gsf
<b>Remodel:</b> \$198,000	<b>Remodel:</b> \$110 gsf
<b>Purpose Code:</b> E-1	

**Phased Funding:**

	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007- 08	Total
CCFE	\$519,779	\$6,597,268				\$7,117,047
CF						
CFE						
FF						
Total	\$519,779	\$6,597,268				\$7,117,047

**EVALUATION****Project Description:**

Colorado School of Mines received from CCHE and the General Assembly approval to proceed with the design of a new addition to the Center for Technology and Learning Media in FY 2003-2004 for the Computing and Networking Center, now located on the top second floor of the Green Center. CCHE attached the condition that no money would be appropriated for actual construction until the School of Mines submitted a plan for overall renovation of the Green Center. Therefore, only architectural and engineering money was released to School of Mines, and Mines is now seeking an appropriation to actually build the addition.

An addition for the Computing and Networking Center is the first step in an overall plan to remove asbestos and repair the roof of the Green Center. All data and telephone service, including emergency 911 service, emanates from the Computing and Networking Center. In order to repair and replace the roof, however, the computer center must be moved to a permanent location. Because asbestos is extensive below the roof, consultants recommend that demolition of all interior construction and asbestos abatement precede roof replacement. Portions of the roof have been found to be saturated with moisture, including areas above the campus computing center.

The computer center addition will be housed in an approximate 19,578 gross square foot (gsf) addition to the Center for Teaching and Learning Media (CTLM). Another 1,800 gsf in the basement of the CTLM building would be renovated for the computer machine room and some associated storage space. The basement is close to the campus utility tunnel and is a secure space without windows. This project would centralize high technology and campus computing functions in a single location.

The addition would be east of the CTLM building and border Arapahoe Street on a site that slopes downward toward Arapahoe. If necessary, an elevator for both general and service use would be included in the addition. The CTLM building is operated as a satellite of the Computing and Networking Center. This project would centralize high technology and campus computing functions in a single location.

### **Project Justification:**

The 30-year-old roof at the Green Center has reached the end of its natural life, but the roof can't be repaired or replaced until the asbestos-containing materials, including sprayed-on asbestos fireproofing, is abated below the roof. That's precisely where the Computing and Networking Center is located. Moving the computer center to a permanent location would save on expenses associated with moving to a temporary space and then moving the computing center back to the Green Center; consolidate all computing and high technology functions in one location; and minimize the potential hazard that either asbestos contamination or roof leakage-caused disruption would cause to the computing center. In addition, the current location on the second floor of the Green Center is not efficient. Projectors can't be mounted and lighting can't be changed to accommodate current needs because access above the ceilings is restricted due to the presence of asbestos.

### **CCHE Recommendations:**

Although Colorado School of Mines hasn't met the conditions for approval to proceed beyond the design stage for this project, the Green Center Decontamination and Repair, Phases 1 and 2 (Computer Center Addition to CTML) should be approved for construction and equipping. The rationale for making such a recommendation is detailed in the section below.

## **CCHE Comments:**

*Conditions for Approval:* On March 4, 2002, CCHE attached three conditions for approval of the design phase of the Green Center Decontamination and Repair Project (the Computer Center Addition to CTLM). They were that Colorado School of Mines would:

1. Amend its plan for the Green Center Basement Renovation (Colorado School of Mines then withdrew its request for the Green Center Basement Renovation);
2. Submit a comprehensive plan for the Green Center in 2003; and
3. Submit an updated facility master plan for the campus before July 1, 2003.

In an August 7, 2003, letter to Joan Johnson, CCHE director of Capital Assets, Colorado School of Mines President John U. Trefny asked that CCHE approve release of funds for construction of the Computing and Networking Center in order to move the computer center from the Green Center as soon as possible. The letter, attached to this review, stated the Colorado School of Mines would not be able to give CCHE a comprehensive plan for the Green Center this year due to continuing negotiations between the college and the City of Golden regarding the possibility of outside financial assistance with redevelopment of the Green Center and a joint use agreement for the building. The college also was unable to meet the July 1, 2003, deadline for submittal of an updated facility master plan due to serious medical problems of the person retained to develop a strategic plan. The facility master plan is still expected to be delivered in the fall within two to six weeks following the October 17, 2003, meeting of the School of Mines Board of Trustees.

CCHE has reviewed the reasons why the School of Mines didn't comply with the conditions, and finds them justified.

*Total Project Cost Estimate Difference:* The program plan for the computer center addition submitted in February 2002 estimated the total project cost at \$6,676,943. The budget documents submitted for FY 2003-2004 and 2004-2005, however, carried a total project estimate of \$7,117,047. This represents a \$440,104 increase, well above the permitted 0 percent inflationary increase for continuation projects. The increase in total cost came about due to the discovery that the School of Mines would need another chiller to serve the additional square footage of the CTML addition for the computer center. The School of Mines has several chiller plants around campus that convert steam from the Coors brewery into coolants.

*Design Progress:* Colorado School of Mines has selected a design firm. The School of Mines executed an architectural and engineering agreement on August 12, 2003. The schematic design is in progress, but no expenditure of the \$519,779 FY 2003-2004 appropriation had occurred as of August 25, 2003, according to the budget documents. Of the \$519,779, \$388,358 has been encumbered, or about 75 percent of the total appropriation for Phase 1 (design of the computer center).

*Elevator Need:* The three-story building may include an elevator, but the exact location has not been decided pending design studies on where pedestrian circulation should be limited. The budget includes funds for an elevator. Design studies also will determine if the addition should be two or three stories.

*Adequacy of Solution:* Mines anticipates the new addition should house the functions of the Computing and Networking Center for at least the next five or 10 years. It should heighten security because the computer machines will be located in an area removed from public access. Teaching laboratories would be designed with more flexibility to double as open-access labs or by designing 25-seat teaching labs to combine into larger 50- or 75-seat teaching laboratories.

*Contamination Threat:* The Green Center had at least one asbestos contamination incident. In 1991, a contractor doing some remodeling work cut into the drywall surrounding the fireproofed column in an occupied area of the building. The cutting exposed the asbestos-containing fireproofing. Asbestos then was tracked to at least the top two floors. The building had to be evacuated and completely closed for four days. The first floor was closed for about three weeks. A hazardous materials team cleaned up the contamination at the cost of \$50,000-\$250,000, according to the recollections of campus staff who worked at the college at the time. This incident illustrates the potential problems that would be encountered if asbestos abatement proceeds while the building is occupied.

*Communications Link:* Relocating the communications equipment from the computer center at the Green Center to the CTLM should not be a problem because the utility tunnel that serves the Green Center was extended to the CTLM. The project cost estimate includes \$550,000 for communications. That amount is for relocation of all QWest telephone and data service that comes onto campus to the Green Center and from which all of the wiring to other buildings originates. The \$550,000 includes moving the campus backbone of fiber, fiber/copper, and copper and the QWest point -of-presence, and well as relocation of equipment and circuits.

### **Program and Facility Requirements:**

The Computing Center provides the following services to the Colorado School of Mines:

1. Management, operation, and development of the campus network and connections to external networks such as the Internet; central servers; central computer systems; general use computers in student workrooms; computer teaching laboratories; modem pools; email/web browsing stations; designated programmatic laboratories such as teaching labs, the campus writing center, and the Physics studio in the CTLM;
2. Checkout to faculty and students of portable computers, LCD projectors, digital cameras, and related media services;
3. Assistance to the campus community with general computing and networking needs and problems;

4. Equipment and audio-visual support for smart classrooms in the CTLM and other designated locations as well as limited videoconferencing;
5. Support for departmental teaching labs and other resources;
6. Coordination of computer resource development, management, and support with academic departments and programs;
7. Management of a broad range of services to the campus such as campus-wide e-mail services, mailing list management, administration of Colorado School of Mines general web site, dial-in services, bandwidth management, campus firewall and virtual private network, and site license administration; and
8. Houses the Qwest point-of-presence on campus and the campus phone switch, from which all campus phone service originates.

Approximately 1,700 students per day use the services of the Center for Technology and Learning Media (CTLM), which the Computing and the Networking Center manages as a satellite. This leads to some operational inefficiencies since both facilities must be kept open weekend and evening hours to accommodate student demand. Combining the two functions in a single building should lead to more efficient use of staff.

The Computing and Networking Center addition to the CTLM will have open computer labs, computer classrooms, office and support space, and the main machine room, which serves as the hub for the data network and phone system. The Computing and Networking Center also will have group study rooms, a popular feature at the CTLM that is lacking at the present site.

#### **Building Functional Uses:**

The Computing and Networking Center will have classrooms, labs, office and support staff, and the main machine room.

#### **Building Efficiency Factor/Space Utilization:**

The building efficiency factor for this building would be 65%, the CCHE efficiency factor for classroom buildings. If the Computer Center is open as many hours as it is at the Green Center, the space utilization should be very high. The Computing and Networking Center maintains extensive workroom hours, until midnight Sunday through Thursday, through 6 p.m. on Fridays and 5:30 p.m. on Saturdays.

#### **Appropriateness of Funding:**

The use of state funds for a project of this type, even in these times of limited state funding, is appropriate because state money would be used to correct serious health and life safety problems caused by asbestos contamination and disruption of the computer center. Health and life safety

problems are the only category of projects for which state money may be sought for FY 04-05, according to both the Office of State Planning and Budgeting and CCHE.

**Facility Alternatives:**

Doing nothing would not be acceptable because the potential for asbestos contamination threatens the health and safety of faculty, staff and students and threatens computer and phone systems critical to the campus. Moving the Computer Center out of the Green Center temporarily would be very expensive and a redundant use of state resources for relocating the infrastructure, campus telephone switching facility, and phone and data lines twice. Abating the asbestos and demolishing the interior without moving the Computer Center would require too much phasing to be accomplished easily, besides risking having to shut down the Computer Center entirely. Simply abating the asbestos-containing materials without demolishing the interior would not be effective due to the extent of asbestos-containing materials. Any approach that failed to completely remove the asbestos creates significant risk and limits the use of the building in the future.

**Consistency with Institutional Master Plan:**

This project is consistent with the Colorado School of Mines Facilities Master Plan that CCHE approved in 1991. A master plan update is under way.

**Consistency with Institutional 5-Year Capital Improvement Plan Schedule:**

The project is in the 5-Year Capital Improvement Plan Schedule for FY 04-05.

**Attachments:**

[Attachment A](#): August 7, 2003, letter from Colorado School of Mines President John U. Trefny.

**PROGRAM PLAN EVALUATION FY 04-05**  
**Colorado Commission on Higher Education**

<b>Project:</b> Regulated Materials Handling Facility (also known as Material Storage and Handling Facility)	<b>Institution:</b> Colorado State University
<b>Original Submittal Date:</b> June 2001 when it was called Material Storage and Handling Facility	<b>Revision Date:</b> July 2003 (budget documents only; little change in scope or scope).
<b>Total Project Cost:</b> \$2,491,304  <b>New Construction Cost:</b> \$1,951,163  <b>Renovated Construction Cost:</b> \$7,368  <b>Anticipated Completion Date:</b> January 2006  <b>Purpose Code:</b> F-5	<b>Total Square Footage:</b> 9,481 gross square feet (gsf)  <b>New Construction:</b> 9,289 gsf  <b>Remodel:</b> 192 gsf  <b>Cost per Square Foot:</b>  <b>New Construction:</b> \$180  <b>Remodel:</b> \$38.38  <i>Comments: Very low figure for renovation; fairly low square-footage costs for new construction for such a specialized building.</i>

**No Phased Funding:**

	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008- 09	Total
CCFE	\$2,491,304					\$2,491,304
CF						
CFE						
FF						
Total	\$2,491,304					\$2,491,304

**EVALUATION:****Project Description:**

This project involves construction of a 9,289-gross-square-foot (gsf) building on the north perimeter of the Colorado State University South Campus for temporary storage and processing of hazardous, radiation, and mixed (hazardous and radiation) waste generated from

approximately 576 sites around the campus. The single-story, masonry structure on a 1.8-acre site would include waste and supply storage rooms to separate the various categories of waste as

federal and state regulations mandate, processing laboratories for collection by waste disposal contractors, receiving/shipping facilities, and an office space for Environmental Health Services staff to handle administrative responsibilities. Licensed contractors about six times a year would collect the waste from this building for disposal at approved disposal facilities.

Because the South Campus is considered contiguous to the Main Campus due to property line linkages, wastes can be transported between Main and South campuses without excessive regulation for this proposed facility.

**Project Justification:**

Colorado State’s Environmental Health Services collects and processes hazardous, radioactive, and mixed waste from the University’s academic, operations and research generators. The existing facilities are outdated and lack the features required for more current waste handling procedures. This plan would eliminate redundant equipment needed in multiple facilities by consolidating all at one location. The University is resubmitting the program plan in order to address the increasing health and life safety concerns.

Colorado State Environmental Health Services reported these trends in the amounts of wastes collected on campus from the more than 500 campus laboratories where they are generated:

*CSU-Generated Hazardous, Radiation, and Mixed Wastes*

	Hazardous Waste, Pounds	Radiation/Mixed Wastes, Pounds
1997	75,486	16,272 average
1998	100,176	16,272 average
1999	110,778	16,272 average
2000	110,424	16,272 average
2001	115,532	16,272 average
2002	89,950	16,272 average
2003	>115,000 (projected)	16,272 average

About 85 percent of the wastes are generated in support of undergraduate and graduate education, as well as from agencies such as the Agriculture Experiment Station and Colorado State Forest Service programs and activities. More than 800 registered and trained people on campus are directly involved in waste generation (primarily related to academic instruction).

**CCHE Recommendations:**

The General Assembly passed a law (HB 03-1256) that gave the University Health Sciences Center authority to use state funds to construct a waste handling facility (Environmental Health and Safety II). Staff will be recommending approval of such a program plan to the Commission on October 2, 2003. This Colorado State University project also should be approved for funding from state funds.

## **CCHE Comments:**

*Background:* The Commission's Capital Assets Subcommittee at its December 3, 2001, meeting granted conditional approval of this program plan if Colorado State University resubmitted the program plan as a cash-funded one. The Commission believed wastes generated from student research and education should be handled from indirect cost recoveries or other cash exempt sources, as the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center proposed for a similar facility (Environmental Health and Safety I) in 2001. Colorado State University, however, insisted state funds should be used for the project because graduate and undergraduate instruction generated a majority of hazardous, mixed, and radiation waste. Most of the waste generators then and now support Education and General funded programs. Due to the University's reluctance to consider the project as a cash-funded one, the Commission did not forward this project to the General Assembly as either a cash or state-funded project in 2001.

*Waste Generation:* Improvements in the efficiency of the generation of hazardous waste and radiation waste functions have reduced the backlog of hazardous, mixed, and radioactive waste awaiting disposal and helped the University keep current with disposal of wastes generated. More stringent chemical/radiation management and increased education of waste generators has resulted in minimizing the amount of wastes. However, Colorado State University officials believe that the leveling off of wastes generated probably will reverse and begin to rise by more than 20 percent over the next five to 10 years as a result of recent completion of the Argus Tumor Research Center in 2002 and the Microbiology Building Addition in 2003. Also pending are plans for a cash and federally funded regional biocontainment laboratory and for a state-funded diagnostic medicine center, both of which will increase the stream of wastes that will need storage and treatment.

*Funding Sources:* The need for the project is driven by state and federal regulatory requirements for the handling of hazardous materials and the academic and research missions of the University. The primarily education-related use of this facility is why capital construction funding is being sought. Facilities and Administrative Cost Recovery and the Research Building Revolving Fund are fully budgeted for other purposes, and gifts from the CSU foundations for such a project are not forthcoming unless the University has a revenue stream with which it can pay back the foundations.

*Access:* The site plan shows the building bordered on the north and west by "proposed road" that parallels Larimer County Canal No. 2. The proposed road was to be built through another project. It was not identified in the cost breakdown on either document because it represented such a small amount of the total project.

*Reuse of Equipment:* As much of the current Environmental Health Services equipment will be reused as possible. The program plan proposes spending \$120,700, mostly for equipment the division doesn't have. That new equipment includes a truck for carrying pallets, floor scales, and additional neutralizers and freezers. An old mercury vacuum and compactor will be replaced. Gas cylinder cabinets and industrial shelving, for example, can't be reused because the cabinets are built into the existing wall and the existing hazardous and mixed waste shelving doesn't meet current requirements.

*Space Reuse:* Colorado State University currently has five structures for handling waste. If this project were built, all waste-handling structures would be used for other purposes. Facilities Management would use two present waste handling facilities of 3,410 gsf on the Main Campus for Facilities Management or Central Receiving as workroom and storage. The two structures, built in 1983 and 1984, are in good condition with a facility condition index of 85. They can be used for purposes other than hazardous materials storage until the space is needed for other uses. Two other buildings of 1,800 gsf, located next to the Center for Environmental Toxicology and Technology (CETT) on the Foothills Campus, may be used for storage for the CETT program or for Laboratory Animal Resources. They were built in 1963 and 1964 and are in good condition. A third structure, of 192 gsf, would be moved from the Main Campus to the \*Foothills Campus for pesticide storage. Construction of the Regulated Materials Handling Facility will allow for the elimination of all waste handling facilities on the Main and Foothills campuses. When the program plan for this facility was first proposed in 2001, Colorado State University officials believed the University had to retain its waste handling facilities at the Foothills Campus for management and shipment of all hazardous wastes generated at Foothills Campus under the terms of its permit from the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment. Since then, the University has obtained permission to close the other waste handling facilities if this structure were built.

### **Program and Facility Requirements:**

The Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment classifies Colorado State University as a large quantity waste generator, meaning the college must have facilities for holding wastes for up to 90 days before transport to approved disposal facilities. The only exception is for wastes for which no permitted disposal facility is available.

Environmental Health Services estimates that planned construction projects for academic and research programs could increase the amount of waste generated by more than 20% over the next five to 10 years. The College of Natural Sciences and the College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences, the colleges responsible for the four major projects, generated about 73% of the total hazardous waste per year from 1997 through 2000 and 90% of the radiation wastes generated per year. Programs in the College of Natural Sciences are growing in enrollment at a rate of 2.8 percent annually. At that rate, a new hazardous waste collection system is becoming more urgent. Most of the hazardous, mixed, and radiation waste comes from resident instruction, such as graduate students working on sponsored research projects.

The Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment requires the following of CSU:

1. Handling, labeling, and storage of wastes in the laboratories
2. Transportation of wastes on the contiguous campuses
3. Transportation of wastes from off the contiguous campuses
4. Storage and handling of wastes at the hazardous waste facilities

5. Disposal of wastes
6. Maintenance of hazardous waste facilities
7. Maintenance of records
8. Management of areas of suspected contamination within the contiguous property

Facility space needs identified under assignable square feet in the program plan were:

**Facility Space Needs for Material Storage and Disposal**

	Assigned	Non Assigned
Administrative	288	930
Waste Management	2,466	
Regulated Waste	2,864	770
Mechanical/Electrical/Plumbing		1,971
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5,618</b>	<b>3,671</b>

Special features and systems are required for primarily health and safety reasons. They include such things as: epoxy floors or special concrete sealants to prevent contamination from spills; alarm systems for refrigeration units to notify of malfunctions or power problems; roof panels built for explosions and explosion-proof light fixtures; and a sump pit and floor drain system for spill containment in each storage room and materials handling room.

The hazardous waste occupancies require masonry or concrete construction with exterior walls effectively rated at four-hour fire protection levels. The only parts of the building that need not meet such standards are the entry and administrative areas.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency requires the building to be set back 50 feet from all property lines. In addition, 2,600 gsf of paving will be required for visitor and staff parking and access to the loading dock by a waste disposal contractor and the university truck. Storm water runoff will be collected on site at a detention pond in order to make sure waste spills are contained.

To save costs on disposal, the University places the same hazardous materials in larger containers. Disposal costs are based on weight, including the weight of containers. For wastes that are not combined with other wastes because of incompatibility, the waste contractor packs smaller containers in large containers for shipment in a procedure called “labpacking.” For radiation waste, dry, non-mixed waste is compacted to reduce volume and liquids are labpacked or bulked with other materials. Because the cost of radiation wastes disposal is based on volume, labpacked or compacted wastes are placed in larger drums.

**Building Functional Use:**

The use of the building is for storage and disposal of hazardous, radiation, and mixed wastes.

### **Building Efficiency Factor/Space Utilization:**

The building efficiency of this facility is 60 percent, lower than some due to the special requirements for this type of facility. CCHE guidelines have no suggested building efficiencies for materials handling facilities such as this one. The building would be used 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

### **Appropriateness of Funding:**

For the reasons outlined in the CCHE staff recommendations section above, the use of state funds for construction of such a facility is appropriate.

### **Facility Alternatives:**

Because of federal and state statutes governing the disposal of wastes, this facility cannot be combined with city or county facilities or services of a similar nature. Several sites were considered, two on South Campus and two at Foothills Campus.

At South Campus, a site on the northeast corner of the South Campus was considered, but it does not have direct access to Main Campus, and therefore wouldn't meet the guidelines for contiguous property. Also, waste removal operations would have to travel on public streets, which is contrary to state and federal requirements. A parking lot to the south of Aggie Village, a married student housing complex, would not be quite large enough for good vehicular access and would be much closer to property boundaries and residential areas.

At Foothills Campus, space is available for the facility next to the Bio-environmental Hazards Research building, but it would be counterproductive to locate it at Foothills because 95% of the University's total hazardous, radiation, and mixed waste would have to be transported longer distances and would have to adhere to expensive and cumbersome state health and transportation regulations. Space also is available adjacent to the Radioactive Waste Facility, but was rejected for the same reasons as the other Foothills Campus site.

CSU estimates that contracting for all direct removal and disposal would cost about \$482,000 a year. It estimates the costs of building a new material storage facility with state money, operating it with CSU's Environmental Health Services personnel, and contracting for disposal only at \$206,000 a year. Over a 30-year period, contracting everything would cost \$10.19 million, compared to \$6.80 million for doing as outlined in this program plan.

### **Consistency with the Institutional Master Plan:**

The Colorado State University Environmental Health Services provides essential support to all university academic and research programs. As such, the program helps the University fulfill its educational and research missions. This project supports the University's basic planning assumption to relocate non-academic functions from the Main Campus or to the perimeter so that academic functions can be expanded on Main Campus. The proposed building will be in the service core portion of the South Campus, accessed by a proposed service drive corridor.

**Consistency with Institutional 5-Year Capital Improvements Program Schedule:**

This project is in the five-year program schedule submitted to CCHE for FY 04-05.

**Approved by Governing Board:**

The State Board of Agriculture first approved this program plan on May 1, 2001. Now called the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System, the board approved this program plan again on August 27, 2003, to confirm the continuing need and include health and life safety justification for inclusion of this project in the request for state capital construction funds. At its June 2003 meeting, the Board approved a capital priority list that also included this project. The Board certified that the educational benefits of the program are from supporting research and instructional programs of the University.

**BUILDING RENEWAL PROGRAM PLAN EVALUATION FY 2004-05**  
**Colorado Commission on Higher Education**

<b>Project:</b> Veterinary Teaching Hospital Mechanical and Fire Sprinklers	<b>Institution:</b> Colorado State University
<b>Original Submittal Date:</b> June 15, 2003	<b>Revision Date:</b>
<b>Total Project Cost:</b> \$3,877,771	<b>Total Square Footage</b>
<b>Construction Cost:</b> \$2,931,983	<b>New Construction:</b>
<b>Anticipated Completion Date:</b> July 2006	<b>Remodel:</b> 137,233 gross square feet (gsf)
<b>Purpose Code:</b> F-3	<b>Cost per Square Foot:</b>
	<b>New Construction:</b>
	<b>Remodel:</b> \$23.51
	<i>Comments: Low cost of remodeling reflects heating, ventilation, and air conditioning replacement and fire suppression costs being divided into a building of such large gross square footage.</i>

**No Phased Funding:**

	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008- 09	Total
CCFE	\$3,877,771					\$3,877,771
CF						
CFE						
FF						
Total	\$3,877,771					\$3,877,771

**EVALUATION****Project Description:**

Colorado State University has submitted to CCHE and to State Buildings and Real Estate Programs (SBREP) a request for state funding to replace the heating, ventilation, and air conditioning system and install a fire sprinkler system for the Veterinary Teaching Hospital on the University's South Campus. The veterinary hospital has no fire suppression system. Colorado State University made this request through submittal of a

CM-03 form that SBREP devised in 2000 for capital renewal projects.

### **Project Justification:**

The heating, ventilation, and air conditioning system of the Veterinary Teaching Hospital, built in 1979, is more than 20 years old and needs to be replaced. Heating and cooling coils are corroded and leaking. The fan wheels are cracked and in danger of stalling. Leaks in the coils, expansion valves, and capillary tubes are resulting in release of pollutants into the atmosphere. Not having a fire suppression (or fire sprinkler) system is a serious problem for such a large, high-occupancy facility. Installing fire sprinklers inside the building is the only way to get enough time to evacuate the building in case of fire. The lack of fire sprinklers inside the building is in violation of current building codes. Failure of the heating, ventilation, and air conditioning units at times leaves portions of the teaching hospital without heating, cooling, and ventilation, a difficult situation in a building that contains chemicals and hazardous materials. The lack of a fire suppression system, together with an old heating, ventilation, and air conditioning system, results in health and life safety hazards. If the work outlined in the CM-03 is completed, the facility condition audit for the Veterinary Teaching Hospital should increase from 78 to 94. (SBREP is trying to find enough money for maintenance work so that all state-owned buildings have an FCI of at least 85.)

### **CCHE Recommendations:**

This CM-03 building renewal request should be approved to allow the Colorado State University Veterinary Teaching Hospital (also known as the James L. Voss Veterinary Teaching Hospital) to get the badly needed fire sprinkler system installed and to replace the deteriorated heating, ventilation, and air conditioning system. Both aspects of the project are undeniably controlled maintenance addressing health and life safety deficiencies that would be funded through controlled maintenance funding--if the total project cost were less than \$2 million. This makes the project a definite candidate for funding through the building renewal program. The building renewal program was designed for controlled maintenance projects having no programmatic implications and whose costs exceed \$2 million.

### **CCHE Comments:**

*Background:* In the past five years, the state funded Phase 1 of a controlled maintenance project for the Veterinary Teaching Hospital called Replace Deteriorated Mechanical Systems completed it in March 2000. However, funding for Phases 2-5 was cut when many projects were reduced due to state revenue shortfalls. This request is an attempt to correct health and life safety hazards in the heating, ventilation, and air conditioning system that were left undone as a result of the funding cuts. Fire suppression is new to the overall program. Other Veterinary Teaching Hospital projects in the past five years were: Replace Deteriorated Safety System, finished in May 2000, and Equipment Acquisition, completed in December 2000.

*Not Program-Driven:* A project is eligible for consideration as a building renewal project if it is maintenance-driven, not program-driven. That means that a project cannot involve

any work intended to address programmatic needs, such as remodeling to change the size of clinics or labs. A review of the CM-03 indicates that all the work planned would only correct the maintenance deficiencies of the teaching hospital.

**Program and Facility Requirements:**

This project has no program requirements. The only facility requirements are to replace deteriorated parts of the heating, ventilation and air conditioning system and to install a fire sprinkler system so that the building meets current building codes.

**Building Functional Uses:**

The Veterinary Teaching Hospital would still have the same functional uses it has always had: laboratories, animal clinics, offices, storage, and conference areas.

**Building Efficiency Factor/Space Utilization:**

This section is not applicable to renewal projects, which are renovations of existing buildings.

**Appropriateness of Funding:**

Although state funding is limited for state capital construction projects, Capital Construction Funds Exempt is an appropriate source of funds for this project because it is, without question, a health and life safety project. Due to uncertainty about the availability of state funds, CCHE and the Office of State Planning and Budgeting directed that all capital construction requests for FY 2004-2005 should be limited to health and life safety projects.

**Facility Alternatives:**

Although the CM-03 form doesn't provide a spot for institutions to list possible alternatives, doing nothing is an option. It's an option that would be extremely ill advised due to the dangers of the building being engulfed in flames with no way of buying time through an indoor fire sprinkler system. The presence of hazardous materials and chemicals in the building makes the fire danger particularly acute. Doing nothing about the antiquated heating, ventilation and air conditioning system not only pollutes the indoor atmosphere, but poorly protects the building's occupants against heat and cold. The building is occupied 24 hours a day, seven days a week, increasing the vulnerability of the building occupants to the discomfort of being without heating, cooling, and air conditioning in portions of the building and the danger of fire.

**Consistency with Institutional Master Plan:**

Addressing the maintenance deficiencies of the Veterinary Teaching Hospital is consistent with the latest facility master plan, which CCHE approved in 1997. The master plan has as one of its goals providing the resources to maintain facilities.

**Consistency with Institutional 5-Year Capital Improvement Plan Schedule:**

This project is included in the 5-Year Capital Improvement Plan Schedule that Colorado State University submitted for FY 04-05.

**Governing Board Approval:**

The Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System approved this CM-03 when it approved the prioritization of projects for CSU in June 2003.

---

# STATE OF COLORADO

---

**Department of Higher Education  
COLORADO COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION**

Raymond T. Baker, Chair  
Terrance L. Farina, Vice Chair  
Judith Altenberg  
Richard L. Garcia  
Pres Montoya  
Dean L. Quamme  
Gully Stanford  
Greg C. Stevinson  
James M. Stewart  
William Vollbracht  
Judy Weaver



Bill Owens  
Governor

Timothy E. Foster  
Executive Director

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Joan Johnson, Director, Capital Assets

FROM: Gail Hoffman, Facility Planning Analyst

DATE: September 15, 2003

SUBJECT: **Colorado Community College System, Program Plan Waiver Request for Lowry H-Building Hazardous Material Abatement and Demolition (\$400,000 Capital Construction Funds Exempt)**

Approval

### REQUEST FOR FACILITY PROGRAM PLAN EXEMPTION

The Colorado Community College System is requesting an exemption from the requirements of program planning in order to abate hazardous materials at and demolish nine of the 10 H-shaped, circa-1950, wood-framed barracks that are clustered in the center of what is now the Colorado Community Colleges at Lowry campus. A 10-foot chain-link fence surrounds the H-shaped buildings. The Air Force used the barracks for military housing when Lowry was an Air Force Base.

Removal of asbestos-containing materials in the soil and H-shaped barracks and demolishing the partially demolished barracks is, without question, a health and life safety issue. If state capital construction funds are available, I recommend their use for this project.

### JUSTIFICATION

In early 2002, work began on removing the asbestos-containing material including air ducts, mastic (a paste-like cement), and contaminated soils in preparation for demolishing and removing the nine H-shaped barracks as part of the Lowry Infrastructure Replacement project (also known as the Lowry Site and Utility Infrastructure project). Lowry received \$5.82 million in state funds for that project, but an executive order froze the appropriation and a legislative act later rescinded it before Lowry completed the project. The actions were taken in the face of

declining state revenues. Lowry is seeking state funds to carry out a health and life safety project per the memorandum that accompanied the budget manual for fiscal year 2003-2004. Removal of the nine barracks would remove a critical health/life safety hazard of airborne asbestos and contaminated soil at Lowry.

## BACKGROUND

The current facilities master plan for Lowry notes that the area the nine barracks occupy was to be cleared to make way for the proposed High Tech High School, a charter school that the New Schools Development Corporation would build. Since CCHE reviewed that master plan and referred it back to Lowry, however, the school has relocated to the development taking shape at the old Stapleton Airport site. Lowry officials are revising the master plan to take out all references to the proposed high school and to respond to CCHE concerns. The master plan may be resubmitted to CCHE by the end of 2003.

This program plan waiver request essentially separates the most urgent life and health safety aspects into a program plan waiver request so that they can be addressed while state funding is too tight to consider funding the entire Lowry Site and Utility Infrastructure, Project 1, program plan. The overall Site and Utility, Project 1, program plan, if funded, would have paid for replacing water and sanitary sewer systems that serve the eastern edge of the campus, as well as \$300,000 for improvements to "perimeter roads." Perimeter roads are those that were off the land set aside for the Lowry campus. Information that came to light later showed that the state board for community colleges was committed in an October 31, 1996, agreement with the Lowry Economic Redevelopment Authority (LRA) to pay a total of \$4,500,000 to the LRA for off-site improvements to roads, water, sewer, and landscaping over a period of 11 years. The \$300,000 for perimeter roads was an installment in that agreement. When state revenue shortfalls forced the state to take away money for the project, LRA officials complained to the governor's office about the state renegeing on the agreement. Discussions that occurred after that resulted in the signing of an amended and restated agreement on June 27, 2003, between LRA and the State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education. The agreement also went to the Commission on Higher Education, the State Attorney General's Office, and the legislative Capital Development Committee for approval.

## FINANCING

Lowry officials are seeking state capital construction dollars to pay for demolishing the H-buildings and abating asbestos contamination in the structures and in the soil.

# Colorado Commission on Higher Education

## Continuing and Proposed Capital Projects for Funding in FY 2004 / 2005

Project Title		Prior Year Appropriation	FY 2004 / 2005	FY 2005 / 2006	FY 2006 / 2007	FY 2007 / 2008	FY 2008 / 2009	Total Project Cost			
Trustees of the Colorado School of Mines											
Colorado School of Mines											
<i>Gov.Bd. Priority</i>	Green Center Decontamination, Phase II (CTLM Addition)	<i>PP FOR PHASE II REVIEWED--Computer operations of the campus will be moved from the Green Center to a new addition of the Center for Technology and Learning Media to allow asbestos abatement and roof repair to go forward at the Green Center.</i>	CCFE	\$519,779	<b>\$6,597,268</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$7,117,047	
1			CF	\$0	<b>\$0</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
<i>CCHE Priority</i>			CFE	\$0	<b>\$0</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	CC-C-03-CSM-01	<i>New Sq.Ft.</i> 21,443	FF	\$0	<b>\$0</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
1	New	<i>Renov. Sq.Ft.</i> 1,800	All Funding Sources		\$519,779	<b>\$6,597,268</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$7,117,047
Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System											
Colorado State University-Pueblo											
<i>Gov.Bd. Priority</i>	H.P.E.R. Renovation	<i>PP APPROVED 2000--This project would add and renovate spaces to address deficiencies in space and code compliance (electrical, air handling and ventilation, roof leakages, plumbing) for better accommodation of academic and athletic shared use.</i>	CCFE	\$0	<b>\$2,209,315</b>	\$7,288,206	\$821,000	\$0	\$0	\$10,318,521	
1			CF	\$0	<b>\$0</b>	\$1,220,035	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,220,035	
<i>CCHE Priority</i>			CFE	\$0	<b>\$0</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	CC-C-03-CSU-P-01	<i>New Sq.Ft.</i> 15,000	FF	\$0	<b>\$0</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
2	New	<i>Renov. Sq.Ft.</i> 89,794	All Funding Sources		\$0	<b>\$2,209,315</b>	\$8,508,241	\$821,000	\$0	\$0	\$11,538,556
Trustees for the University of Northern Colorado											
University of Northern Colorado											
<i>Gov.Bd. Priority</i>	Building/Infrastructure Renewal Project, Replace Buried HTHW Main -CM03	<i>CM-03 FORM APPROVED 2002--A 40-year-old buried high temperature hot water main would be replaced with a larger main placed in a utility tunnel to provide more reliable service and allow for future growth.</i>	CCFE	\$0	<b>\$635,825</b>	\$6,094,485	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$6,730,310	
1			CF	\$0	<b>\$0</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
<i>CCHE Priority</i>			CFE	\$0	<b>\$0</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	CC-C-03-UNC-01	<i>New Sq.Ft.</i> 0	FF	\$0	<b>\$0</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
3	New	<i>Renov. Sq.Ft.</i> 0	All Funding Sources		\$0	<b>\$635,825</b>	\$6,094,485	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$6,730,310

<i>Project Title</i>				<i>Prior Year Appropriation</i>	<i>FY 2004 / 2005</i>	<i>FY 2005 / 2006</i>	<i>FY 2006 / 2007</i>	<i>FY 2007 / 2008</i>	<i>FY 2008 / 2009</i>	<i>Total Project Cost</i>		
Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System												
Colorado State University												
<i>Gov.Bd. Priority</i>	Regulated Materials Handling Facility		<i>PP REVIEWED 2003--Temporary storage and processing of chemical, radiation, and mixed (hazardous and radiation) wastes generated primarily from academic functions will be provided in a new facility north of the vet hospital on CSU's South Campus.</i>	CCFE	\$0	<b>\$2,491,304</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,491,304	
1				CF	\$0	<b>\$0</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
<i>CCHE Priority</i>				CFE	\$0	<b>\$0</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	CC-C-03-CSU-01	<i>New Sq.Ft.</i>	9,289	FF	\$0	<b>\$0</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
4	New	<i>Renov. Sq.Ft.</i>	192	<i>All Funding Sources</i>		\$0	<b>\$2,491,304</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,491,304
Community Colleges of Colorado												
Arapahoe Community College - Littleton Campus												
<i>Gov.Bd. Priority</i>	Telephone Switch Deterioration		<i>PP APPROVED 2001--The overloaded circa-1998 telephone switch would be upgraded and these life safety measures installed: 12 emergency phones in parking lots, security cameras at building entrances and parking lots, and caller ID for all calls.</i>	CCFE	\$0	<b>\$254,100</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$254,100	
3				CF	\$0	<b>\$0</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
<i>CCHE Priority</i>				CFE	\$0	<b>\$0</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	CC-IT-03-ACC-L-01	<i>New Sq.Ft.</i>	0	FF	\$0	<b>\$0</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
5	New	<i>Renov. Sq.Ft.</i>	0	<i>All Funding Sources</i>		\$0	<b>\$254,100</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$254,100
Community Colleges of Colorado												
Community College of Aurora												
<i>Gov.Bd. Priority</i>	Campus Maintenance Facility		<i>PP APPROVED 2000--A maintenance facility and garage would be built to more safely store vehicles and noxious chemicals. People are getting headaches and becoming dizzy in the office and student service areas adjacent to shipping and receiving.</i>	CCFE	\$0	<b>\$116,051</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$116,051	
1				CF	\$0	<b>\$0</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
<i>CCHE Priority</i>				CFE	\$0	<b>\$0</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	CC-C-03-CCA-01	<i>New Sq.Ft.</i>	1,200	FF	\$0	<b>\$0</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
6	New	<i>Renov. Sq.Ft.</i>	0	<i>All Funding Sources</i>		\$0	<b>\$116,051</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$116,051



<i>Project Title</i>				<i>Prior</i>	<i>FY</i>	<i>FY</i>	<i>FY</i>	<i>FY</i>	<i>FY</i>	<i>Total</i>	
				<i>Year</i>	<i>2004 /</i>	<i>2005 /</i>	<i>2006 /</i>	<i>2007 /</i>	<i>2008 /</i>	<i>Project</i>	
				<i>Appropriation</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2006</i>	<i>2007</i>	<i>2008</i>	<i>2009</i>	<i>Cost</i>	
Community Colleges of Colorado											
Lowry Higher Education Center											
<i>Gov.Bd.</i>	Lowry Asbestos Abatement and Demolition		WAIVER REVIEWED 2003--Nine H-shaped	CCFE	\$0	\$400,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$400,000
<i>Priority</i>			wood-framed circa-1950s barracks would be removed	CF	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
4			asbestos-contaminated materials associated with	CFE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<i>CCHE</i>			them removed from the soil and buildings to eliminate	FF	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<i>Priority</i>			the danger of airborne asbestos.								
	CC-C-03-LHEC-04	<i>New Sq.Ft.</i>	0								
7	New	<i>Renov. Sq.Ft.</i>	0	All Funding Sources	\$0	\$400,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$400,000
Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System											
Colorado State University											
<i>Gov.Bd.</i>	Vet Teaching Hospital Mechanical and Fire Sprinklers		STATE BUILDINGS APPROVED CM-03 REQUEST	CCFE	\$652,599	\$3,225,172	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,877,771
<i>Priority</i>			2001, CCHE REVIEWED AMENDED CM-03 2003	CF	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2			-The veterinary hospital's fire sprinkler system would	CFE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<i>CCHE</i>			be installed and the HVAC system replaced to	FF	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<i>Priority</i>			address the most critical health and life safety issues.								
	CC-C-03-CSU-02	<i>New Sq.Ft.</i>	0								
8	Continuing	<i>Renov. Sq.Ft.</i>	0	All Funding Sources	\$652,599	\$3,225,172	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,877,771
<b>Grand Total All of Higher Education</b>				CCFE	\$1,172,378	\$15,929,035	\$13,382,691	\$821,000	\$0	\$0	\$31,305,104
Total New Gross Sq Ft.				CF	\$0	\$0	\$1,220,035	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,220,035
Total Revotation Gross Sq Ft.				CFE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Project Costs				FF	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
				All Funding Sources	\$1,172,378	\$15,929,035	\$14,602,726	\$821,000	\$0	\$0	\$32,525,139



**TOPIC: COLORADO DECLARATION ON HIGHER EDUCATION**

**PREPARED BY: COMMISSIONER TERRY FARINA**

**I. SUMMARY**

At Colorado Commission on Higher Education's advance that took place August 7-8, 2003, with commissioners, board member, and guest speakers, the Commission agreed that a short paper be written to state its goals in a formal way. Based upon the dialog that occurred over the two-day planning meeting, the Colorado Declaration on Higher Education (Attachment A) was written.

**II. STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

**That the Commission approve the Colorado Declaration on Higher Education.**

**Attachment A**

**COLORADO DECLARATION ON HIGHER EDUCATION**

We hold these truths to be of great significance to the future of the State of Colorado:

A QUALITY EDUCATION at every level is essential for the economic and civic well being of every Colorado resident;

HIGHER EDUCATION, in one or more of its many forms, is virtually a necessity in today's world for all students and prospective students;

LINKAGE AND COOPERATION between educators and administrators at all transition points in the education system is mandatory to assure proper preparation of our students for the higher education experience.

THE CITIZENS of Colorado are entitled to expect continuous, incremental and at times, innovative improvement at every level of public education; and

LEADERSHIP by educators and every other segment of the Colorado community is vital for the future success of higher education in the State.

NOW, THEREFORE, the undersigned commit themselves to the following goals:

ACCESS TO HIGHER EDUCATION, to the maximum degree possible, shall be made available to every Colorado citizen.

WHEN A CHILD STARTS SCHOOL, the expectations shall include successful participation in pre-kindergarten through 12<sup>th</sup> grade and successful participation in one or more forms of higher education.

APPROPRIATE PUBLIC FUNDING, in all its various forms, will be provided to students and/or institutions of higher education to ensure the attainment of a high quality education.



**TOPIC: TEACHER EDUCATION LEGISLATIVE REPORT (2003)**

**PREPARED BY: CAROL FUTHEY**

**I. SUMMARY**

Pursuant to Colorado Revised Statute 23-1-121(6) the Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) reports annually to the Education Committees of the General Assembly on the implementation of the SB 99-154, including:

- Overview of the number of approved teacher education programs, including programs newly-approved by CCHE. Enrollment data are provided by institution and licensure areas based on two years of teacher education data collection.
- Efforts to improve the reliability and validity of the primary performance indicators of the teacher education performance model. This has involved two on-going efforts: 1) activities leading to use of the Praxis II exam, from Educational Testing Service, as an alternative to the PLACE content area assessment, and 2) on-going development of the first-year teacher survey to align with the statutory performance measures.
- A summary of the findings from the follow-up site visits as part of program reauthorization at two universities.
- An overview of establishing program requirements for principal preparation offered by institutions of higher education.

In accordance with statute, all pre-existing teacher education programs sunset on June 30, 2001, and programs preparing prospective teachers in Colorado met the criteria specified in the performance model. The Commission approved more than 400 initial teacher licensure preparation programs by June 2001. Since that time, additional institutions and programs have received CCHE approval. A list of approved programs is included (Attachment A).

**II. TEACHER PREPARATION AND ENROLLMENTS**

With adoption of SB99-154, the Colorado legislature posed several questions that included how many teacher candidates are being prepared in different licensure areas, and how do these teacher candidates perform while enrolled in the teacher preparation program and in the K-12 classroom following graduation? This section responds to the first of these issues.

The first point—the number of students competing teacher preparation programs—is addressed in Tables 1 and 2. Because students began enrolling in redesigned teacher preparation programs in 2000, it is too early to gauge the number of undergraduates completing for initial licensure. Table 1 summarizes the number of post-baccalaureate completers who pursued initial licensure for FY 2002 and 2003 by institution. With programs in transition, note that the data reflect a combination of students completing under the old and new standards. The University of Colorado-Denver recommended one in four post-baccalaureates for the past two fiscal years, followed by the University of Northern Colorado with another 20% and Colorado Christian University at 13%.

**Table 1. TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM POST-BACCALAUREATE COMPLETERS BY INSTITUTION**

Institution	Number of Post-Baccalaureate Completers in --			% of Total
	FY 2002	FY 2003	Total	
UCD	192	202	<b>394</b>	26.8
UNC	168	125	<b>293</b>	19.9
CCU	78	118	<b>196</b>	13.3
METRO	29	86	<b>115</b>	7.8
CSU	58	52	<b>110</b>	7.5
FLC	52	32	<b>84</b>	5.7
DU	30	28	<b>58</b>	3.9
MESA	24	28	<b>52</b>	3.5
CC	18	28	<b>46</b>	3.1
UCB	18	19	<b>37</b>	2.5
WSC	11	17	<b>28</b>	1.9
CSU-P	12	9	<b>21</b>	1.4
UCCS	29	2	<b>31</b>	2.1
ASC	3	1	<b>4</b>	0.3
REGIS	n/a	n/a	<b>0</b>	0.0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>722</b>	<b>747</b>	<b>1,469</b>	

Note: Headcount includes students admitted to the teacher preparation program prior to redesign.

Source: FY2001- SURDS Teacher Education File. FY2002 and 2003-institutional files; data from Regis University not available.

By licensure area, elementary education is by far the most popular area, representing half of post-baccalaureate licensure completers (Table 2). The state's priority licensure areas—special education, mathematics, and science—supported by the Loan Incentive for Teachers (LIFT) program, accounted for 22.2% of these licensure recommendations.

**Table 2. TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM POST-BACCALAUREATE COMPLETERS BY LICENSURE AREA**

Licensure Aea	Number of Post-Baccalaureate Completers in --			% of Total
	FY 2002	FY 2003	Total	
Elementary	382	359	<b>741</b>	50.4
Special Education*	70	91	<b>161</b>	11.0
Secondary - Science*	70	65	<b>135</b>	9.2
Secondary - Social Studies	46	45	<b>91</b>	6.2
Secondary - Language Arts	46	33	<b>79</b>	5.4
Early Childhood	26	39	<b>65</b>	4.4
K-12: Art	11	24	<b>35</b>	2.4
Secondary - Mathematics*	12	17	<b>29</b>	2.0
ESL	0	20	<b>20</b>	1.4
School Library Media	12	13	<b>25</b>	1.7
K-12: Physical Education	7	11	<b>18</b>	1.2
K-12: Music	2	8	<b>10</b>	0.7
Secondary - Foreign Language	7	6	<b>13</b>	0.9
Secondary - Business	2	4	<b>6</b>	0.4
Middle School	4	3	<b>7</b>	0.5
Reading Teacher	2	3	<b>5</b>	0.3
Speech	1	3	<b>4</b>	0.3
Secondary - Family and Consumer Studies	2	1	<b>3</b>	0.2
Secondary - Technical	2	1	<b>3</b>	0.2
Secondary - Drama	1	1	<b>2</b>	0.1
Secondary - Marketing	9	0	<b>9</b>	0.6
Bilingual Bicultural	6	0	<b>6</b>	0.4
Secondary - Agriculture	2	0	<b>2</b>	0.1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>722</b>	<b>747</b>	<b>1,469</b>	

\*Identified as shortage area in LIFT.

Note: Data not available from Regis University for FY2002 or 2003.

The second indicator—the number of students in teacher preparation programs—is answered by tracking enrollments in the teacher preparation programs. Students were formally admitted into the redesigned teacher education programs beginning July 1, 2000, with the first graduates from this cohort completing one-year post-baccalaureate programs during FY 2001 and applying for licensure in spring 2001. Students in the first year of redesigned programs were reported in a CCHE’s teacher education file, designed to include indicators for a performance model. The data file allows tracking of student enrollments and completions, as well as reporting on performance aspects of teacher education programs and students. Data collected since FY 2001 enabled CCHE to establish a baseline for enrollment in the Commission-approved teacher education programs and is summarized below. Prior to this time, only self-reported aggregate data from institutions were available which limited the analyses that could be generated about students in teacher preparation.

The institutions preparing the largest number of teacher candidates are the University of Northern Colorado (UNC), University of Colorado-Denver (UCD), and Metropolitan State College of Denver (Metro). These three institutions enrolled approximately 48% of all students enrolled in professional educator programs. Table 3 summarizes the FY 2002 unduplicated enrollment in the redesigned teacher education programs for each of the 15 institutions at all levels: undergraduate, post-baccalaureate (leading to licensure recommendation only), and graduate. The numbers reflect students enrolled in teacher education programs during at least one term in FY 2002 but do not include students completing teacher preparation under the old standards.

**Table 3. TEACHER EDUCATION REDESIGNED PROGRAM ENROLLMENT\*\* FOR INITIAL LICENSURE BY INSTITUTION, FY2002**

Institution	Number of Enrolled Students					Total	% of Total
	Undergraduate	Post-baccalaureate	Graduate	No Level reported	Total		
UNC	884	41	108	1	<b>1,034</b>	21.1	
UCD	0	105	597	0	<b>702</b>	14.3	
METRO	431	181	0	2	<b>614</b>	12.5	
CSU	341	92	42	0	<b>475</b>	9.7	
UCB	175	68	69	0	<b>312</b>	6.4	
REGIS	141	27	106	0	<b>274</b>	5.6	
UCCS	49	77	120	0	<b>246</b>	5.0	
ASC	207	2	0	0	<b>209</b>	4.3	
MESA	179	21	0	0	<b>200</b>	4.1	
CSU-P	148	27	0	0	<b>175</b>	3.6	
FLC	84	88	0	0	<b>172</b>	3.5	
DU	11	67	85	0	<b>163</b>	3.3	
WSC	130	4	0	0	<b>134</b>	2.7	
CCU	123	3	0	0	<b>126</b>	2.6	
CC	15	0	46	0	<b>61</b>	1.2	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,918</b>	<b>803</b>	<b>1,173</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4,897</b>	100.0	

\*\*Headcount based on enrollment during at least one term in FY 2002

Colorado's institutions with the highest undergraduate enrollment in redesigned teacher preparation programs continue to be the same as last year: UNC (30%), Metro (15%), and Colorado State University (CSU) (12%), while the largest post-baccalaureate enrollment in new teacher preparation programs is offered by Metro (23%), followed by UCD (13%), and CSU (12%). UCD enrolled 51% of graduate enrollments, with the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs (UCCS), UNC, and Regis University (RU) representing an additional 28%. The data indicate that program access, as indicated by the number of students able to enter the teaching field, has not diminished with implementation of SB 99-154.

Colorado’s teacher education reform initiative is driven by the goal of producing quality teachers. While confident in the quality of the approved programs, the Commission expressed interest in knowing if the approved degree programs provided sufficient opportunities for training teachers in all licensure areas. An analysis of the initial licensure candidates in the teacher preparation programs indicates that elementary education teachers comprise nearly 45% of the students in the pipeline (Table 4). From the perspective of the state’s shortage areas, high numbers of students are pursuing special education (558), with secondary science licensure reported for 296 students, and 158 students are projected to complete a secondary mathematics licensure. The number of students pursuing licensure in these three areas may, in part, be attributable to the LIFT program.

**Table 4. NUMBER OF ENROLLED STUDENTS\*\* BY LICENSURE AREA FOR INITIAL LICENSURE, FY2002**

Licensure Area	Undergraduate	Post-baccalaureate	Graduate	No level reported	Number of Students	% of Total
Elementary	1,414	326	453	1	<b>2,194</b>	44.9
Special Education*	46	108	404	0	<b>558</b>	11.4
Secondary - Language Arts	260	56	90	1	<b>407</b>	8.3
Secondary - Social Studies	264	79	58	0	<b>401</b>	8.2
Secondary - Science*	116	87	93	0	<b>296</b>	6.1
K-12: Physical Education	182	15	0	0	<b>197</b>	4.0
Secondary - Mathematics*	117	18	23	0	<b>158</b>	3.2
K-12: Art	105	34	8	0	<b>147</b>	3.0
K-12: Music	127	9	5	0	<b>141</b>	2.9
Early Childhood	113	19	0	0	<b>132</b>	2.7
Secondary - Foreign Language	55	14	12	0	<b>81</b>	1.7
Middle School	26	6	7	0	<b>39</b>	0.8
No licensure area/Invalid area reported	13	10	12	1	<b>36</b>	0.7
Secondary - Business	14	8	1	0	<b>23</b>	0.5
Secondary - Agriculture	14	1	3	0	<b>18</b>	0.4
Secondary - Drama	13	3	0	0	<b>16</b>	0.3
Secondary - Family and Consumer Studies	13	2	1	0	<b>16</b>	0.3
Secondary - Technical	13	2	1	0	<b>16</b>	0.3
Speech	5	3	1	0	<b>9</b>	0.2
ESL	0	0	2	0	<b>2</b>	0.0
Secondary - Marketing	1	1	0	0	<b>2</b>	0.0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,911</b>	<b>801</b>	<b>1,174</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4,889</b>	

\*Identified as shortage area in LIFT.

\*\*Based on enrollment during at least one term in FY 2002

### **III. THE PERFORMANCE MODEL**

The second question posed by the legislature—how do the teacher candidates perform while enrolled in the teacher preparation program and subsequently in the K-12 classroom following graduation—is the focus of the performance model in development by CCHE. A content assessment (i.e., the PLACE or PRAXIS) measures teacher candidate content knowledge from preparation in college, and the first-year survey acts as

a measure of teacher performance in the K-12 classroom (i.e., quality of degree program and quality of field experience).

**A. Performance in the College Classroom: The PLACE**

The preliminary design of the performance model depends on a valid measure of content knowledge. The state of Colorado currently uses the Professional Licensing Assessment for Colorado Educators (PLACE) from National Evaluation Systems (NES). In 2000, the General Assembly eliminated three PLACE assessments (i.e., basic skills, general education, and pedagogy) since alternative assessment tests provided more valid performance data. The elimination of an examination in these areas reduced the testing burden on students since often they needed to take duplicative tests measuring the same knowledge areas. The legislature maintained a content test because the legislative vision of a strong teacher education program is based on content knowledge.

Unfortunately, the initial review of the PLACE exam indicated that some critical content tests, (including Elementary Education, English, and Early Childhood) measure knowledge of pedagogy, and the content may not align with the state's content standards. This fact is supported by sample questions, training manuals that are vague in their description of the purpose of the test, and feedback from students. The material itself does not contend that the PLACE content exams measure content only. For example, sample questions available for the elementary education content test are 20% content and 80% pedagogy. NES representatives acknowledged in meetings with CCHE staff that the elementary licensure test commingles pedagogical knowledge with content items. The deans of education indicated that this weakness is found in other content tests in addition to the three listed above.

CCHE requested validity and reliability information on the test in May 2001. NES indicated its intent to publish a technical report addressing questions regarding validity and reliability and to cooperate in furnishing required information to CCHE staff. The inability of NES to confirm PLACE test item validity, coupled with the slow response time with this vendor, delayed implementation of the performance model. As a result, CCHE has identified a viable, valid alternative – Educational Testing Service's PRAXIS II – the content examinations that are used by most other states to measure of student content knowledge.

Other issues that affected using the PLACE test scores as a performance indicator included: 1) infrequent administration and lengthy turn-around for results inhibit institutions in implementing the new performance model that stipulates content assessment before student teaching; 2) little study material available to teacher candidates resulting in the need for several retakes and high expenses to candidates; 3) reciprocity with other states sacrificed when using an assessment

only recognized in Colorado. Because K-12 content standards among states are similar, it is possible to use a nationally recognized test for the majority of the Colorado Model Content standards; 4) validity of PLACE for low demand exams, such as agriculture; and 5) other testing organizations have affiliated with the national accrediting organizations – National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) – that require performance-based standards. NES has not indicated any motion in this direction. While the Colorado Department of Education has negotiated some improvements with NES, CCHE has indicated a preference for use of the PRAXIS II exam over PLACE as the accepted content exam, and PRAXIS cut scores have been set through a collaborative effort by ETS, CDE, and CCHE staff for the five most popular licensure areas.

Nonetheless, Colorado has used the PLACE exam to measure content preparation for three years, and Table 5 summarizes pass rates for all content areas for students seeking initial licensure. While one must recognize that the exams vary in emphasis, test results from students at Colorado College show a consistent pass rate of 100% for all three years, closely followed by test-takers at the University of Colorado-Colorado Springs, and the University of Colorado-Denver.

**Table 5. PASS RATES FOR SELECTED ALL CONTENT AREAS ON THE PROGRAM FOR LICENSING ASSESSMENTS FOR COLORADO EDUCATORS (PLACE) EXAM**

Institution	All Academic Content Areas					
	1999 - 2000		2000 - 01		2001 - 02	
	# Tested	% Passed	# Tested	% Passed	# Tested	% Passed
<b>Public Inst</b>						
Adams S C	95	89%	76	88%	63	86%
CO State U	115	94%	128	98%	111	95%
CO State U - Pueblo (was USC)	90	83%	77	86%	67	91%
Fort Lewis C	87	95%	84	90%	76	100%
Mesa S C	80	95%	43	91%	75	91%
Metro S C of Denver	273	90%	285	92%	247	96%
U of CO - Boulder	201	97%	175	97%	153	100%
U of CO - CO Springs	30	100%	38	97%	29	100%
U of CO - Denver	125	98%	123	99%	149	100%
U of Northern CO	370	91%	402	86%	382	90%
Western S C	36	89%	41	98%	30	97%
<b>Private Inst</b>						
CO Christian U	67	93%	45	91%	30	90%
CO College	37	100%	27	100%	22	100%
Regis U	183	95%	133	94%	132	90%
U of Denver	69	90%	90	94%	54	93%
<b>Statewide Totals**</b>	--	<b>93%</b>	--	<b>93%</b>	--	<b>97%</b>

\*\*Totals based on all tested students including test-takers at institutions with fewer than 10 examinees per year and alternative certification.

Sources: PLACE Annual Institutional Reports and State-level Single-Assessment Pass-Rate Data for Regular Teacher Preparation, selected years.

Institution concentrations in various aspects of teacher education make comparisons across campuses difficult, but preparation leading to licensure in elementary education is one area that all but one institution offer, thereby masking the impact on the overall average by that one institution (CSU). Three programs produced 100% pass rates in each of the three years documented in Table 6: Colorado College, University of Colorado-Colorado Springs, and the University of Colorado-Denver, with the University of Colorado-Boulder narrowly missing the same level of student success.

**Table 6. PASS RATES FOR SELECTED ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ON THE PROGRAM FOR LICENSING ASSESSMENTS FOR COLORADO EDUCATORS (PLACE) EXAM**

Institution	Elementary Education					
	1999 - 2000		2000 - 01		2001 - 02	
	# Tested	% Passed	# Tested	% Passed	# Tested	% Passed
<b>Public Inst</b>						
Adams S C	68	93%	43	95%	45	87%
CO State U	--	--	--	--	--	--
CO State U - Pueblo (was USC)	44	95%	44	91%	50	92%
Fort Lewis C	49	98%	51	92%	35	100%
Mesa S C	34	97%	22	95%	24	100%
Metro S C of Denver	130	95%	154	95%	149	98%
U of CO - Boulder	97	100%	101	99%	92	100%
U of CO - CO Springs	20	100%	25	100%	19	100%
U of CO - Denver	87	100%	90	100%	102	100%
U of Northern CO	207	94%	208	94%	195	96%
Western S C	18	94%	15	100%	15	100%
<b>Private Inst</b>						
CO Christian U	63	92%	39	95%	24	96%
CO College	21	100%	19	100%	17	100%
Regis U	126	96%	87	97%	88	95%
U of Denver	44	93%	64	97%	34	100%
<b>Statewide Totals**</b>	<b>1,008</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>1,056</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>889</b>	<b>97%</b>

\*\*Totals based on all tested students including test-takers at institutions with fewer than 10 examinees per year and alternative certification.  
 Sources: PLACE Annual Institutional Reports and State-level Single-Assessment Pass-Rate Data for Regular Teacher Preparation, selected years.

**B. Performance in the K-12 Classroom: The First Year Teacher Survey**

The Colorado First-Year Teacher Survey is a measure used to evaluate the quality of Colorado teacher education programs in the areas of content preparation and teaching skills preparation, as outlined in CCHE's Teacher Education Policy 4.00 (content preparation) and CDE Performance-Based Standards for Colorado Teachers (teaching skills preparation). The legislative intent of the survey is to measure content knowledge and mastery of teaching skills once a teacher has taught a full year in a K-12 classroom and includes sections on teaching and

licensure areas, teacher education background, student teaching experience, subject matter content preparation and teaching skills preparation of the respondents. Based on research findings, the CCHE survey is guided by the following research questions:

- What is the overall level of content area preparation among first-year teachers and the training and background that explain differences in content area preparation?
- What is the overall level of teaching skill preparation among first-year teachers as well as the training and background that explain differences in teaching skills preparation?

Survey results support the original assumptions of the teacher education reform movement. Students in secondary education programs were better prepared in subject matter than elementary and special education teachers. With the redesign of teacher preparation in 2000-01, elementary and special education programs were aligned only with degree programs whose curriculum corresponded with content standards in subject areas. Formerly, a student majoring in any undergraduate degree program could be admitted into a teacher education program. Since the survey measured students who graduated from the “old” teacher education programs, the actual results are of less interest than serving as a benchmark for measuring change as future first-year teachers complete under the new standards.

**1. Survey Background**

The spring 2001 pilot survey served a valuable function by highlighting some significant methodological issues. The survey established a legitimate response rate (49%) using telephone interviews. During the analysis, it became apparent that bias may be introduced with phrasing questions certain ways. Other findings from the pilot survey included: 1) the need for multiple consecutive years of data to measure performance at the institution and program level; 2) ambiguity in the vocabulary, ambiguity in phrasing within questions, and non-comparable scales need to be addressed; 3) the necessity to connect questions to performance indicators and teachers to the institutions they attended; 4) the limited number of questions related to content preparation. During 2001-02, CCHE staff convened a technical committee to focus the questions for the 2002 survey administration.

**2. The 2002 Survey**

The specific goals of the 2002 survey included replicating or surpassing the 49% response rate of the 2001 survey and testing the questions for ambiguity, bias, and value in a performance model. Accordingly,

excluding demographic information, 50% of the survey addressed content preparation and 50% of the survey measured teaching skills preparation.

Survey results will be used in combination with other indicators, such as cumulative college GPA, general education assessment, content assessment (currently the PLACE) results, and rates of job placement in the licensure area trained, as evidence for reauthorization of teacher preparation programs in Colorado. Because of its use in the performance model for each institution, a confidence level of 95% with +/- 15% accuracy on each item is the goal. This accuracy range is reasonable and achievable, but requires a well-defined sampling frame with a high response rate and appropriate survey methodology.

The reader is cautioned about drawing conclusions or implications from the survey responses. Staff continue to have concerns about the validity and reliability of the survey at this stage of its development and will continue efforts to improve both.

**3. Survey Demographics**

Usable survey responses were received from 633 first-year Colorado teachers, the majority of whom were female (73.9%) and white (91.9%) with an average age of 30. Approximately 39% of respondents were licensed as elementary teachers while only 3.3% were licensed special education teachers. In contrast, 7.4% of the first-year teachers were teaching as special education teachers. Fifty percent of first-year teachers (316) were trained at a Colorado college or university while the other 317 first-year teachers received their training out-of-state.

**4. Content Area Preparation of Respondents**

Perceptions of first-year teachers' content area preparation were assessed through three different sets of questions depending upon whether a respondent was in early childhood/elementary, secondary, or special education. Direct comparisons of perceived content area preparation among the three groups of teachers was possible on only two items common to all three groups. These items asked respondents to rate the extent to which the degree or major provided them with the depth and breadth of knowledge needed as a teacher. The results are summarized in Tables 7 and 8; means of the scales were computed so that scores ranged between 1 and 7. Both elementary/early childhood and secondary respondents reported significantly higher mean ratings on these two items than special education respondents.

**Table 7. MEAN LEVEL TO WHICH UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE PROVIDED SUFFICIENT BREADTH OF KNOWLEDGE BY LICENSURE AREA**

Licensure Area	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Elementary	244	5.53	1.64
Secondary	224	5.35	1.56
Special Education	42	4.17	2.25
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>510</b>	5.34	1.70

**Table 8. MEAN LEVEL TO WHICH UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE PROVIDED SUFFICIENT DEPTH OF KNOWLEDGE BY LICENSURE AREA**

Licensure Area	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Elementary	252	5.29	1.67
Secondary	229	5.11	1.64
Special Education	44	3.95	2.22
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>525</b>	5.10	1.74

Because mean scores can camouflage quality, both positively and negatively, it is interesting to look beyond the mean. To investigate whether preparation background was related to perceived subject area preparation, a composite score of the sum of the two items which asked respondents directly if their undergraduate programs provided the breadth and depth of knowledge necessary to teach was made for all respondents answering these two questions. Comparisons were made among three teacher preparation groups. One group consisted of all respondents who indicated that they either completed an undergraduate degree in teacher education or a post-baccalaureate teacher preparation program at a Colorado university or institution, a second group consisted of those who indicated they completed a similar training program out of state, and a final group consisted of those who indicated they were participating in an alternative licensing program including emergency or substitute certification or teacher-in-residence programs.

The results indicate that those prepared for teaching in a Colorado university or institution differed significantly from those who were prepared out-of-state, with out-of-state trained teachers reporting more positive perceptions of preparation than Colorado trained teachers. These results should be interpreted with caution and should not be interpreted as evidence for inferior in-state teacher programs. The group sample sizes were quite small (approximately 10 in each group), and the composite score was based on only two items, which may or may not have been an accurate

measure of preparation. Additionally, some districts may have identified these teachers as first year teachers, although these individuals may have taught prior to earning licensure in Colorado. Lastly, there are other possible explanations as to why out-of-state trained respondents might feel more prepared as a group.

**a. Elementary and Early Childhood Teachers**

Usable surveys were received from 254 respondents indicating they were teaching in either elementary or early childhood education. Of these, most (88.2%) were licensed in elementary education with only 7.5% not yet licensed. When comparing licensure rates of elementary/early childhood respondents with those of secondary and special education respondents, proportionally more of the elementary/early childhood respondents had licensure than either of the other two groups. Elementary/early childhood respondents also differed from the secondary and special education respondents by representing a greater relative proportion that completed either a baccalaureate (33.1%) or post-baccalaureate (28.0%) teacher preparation program in Colorado. The Colorado institutions from which most respondents received their baccalaureate teacher training included University of Northern Colorado (27.4%), Metropolitan State (21.4%), and University of Colorado at Boulder (9.5%). Most respondents who completed post-baccalaureate training in Colorado attended University of Colorado at Denver (16.9%), University of Denver (15.5%), Metropolitan State (15.5%), or University of Colorado at Boulder (11.3%). As was the case with the complete sample, elementary/early childhood respondents were primarily female (86.6%), white (92.9%), and close to 30 years of age ( $M = 29.72$ ).

No notable differences were found among the Colorado teacher preparation institutions on the four content areas. A significant difference was found on the general content preparation scale when comparing respondents who received their teacher training in Colorado ( $M = 5.08$ ) versus those who received their teacher training outside of Colorado ( $M = 5.59$ ) with non-Colorado trained teachers rating their preparation more favorably than Colorado-trained teachers. Despite the differences between the two groups, the mean for Colorado-trained teachers still reflected an overall positive perception. No differences were found based on whether or not respondents spent their entire undergraduate experience at the same institution. No relationships were found between perceived content preparation and quality of induction, average class size, school district size, school setting, number of first year teaching supports, or number of extracurricular duties.

Because of the high percentage of elementary education teachers, several elements were examined in greater depth. Elementary and early childhood teachers were asked 17 questions pertaining to their perceived content area preparation. These items fell into four distinct categories as follows: math and language, science, social science, and general depth/breadth of knowledge. On all 17 items, the majority of respondents (> 50%) agreed that they felt prepared during their first few weeks as teachers, though there were considerable differences among the various content areas. With respect to the six math and language items, the percent of respondents agreeing exceeded 70% on all items with the highest level of agreement to the items asking about use of conventional grammar, punctuation, etc. (85.5%) and ability to identify purpose, perspective, and cultural influence of the speaker (86.0%). Agreement was lowest on items asking about use of algebra to solve problems (71.8%) and use of geometry to solve problems (71.9%). Perceived content preparation was substantially lower in the science area. While 74.4% did feel their understanding of biology was good, only 57.7% and 50.1% reported having a good understanding of chemistry and physics, respectively.

For some of these items, there were differences in perceived preparation between first-year teachers who had received their teacher training at a Colorado institution versus those who received their training elsewhere. For example, a greater percent of non-Colorado teachers felt experienced in scientific investigation (80.8% versus 71.9%) and believed their understanding of chemistry was good (63.2% versus 54.3%). Most respondents (74% and higher) felt prepared in understanding political institutions such as the U.S. government, identifying and remembering events and people in U.S. history, and in using world geography to study regions. However, far fewer respondents (only 53.5%) believed they were prepared in identifying and remembering events and people in Colorado history. The majority of respondents indicated their undergraduate major provided both the breadth (77.7%) and depth (69.8%) of knowledge needed as a teacher. And when asked about their overall perception of the education and training they received, 80% reported they had strong preparation for teaching students at the start of the school year.

**b. Secondary Teachers**

Usable survey responses were received from 338 first-year Secondary teachers. Almost half of the respondents received their teacher preparation in Colorado 42.3%. Of these, 23.4% completed an undergraduate degree in a teacher preparation program at a

Colorado college or university, and 18.9% already had an undergraduate degree before entering a teacher preparation program at a Colorado college or university. Of the remaining respondents, 23.3% completed a teacher preparation program outside of Colorado, and 33.5% participated in some type of alternative teacher preparation program or received emergency certification. Of the respondents who completed their undergraduate teacher preparation in Colorado, most attended University of Northern Colorado (35.4%), Colorado State University (20.3%), or Metropolitan State (15.2%). For respondents completing a post-baccalaureate teacher preparation program in Colorado, the greatest number did so at Colorado State University (20.3%), Metropolitan State (12.5%), University of Colorado at Denver (12.5%), University of Denver (9.4%), or University of Colorado at Colorado Springs (9.4%). Most respondents (74.3%) required more than four years to complete their undergraduate training, and just over one-fourth of the respondents (26.6%) transferred between institutions at some point during their undergraduate experience.

Secondary teachers were asked five questions pertaining to their perceived content area preparation. Teachers felt least prepared concerning the depth of knowledge needed to teach with 73.2% feeling prepared and 14% feeling unprepared to teach in their content area. Seventy-eight percent of the respondents felt prepared regarding their breadth of knowledge; 10.1% did not. The majority of teachers felt prepared in the remaining three categories of content knowledge: understanding of subject area (84.3%), analyzing information within subject area (90.3%), and solving problems within subject area (91.4%).

There are significant differences in mean perceived preparation for content when comparing “regular” teacher education program graduates ( $M = 5.98$ ) and emergency/alternative certifications ( $M = 5.42$ ). Viewed another way, a greater percent of secondary teachers with emergency certifications felt unprepared in understanding their subject area when compared to teachers who completed a bachelor degree in teacher preparation in Colorado (34.5% versus 2%).

**c. Special Education Teachers**

Forty-seven, or 7%, of the respondents to the First-Year Teacher Survey indicated they were special education teachers. Of the 47, more than three-fourths were female (78.7%). Twenty respondents were licensed to teach in special education, 15 indicated that they were “not yet licensed,” and 14 of these 15 said they would pursue licensure in special education. Twenty-five percent indicated they

are licensed in areas other than special education. Therefore, less than half of the special education teachers are licensed in special education. Almost 30% of respondents did not provide information on the level of students they were teaching or on the setting within which they provided services. However, of those who provided information on level of students, 27% taught mild/moderate needs, 24% moderate needs, 27% severe needs, 6% severe/profound needs, and 15% indicated that they taught all of the above. Of those respondents who provided information on setting, 33% indicated classroom inclusion as the setting for services, 30% indicated resource rooms, 21% indicated self-contained services, 3% indicated segregated services, and 12% indicated other.

As with many of the other items on the survey, the special education content items were in many cases left blank or identified as "not applicable" to large portions of the survey respondents; anywhere from one-third to one-half of the data were missing. Some missing data, whether due to respondents' not giving a response or because the question was not applicable, would be expected given that 57% of the sample is teaching in special education classrooms but is not licensed in special education. However, it is peculiar that portions exceeding 25% of the sample have not answered these questions. Thus, these results must be viewed with caution.

Because of the small sample size, limited analyses could be conducted to determine if any meaningful scales could be created from the content preparation items. Consequently, only item level analyses were performed. Based on a descriptive analysis of those who did respond to the special education content questions, there appear to be mixed results on feelings of preparation. Those questions that asked respondents to agree with the statements "my undergraduate major provided me with the breadth of knowledge needed as a teacher" and "my undergraduate major provided me with the depth of knowledge needed as a teacher" demonstrate that less than half of the respondents agreed with these two questions. This would suggest that of the first year special education teachers answering these two questions (approximately 30 respondents to each), overall quality of preparation was perceived as quite low. Since these teachers are not licensed, they are reflecting on content, not pedagogy. As stated earlier, ratings on these two items for special education respondents were significantly lower than they were for elementary/early childhood and secondary respondents.

### 5. Teaching Skill Preparation of Respondents

First-year teachers were also asked 10 questions regarding how well their education coursework prepared them in their teaching skills. The 10 items fell into two distinct categories: teaching skills and interpersonal/classroom management skills (Table 9). On 5 of the 6 teaching skills items, more than 80 percent of respondents agreed that that were good at incorporating math and literacy in their instruction, practicing a variety of instructional methods, and using assessment to improve students' achievement. They were somewhat less confident about their ability to use technology to enhance student achievement (73.6%). Regarding interpersonal and classroom management skills, respondents generally reported having the skills necessary to manage a classroom (79.6%), talk to parents about either a student's performance (82.5%) or student's emotional problems (77.5%), and prepare lesson plans (87.1%).

**Table 9. MEAN RATINGS FOR TEACHING SKILLS AND INTERPERSONAL AND CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT FOR COLORADO INSTITUTIONS**

Institution	Teaching Skills Ratings			Interpersonal & Classroom Management Ratings		
	N*	Mean	Standard Deviation	N*	Mean	Standard Deviation
<b>Public Inst</b>						
Adams S C	10	5.37	1.14	9	5.28	0.53
CO State U	30	5.71	1.07	27	5.84	0.75
CO State U - Pueblo (was USC)	11	4.94	1.13	11	5.07	1.26
Fort Lewis C	8	--	--	8	--	--
Mesa S C	16	5.58	1.16	16	5.86	1.17
Metro S C of Denver	52	5.62	0.99	50	5.80	1.11
U of CO - Boulder	24	5.29	1.33	24	5.33	1.42
U of CO - CO Springs	15	5.58	1.30	14	5.57	1.62
U of CO - Denver	19	6.03	0.70	18	6.06	0.95
U of Northern CO	62	5.37	1.10	59	5.62	1.06
Western S C	7	--	--	7	--	--
<b>Private Inst</b>						
CO Christian U	6	--	--	7	--	--
CO College	9	--	--	9	--	--
Regis U	15	5.65	1.31	15	6.12	1.15
U of Denver	17	5.89	0.79	17	6.00	1.18
<b>All Respondents</b>	<b>303</b>	<b>5.59</b>	<b>1.11</b>	<b>293</b>	<b>5.73</b>	<b>1.15</b>

Source: First-year teacher survey.

\*Means not reported for institutions with fewer than 10 respondents; two respondents did not report an institution.

Respondents provided generally favorable ratings of both their teaching skills (M 5.59) and their interpersonal and classroom management skills (M = 5.78), though ratings of interpersonal and classroom management skills were significantly more favorable than ratings of teaching skills.

Ratings on the global teaching preparation item were also positive with 78.8% agreeing that their training had prepared them to teach at the beginning of the school year ( $M = 5.61$ ). No differences in ratings of teaching skills were found based on gender, ethnicity, or age. When comparing elementary/early childhood, secondary, and special education respondents, a significant difference was found on perceptions of teaching skills with elementary/early childhood respondents reporting better preparation ( $M = 5.83$ ) than secondary respondents ( $M = 5.44$ ). No differences were found among these three groups on interpersonal and classroom management skills or on the global teacher preparation item.

Ratings of perceived teaching skills preparation differed among some Colorado teacher training institutions. Highest mean ratings of teaching skills were given by respondents from Colorado College ( $M = 6.4$ ), University of Colorado at Denver ( $M = 6.03$ ), and Western State College ( $M = 6.01$ ). Lowest average ratings were reported by respondents trained at the University of Southern Colorado ( $M = 4.94$ ), University of Colorado at Boulder ( $M = 5.29$ ), and Adams State College ( $M = 5.37$ ). The only statistically significant differences were between Colorado College and both University of Northern Colorado and University of Southern Colorado. Caution should be exercised in interpreting these mean differences given the small number of respondents for some institutions. Further, even the lowest mean rating of teaching skills, provided by graduates from University of Southern Colorado, was not significantly lower than 5.0, indicating respondents from that institution felt generally prepared in their teaching skills. No significant differences in ratings of interpersonal and classroom management skills were found among the Colorado institutions. Perceptions of teaching skills preparation also did not differ based on whether or not respondents received their training at a Colorado institution nor on whether or not they had spent their entire undergraduate experience at the same institution.

Relationships between perceived teaching skills preparation and factors associated with the first year teaching experience were also examined. Similar to what was found in terms of content area preparation, no relationships were found between perceived teaching skills preparation and average class size, school district size, school setting, number of first year teaching supports, or number of extracurricular duties.

**a. Elementary and Early Childhood Teachers**

Means on both dimensions of classroom and teaching skills were greater than 5.0 indicating overall agreement with the classroom and teaching skills preparation items within each scale. Elementary and early childhood respondents reported satisfactory preparation in both their interpersonal and classroom management skills ( $M =$

5.83) and in their teaching skills ( $M = 5.87$ ). In addition, the majority of respondents (80%) expressed confidence in the quality of their education and training by agreeing to the item asking them to rate their overall preparation for teaching students at the beginning of the school year ( $M = 5.72$ ).

**b. Secondary Teachers**

Means on both dimensions of classroom and teaching skills were greater than 5.0 indicating overall agreement with the classroom and teaching skills preparation items within each scale. Secondary respondents reported satisfactory preparation in teaching skills ( $M = 5.44$ ) and in their parent contact skills ( $M = 5.66$ ). In addition, the majority of respondents (79.6%) expressed confidence in the quality of their education and training by agreeing to the item asking them to rate their overall preparation for teaching students at the beginning of the school year ( $M = 5.6$ ).

There are significant differences in mean perceived preparation for teaching skills when comparing “regular” teacher education program graduates ( $M = 5.62$ ) and emergency/alternative certifications ( $M = 5.09$ ). Significant differences were found between “received emergency or substitute certification” ( $M = 4.81$ ) and “had bachelor degree before entering a Colorado teacher preparation program” ( $M = 5.64$ ) as well as for “completed teacher preparation program outside Colorado” ( $M = 5.88$ ). Also, “participated in an alternative teacher licensure program” ( $M = 5.18$ ) had a mean response significantly different than that of “completed teacher preparation program outside Colorado ( $M = 5.88$ ).”

Statistical analyses were conducted to determine if other training and background variables might help explain differences in perceived teaching skills preparation. No significant relationships were found between respondents' demographic characteristics (i.e., gender, ethnicity, and age) and perceived preparation in teaching skills. No statistically significant differences were found among the Colorado teacher preparation institutions for teaching skills. No significant difference was found on the teaching skills preparation scale when comparing respondents who received their teacher training in Colorado versus those who received their teacher training outside of Colorado. No differences were found based on whether or not respondents spent their entire undergraduate experience at the same institution. Nor were there any differences in perceived teaching skill preparation depending on whether or not respondents had previous experience as a teacher's aid or

paraprofessional. Student teaching experiences, induction, and prior paraprofessional classroom experience were also unrelated to perceived teaching skills preparation.

**c. Special Education Teachers**

In general, respondents rated their preparedness for a variety of classroom and teaching skills highly. In particular, more than half indicated that they felt prepared for incorporating literacy and math into their instruction, for practicing different instructional methods, for managing a classroom, for using assessments to improve achievement, for talking with parents about academics and emotional problems, for preparing lesson plans and prepared for using technology. Sixty-five percent agreed that their education and training overall prepared them for teaching students at the beginning of the year. There were no significant group differences in feelings of overall preparation, as measured by the one item which asked about overall preparation, by preparation background (i.e., in-state versus out-of-state, etc.)

**6. First Year Teaching Experiences**

Nearly half (45.6%) of all respondents were teaching in the Denver metro area, with another 30.4% teaching in outlying cities or in outlying towns (10.9%). Respondents were working in school districts ranging in size from 301 students to over 25,000 students with the single largest group of respondents (38.4%) from districts with between 6,001 and 25,000 students. Another 28.5% were from the largest districts (over 25,000 students) and an additional 27.4% were working in districts with between 1,201 and 6,000 students. In addition, 44.8% of the respondents did their student teaching in schools similar in size to where they were teaching during their first year. Average class size for respondents ranged between 10 and fewer (7.3%) to over 35 (2 respondents) with most respondents (63.4%) teaching classes of between 21 and 30 students. These proportions differed significantly among respondents in elementary/early childhood, secondary, and special education as would be expected. Class size was smallest for special educators and largest for secondary teachers.

Other first-year experiences included additional duties respondents were required to perform including extracurricular assignments (such as coaching, Odyssey of the Mind, etc.) (47.6%), traveling to more than one school to teach (3.7%), and other non-teaching duties (including lunchroom, hall, and recess duties) (75.7%). Relative involvement in these duties differed among elementary/early childhood, secondary, and special education respondents. Secondary teachers were most likely to be engaged in extracurricular duties (61.7%) compared with either elementary educators (29.8%) or special educators (40.4%) whereas special education respondents were more frequently required to travel to multiple schools (14.9%) than either secondary (4.3%) or elementary respondents (.8%).

In terms of support teachers received during their first year, relatively few were granted a reduced teaching load (7.8%), extra prep time (9.4%), or extra classroom assistance (28.6%). The majority of respondents did receive support in the form of common planning time with teachers in their subject area or grade level (62.1%), seminars or classes for beginning teachers (77.8%), or regular, supportive communication with their principal or with other administrators (76.7%). Level of support differed among elementary/early childhood, secondary, and special education respondents. Fewer special education respondents (3.7%) received reduced teaching schedules than either secondary (10.4%) or elementary/early childhood respondents (10.6%). Similarly, only about a third of special education respondents (34%) were provided common planning time with other teachers in their area and grade level compared with the majority of both secondary (54.6%) and elementary/early childhood respondents (77.6%) who received this type of support. In contrast, special education respondents received more classroom assistance (40.4%) than did secondary (22.1%) or elementary/early childhood respondents (35.2%).

Regarding the quality of induction, only about half of the respondents reported having a mentor. Of these, the majority rated the mentoring during their induction as generally positive with 62.5% of respondents agreeing they had adequate contact with their mentor and 62.2% agreeing they were able to rely upon their mentor to provide good advice. Despite the majority reporting positive experiences with their mentors, approximately one-third of the respondents did not report having positive experiences. In addition, it is noteworthy that nearly half (49.8%) of the respondents indicated that having adequate contact with a mentor as part of their induction program was "not applicable" and that even more (53.7%) of the respondents marked "not applicable" on the item asking them to rate the extent to which they can rely on their mentor to give good advice. No differences were found in quality of mentoring among elementary/early childhood, secondary, and special education respondents.

## **7. Future Teaching Plans**

The majority of respondents planned to teach next year (95.4%) with 85.5% intending to teach at the same school. These percentages were comparable for elementary/early childhood, secondary, and special education respondents. Although only 29 respondents did not plan to teach the next year, 161 respondents provided reasons they might consider for leaving teaching. The most frequently cited reason was financial (39.1%) followed by insufficient support from the school or administration (13.7%), personal reasons (12.4%), and too much time involved (11.2%). The relative frequencies of reasons for leaving teaching differed somewhat among elementary/early childhood, secondary, and special education respondents. Special education respondents cited lack of school/administrative support as their primary reason for leaving teaching (28.6%) whereas only 15% and 6.4% of secondary and elementary/early childhood respondents, respectively, indicated this as their primary reason for leaving.

Special education respondents were also more likely to consider leaving based on the time involved (21.4%) compared with either secondary (8%) or elementary/early childhood respondents (14.9%).

#### **IV. HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTION REAUTHORIZATION SITE VISITS (2002-03)**

The CCHE/CDE reviewed Teacher Education Program Reviews for 2002-2003 at the University of Northern Colorado and Colorado State University. These reviews were only two years after the initial reauthorization of all Colorado teacher education programs in 2000-2001, wherein all programs statewide were required to demonstrate revised policies and curricula responding to the performance-based standards for teacher preparation to align with the Colorado Model Content Standards. Many changes were dictated as a result of both Colorado S.B. 99-154 as well as the No Child Left Behind legislation. Both these institutions volunteered to participate as the first institutions to pilot the new performance review process. The programs were evaluated using the newly developed Performance Model, which evaluates teacher education candidates on how they are able to assist student learning, rather than the former model which evaluated how much student teacher candidates “knew.” Both programs successfully met all the legislatively mandated performance standards. As with all successful programs, there are elements of design that the site team identifies for special attention either because they can serve as examples of excellence for other programs or could benefit by modeling other programs’ innovative design.

The site review team concluded that CSU teaching candidates are coming through the redesigned program with effective initial screening procedures; are competent in their content area; counseled appropriately to lead to success in teaching; have strong student teaching field experiences; and, are prepared for licensure requirements. The assessment aspect of the performance model for undergraduate teacher candidates is still being developed at CSU to coordinate with CCHE’s specific data requirements. The university has hired an assessment coordinator indicating a commitment to addressing this need. The graduate assessment process is effective at this time. Overall, the CCHE site review found the CSU teacher education program able to produce teachers ready to teach in their content area who are valued as an asset by state school districts.

The UNC teacher education program met the state standards for admissions, content, mastery of skills required for state licensure, counseling, field experience, and assessment. The team did suggest areas for improvement in elementary education advising, identification of cooperating teachers for student teacher candidates, and stronger content curriculum for social science majors. Like CSU and all schools during this initial period of accumulating performance data, UNC will be continuing to develop its assessment data collection. The site review team did single out the overall assessment strategy at UNC as a model to other programs with its ability to enhance the quality of programs based on its own data analysis.

**V. PRINCIPAL LICENSURE AND PREPARATION PROGRAMS**

Senate Bill 02-152 requires CCHE to adopt a plan for establishing program requirements for principal preparations offered by institutions of higher education. It also requires the Commission to work in collaboration with the State Board of Education to ensure that principal preparation programs align with performance-based standards for licensure. On or before January 1, 2004, the State Board of Education (SBE) and CDE, along with the CCHE, are directed by the bill to submit a joint report to the Education Committees of the Senate and House. The report will analyze current state licensing and principal preparation program practices, identify the performance-based principal licensure standards adopted by the SBE and the CCHE, and identify the proposed program requirements for institutions of higher education, assessment plans to be used for evaluating the skills of principal candidates seeking licensure and evaluation plans for performance-based principal preparation programs.

In January 2003, SBE adopted performance-based standards that will serve for the development of principal and administrator professional education programs in higher education institutions. The eleven standards are found on the CDE website at:

[www.cde.state.co.us/cdeprof/download/pdf/APRULES.pdf](http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdeprof/download/pdf/APRULES.pdf).

Currently, CCHE and CDE are working to revise the preparation rules for principals/administrators. These preparation rules will be presented to SBE in September 2003 for approval.

**Appendix A**

**STATUTORY AUTHORITY**

**Commission directive – approval of teacher preparation programs**

"Beginning January 2002, the commission shall annually, submit to the education committees of the senate and the house of representatives a report concerning the effectiveness of the review of teacher preparation programs conducted pursuant to 23-1-121. The report shall state the percentage of teacher candidates graduating from each teacher preparation program during the preceding twelve months that applied for and received a provisional teacher license pursuant to section 22-60-201 and percentage of said graduates who passed the assessments administered pursuant to section 22-60.5-203."

Attachment A.

**TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS APPROVED BY CCHE**

<b>CCHE APPROVED TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS</b>			
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Level</b>	<b>Licensure Area</b>	<b>Program</b>
<b>Adams State College</b>	Post-bacc.	Business Secondary	
		Counselor	
		Education: Elem. & Sec.	
		Elementary	
		Elementary/Early Childhood	
		For. Lang. Sec.-Spanish	
		K-12: Art	
		K-12: Music	
		K-12: Physical Education	
		Language Arts (Speech)	
		Language Arts Secondary	
		Mathematics Secondary	
		Reading/Literacy	
		School Principal	
		Science Secondary	
	Social Studies Secondary		
	Special Education		
	Undergrad	Linguistically Diverse	English as a Second Language
		Business Secondary	Business
		Early Childhood	Interdisciplinary Studies
		Elementary	Interdisciplinary Studies
		Foreign Language Secondary	Spanish
		K-12: Art	Art
K-12: Music		Music Education	
K-12: Physical Education		Exercise, Physiology & Leisure Studies	
Language Arts Secondary		English	
		Speech and Theatre	
Mathematics Secondary	Mathematics		
Science Secondary	Biology		
	Chemistry		
	Geology		
Social Studies Secondary	History and Government		
<b>Colorado College</b>	Post-bacc.	Art Secondary	
		Elementary	
		Foreign Language Secondary: Spanish, German, French, Japanese, Classics	
		K-12: Art	

CCHE APPROVED TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS			
Institution	Level	Licensure Area	Program
		Language Arts Secondary	
		Mathematics Secondary	
		Music Secondary	
		Science Secondary: Biology, Geology, Physics, Chemistry	
		Social Studies Secondary	
	Undergrad	Elementary	Liberal Arts & Sciences
		Foreign Language Secondary	Classics
			French
			German
			Japanese
			Spanish
		Language Arts Secondary	English
		K-12: Art	Art
		K-12: Music	Music
		Mathematics Secondary	Mathematics
		Music Secondary	Music
		Science Secondary	Biology
Chemistry			
Geology			
Physics			
Social Studies Secondary	History		
Colorado Christian University	Post-bacc.	Elementary	
		Language Arts Secondary	
		Mathematics Secondary	
		Science Secondary	
		Social Studies Secondary	
		K-12: Music	
	Undergrad	Elementary	Liberal Arts
		K-12: Music	Music
		Language Arts Secondary	English
		Mathematics Secondary	Mathematics
		Science Secondary	General Biology
		Social Studies Secondary	Social Sciences
Colorado State University	Post-bacc.	Agriculture Secondary	
		Business Secondary	
		Counselor	
		Elementary/Early Childhood	
		Family & Consumer Secondary	
		Foreign Language Secondary: German, French, Spanish	
		K-12: Art	

<b>CCHE APPROVED TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS</b>			
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Level</b>	<b>Licensure Area</b>	<b>Program</b>
		K-12: Music	
		Language Arts Secondary	
		Linguistically Diverse: English as a Second Language	
		Mathematics Secondary	
		Science Secondary	
		School Administrator	
		School Principal	
		School Social Worker	
		Social Studies Secondary	
		Technical Secondary	
	Undergrad	Agriculture Secondary	Agricultural Education
		Business Secondary	Business Administration
		Early Childhood	Human Development & Family Studies
		Consumer & Family Secondary	Consumer and Family Studies
		Foreign Language Secondary	French
			German
			Spanish
		K-12: Art	Art
		K-12: Music	Music
		Language Arts Secondary	English
			Speech Communication
		Marketing Secondary	Business Administration
		Mathematics Secondary	Mathematics
		Occupational Therapist	Occupational Therapy
		Science Secondary	Biology
			Chemistry
			Geology
			Natural Sciences
		Social Studies Secondary	Physics
			History
			Liberal Arts
			Technology Education and Training
Technical Secondary	Technology Education and Training		
Trades & Industry Secondary	Technology Education and Training		
<b>Colorado State University-Pueblo (formerly University of Southern Colorado)</b>	Post-bacc.	Elementary	
		Foreign Language Secondary: Spanish	
		K-12: Art	
		K-12: Music	
		K-12: Physical Education	
		Language Arts Secondary	
Mathematics Secondary			

<b>CCHE APPROVED TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS</b>			
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Level</b>	<b>Licensure Area</b>	<b>Program</b>
		School Nurse	
		Science Secondary	
		Social Studies Secondary	
	Undergrad	Elementary	Liberal Studies
		Foreign Language Secondary	Spanish
		K-12: Art	Art
		K-12: Music	Music
		K-12: Physical Education	Physical Education
		Language Arts Secondary	English
		Mathematics Secondary	Mathematics
		Science Secondary	Biology
			Chemistry
			Physics
		Social Studies Secondary	History
Political Science			
<b>University of Denver</b>	Post-bacc.	Counselor	
		Director, Special Education	
		Elementary	
		Foreign Language Secondary, German, Russian, Spanish, French	
		K-12: Art	
		K-12: Music	
		Language Arts Secondary	
		Mathematics Secondary	
		Science Secondary	
		School Principal	
		School Psychologist	
		School Social Worker	
		Social Studies Secondary	
		Special Education	
		Special Education: Moderate Needs	
		Special Education: Early Childhood	
	Undergrad	Elementary	Liberal Arts
		Foreign Language Secondary	German
			French
			Russian
Spanish			
K-12: Art	Art		
Mathematics Secondary	Mathematics		
Science Secondary	General Science		

<b>CCHE APPROVED TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS</b>			
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Level</b>	<b>Licensure Area</b>	<b>Program</b>
		Social Studies Secondary	History
		Special Education	Special Education
<b>Fort Lewis College</b>	Post-bacc.	Elementary	
		Early Childhood	
		Elementary	
		Foreign Language Secondary: Spanish	
		K-12: Art	
		K-12: Music	
		K-12: Physical Education	
		Language Arts Secondary	
		Mathematics Secondary	
		Science Secondary	
	Social Studies Secondary		
	Undergrad	Elementary	Interdisciplinary Studies
		Elementary/Early Childhood	Interdisciplinary Studies
		Foreign Language	Spanish
		Linguistically Diverse	Bilingual
			English as a Second Language
		K-12: Art	Art
		K-12: Music	Music Education
		K-12: Physical Education	Exercise Science
		Language Arts Secondary	English
Mathematics Secondary		Mathematics	
Science Secondary	Biology		
	Chemistry		
	Geology		
	Physics		
	History		
Social Studies Secondary	Humanities		
	History		
<b>Johnson &amp; Wales University</b>	Undergrad.	Business Secondary	Business & Marketing Education
		Consumer & Family Secondary	Consumer & Family Studies
		Marketing	Business & Marketing Education
<b>Mesa State College</b>	Post-bacc.	Language Arts Secondary	
		Mathematics Secondary	
		Science Secondary	
		Social Studies Secondary	
		Elementary	
		Elementary/Early Childhood	
		K-12: Art	
		K-12: Music	

<b>CCHE APPROVED TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS</b>				
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Level</b>	<b>Licensure Area</b>	<b>Program</b>	
	Undergrad	K-12: Physical Education		
		Early Childhood	Liberal Arts	
		Elementary	Liberal Arts	
		K-12: Art		
		K-12: Music		
		K-12: Physical Education		
		Language Arts Secondary	English	
		Mathematics Secondary	Mathematics	
		Science Secondary	Biological Sciences	
			Environmental Science and Technology	
			Physical Science Geology with Earth Science	
			Physical Sciences: Physics	
Social Studies Secondary	History			
<b>Metropolitan State College of Denver</b>	Post-bacc.	Early Childhood Education		
		Elementary		
		Foreign Language Secondary		
		K-12: Art		
		K-12: Music		
		K-12: Physical Education		
		Language Arts Secondary		
		Mathematics Secondary		
		Science Secondary		
		Social Studies Secondary		
		Special Education		
	Undergrad	Early Childhood		Behavioral Science
				English
				History
				Human Development
				Speech Communications
		Elementary		Behavioral Science
				Biology
				English
History				
Modern Languages: Spanish				
Foreign Language Secondary	Modern Languages			
K-12: Art	Art			
K-12: Music	Music Education			
K-12: Physical Education	Human Performance & Sport			
Language Arts Secondary	English			

<b>CCHE APPROVED TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS</b>			
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Level</b>	<b>Licensure Area</b>	<b>Program</b>
		Linguistically Diverse	Bilingual
		Mathematics Secondary	Mathematics
		School Nurse	Nursing
		Science Secondary	Biology
			Chemistry
			Environmental Science
		Social Studies Secondary	Behavioral Sciences
			Chicano Studies
			Economics
			History
			Political Science
		Special Education: Moderate Needs	Special Education

<b>CCHE APPROVED TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS</b>			
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Level</b>	<b>Licensure Area</b>	<b>Program</b>
<b>Regis College</b>	Undergrad	Elementary Education	Biology
			Chemistry
			Communications
			Computer Science
			Economics
			English
			Environmental Studies & Human Ecology
			Fine Arts: Visual Arts
			French
			History
			Mathematics
			Philosophy
			Psychology
			Religious Studies
			Sociology
		Spanish	
		Business Secondary	Business
		English Secondary	English
		Foreign Language Secondary	French
			Spanish
		Mathematics Secondary	Mathematics
		Science Secondary	Biology
Chemistry			
Interdivisional Studies			
Social Studies Secondary	Economics		
	History		
	Interdivisional (History, Political Science, Economics)		
	Political Science		
<b>Regis University</b>	Post-bacc.	Early Childhood	
		Elementary	
		Foreign Language Secondary: French, German, Spanish	
		K-12: Art	
		K-12: Music	
		Language Arts Secondary	
		Linguistically Diverse: Bilingual; English as a Second Language	
		Mathematics Secondary	
		Middle School: Language Arts, Foreign Language, Mathematics, Science, Social Studies	
		School Nurse	

CCHE APPROVED TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS				
Institution	Level	Licensure Area	Program	
		Science Secondary		
		Social Studies Secondary		
		Special Education		
		Special Education: Early Childhood		
		Special Education: Moderate Needs		
	Undergrad	Early Childhood	Liberal Studies	
			Elementary	Biology
			Chemistry	
			Communications	
			Computer Science	
			Economics	
			English	
			Environmental Studies & Human Ecology	
			Fine Arts: Visual Arts	
			French	
History				
Liberal Studies				
Mathematics				
Philosophy				
Psychology				
Religious Studies				
Sociology				
		Foreign Language: Secondary	Spanish	
		Foreign Language: Middle	French	
		German		
		K-12: Art	Fine Arts: Art	
			Fine Arts: Music	
		Language Arts: Secondary Language Arts: Middle	Communication (Speech)	
			English	
			Theater Arts	
		Mathematics: Secondary Mathematics: Middle	Mathematics	
			Science: Secondary Science: Middle	Biological Sciences
			Chemistry	
			Earth Sciences	
			Physics	
		Social Studies: Secondary Social Studies: Middle	Geography	
			History	
Social Sciences				
Special Education	Interdisciplinary Studies			

CCHE APPROVED TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS				
Institution	Level	Licensure Area	Program	
Rocky Mountain College of Art	Undergrad	K-12: Art	Fine Art	
University of Colorado-Boulder	Post-bacc.	Audiologist		
		Linguistically Diverse: Bilingual		
		Linguistically Diverse: English as a Second Language		
		Elementary		
		Foreign Language Secondary: Japanese, Russian Studies, Italian, Germanic Studies, Spanish, French, Classics: Latin,		
		K-12: Music		
		K-12: Music Education		
		Language Arts Secondary		
		Mathematics Secondary		
		Reading Teacher		
		Science Secondary		
		Social Studies, Secondary		
		Special Education: Moderate Needs		
		Speech: Language Pathologist		
	Undergrad	Elementary		American Studies
				Anthropology
				Astronomy
				Biology: Distributive Studies
				Communication
				Chemistry: Distributive Studies
				Economics
				English
				Geography
Geology: Distributive Studies				
History				
Humanities				
Linguistics				
Mathematics				
Physics				
Political Science				
Psychology				
Spanish				
Foreign Language Secondary				Classics (Latin)
	French			
	German			
	Italian			

<b>CCHE APPROVED TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS</b>			
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Level</b>	<b>Licensure Area</b>	<b>Program</b>
			Japanese
			Russian
			Spanish
		K-12: Music	Music
			Music Education
		Language Arts Secondary	Communications
			English
			Humanities
			Linguistics
		Mathematics Secondary	Mathematics
		Science Secondary	Astronomy
			Biology EPO
			Chemistry
			Physics
			Distributed Studies: Chemistry
		Social Studies Secondary	American Studies
			Anthropology
			Economics
			Geography
			History
			International Affairs
Political Science			
<b>University of Colorado-Colorado Springs</b>	Post-bacc.	Counselor	
		Elementary	
		Foreign Language Secondary: Spanish	
		Language Arts Secondary	
		Linguistically Diverse: English as a Second Language	
		Mathematics Secondary	
		Reading Teacher	
		School Administrator	
		School Principal	
		Science Secondary: Biology, Chemistry, Physics	
		Social Studies Secondary	
		Special Education: Moderate Needs	
		Special Education: Severe Needs Cognitive	
		Special Education: Severe Needs Affective	
	Undergrad	Elementary	Biology

<b>CCHE APPROVED TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS</b>			
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Level</b>	<b>Licensure Area</b>	<b>Program</b>
			English
			Geography & Environmental Studies
			History
			Mathematics
			Spanish
		Foreign Language Secondary	Spanish
		Language Arts Secondary	English
		Mathematics Secondary	Mathematics
		Science Secondary	Biology
			Chemistry
			Physics
		Social Studies Secondary	History
		Special Education	Biology
			English
			Geography & Environmental Studies
			History
			Mathematics
			Spanish
		Special Education: Moderate Needs	Special Education
		Special Education: Severe Cognitive	
Special Education: Severe Affective			
<b>University of Colorado at Denver</b>	Post-bacc.	Elementary	
		Foreign Language Secondary	
		Language Arts Secondary	
		Linguistically Diverse: Bilingual & English as a Second Language	
		Mathematics Secondary	
		Reading Teacher	
		School Administrator	
		School Library Media	
		School Principal	
		School Psychologist	
		Science Secondary	
		Social Studies Secondary	
		Special Education: Moderate Needs	
		Special Education: Severe Cognitive	
		Special Education: Severe Affective	

<b>CCHE APPROVED TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS</b>			
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Level</b>	<b>Licensure Area</b>	<b>Program</b>
		Special Education: Severe Communication	
		Special Education: Early Childhood	
		Special Education: Profound	
		Special Education: Early Childhood	
	Undergrad	Elementary	Individually Structured Major
		Language Arts Secondary	English
		Mathematics Secondary	Mathematics
Social Studies Secondary		History Political Science	
<b>University of Colorado Health Science Center</b>	Post-bacc.	School Nurse	Nursing
	Undergrad	School Nurse	Nursing
		Physical Therapy	Physical Therapy
<b>University of Northern Colorado</b>	Post-bacc.	Audiologist	
		Counselor	
		Drama Secondary	
		Early Childhood	
		Elementary	
		Foreign Language Secondary: Spanish, French, German	
		K-12: Art	
		K-12: Music	
		K-12: Physical Education	
		Language Arts Secondary	
		Linguistically Diverse: Bilingual & English as a Second Language	
		Mathematics Secondary	
		Middle School	
		Reading/Literacy	
		Reading Specialist	
		School Administrator	
		School Library Media	
		School Nurse	
		School Principal	
		School Psychologist	
		Science Secondary	
		Social Studies Secondary	
		Special Education	
Special Education: Affective			
Special Education: Cognitive			

CCHE APPROVED TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS			
Institution	Level	Licensure Area	Program
		Special Education: Communication	
		Special Education, Director	
		Special Education: Early Childhood	
		Special Education: Hearing	
		Special Education: Orientation	
		Special Education: Profound	
		Special Education: Vision	
		Speech Pathologist	
	Undergrad	Early Childhood	Interdisciplinary Studies
			Interdisciplinary Studies
		Foreign Language Secondary	French
			German
			Spanish
		K-12: Art	Visual Arts
		K-12: Music	Music Education
		K-12: Physical Education	Exercise & Sports Science
		Language Arts Secondary	Communication Speech
			English
			Theater Arts
		Mathematics Secondary	Mathematics
		Middle School	Biological Sciences
			Chemistry
			Communication Speech
			Earth Sciences
			English
			French
			Geography
			German
History			
Mathematics			
Physics			
Social Sciences			
Spanish			
Theatre Arts			
Science Secondary		Biological Sciences	
		Chemistry	
	Earth Sciences		
	Physics		
Social Studies Secondary	Geography		
	History		

<b>CCHE APPROVED TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS</b>				
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Level</b>	<b>Licensure Area</b>	<b>Program</b>	
			Social Science	
		Special Education	Interdisciplinary Studies	
<b>University of Phoenix</b>	Post-bacc.	Business Secondary		
		Counselor		
		Elementary		
		Language Arts Secondary		
		Linguistically Diverse: English as a Second Language		
		Marketing Secondary		
		Mathematics Secondary		
		School Principal		
		Social Studies Secondary		
		Technology Secondary		
<b>Western State College</b>	Post-bacc.	Counselor		
		Elementary		
		Foreign Language Secondary: Spanish		
		K-12: Art		
		K-12: Music		
		K-12: Physical Education		
		Language Arts Secondary		
		Linguistically Diverse: English as a Second Language		
		Mathematics Secondary		
		School Principal		
		Science Secondary		
		Social Studies Secondary		
		Special Education		
		Undergrad	Elementary	
				English
				Geology
				Interdisciplinary Studies
				Mathematics
	Foreign Language Secondary			Spanish
	K-12: Art			Art
K-12: Music	Music			
K-12: Physical Education	Kinesiology			
Language Arts Secondary	English			
Mathematics Secondary	Mathematics			
Music Secondary	Music			
Science Secondary	Biology			
	Chemistry			

<b>CCHE APPROVED TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS</b>			
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Level</b>	<b>Licensure Area</b>	<b>Program</b>
			Geology
			Physics
		Social Studies Secondary	Economics
			History
			Political Science
		Special Education	Interdisciplinary Studies
		Special Education: Moderate Needs	Special Education

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

**PREPARED BY:       ANDREW BRECKEL III**

**I.       SUMMARY**

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

**II.      BACKGROUND**

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

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

**III.     ACTION**

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

The Board of Regents of the University of Colorado has submitted a request for an out-of-state instructional program to be delivered by the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center.

- **"New Strategies in the Treatment of Pulmonary Hypertension,"** described herein as an out-of-state instructional program to be presented in Boston, MA on June 11, 2003.
- **"5<sup>th</sup> Annual Jackson Hole Summer Urologic Conference,"** described herein as an out-of-state instructional program to be presented in Teton Village, Wyoming on July 26-August 1, 2003.
- **"Therapeutic Challenges, Enhanced Clinical Expectations: Evolution of the Protease Inhibitor Class,"** described herein as an out-of-state instructional program to be presented in Paris France on July 12, 2003.

The Adams State College Board of Trustees has submitted a request for out-of-state instructional programs to be delivered by Adams State College.

- **ED 589: Standards-Based Performance Assessment & Instruction in Mathematics**  
The dates for this course in El Paso, Texas are July 9 through July 10, 2003.  
The dates for this course in Bennington, Vermont are August 4 through August 5, 2003.
- **ED 289/589: Reaching Kids Through Whole Brain/Body Learning**  
The dates for this course are October 4 – November 15, 2003.
- **ED 289/589: Eye Exercises to Make Learning Easy**  
The dates for this course are March 6 – April 17, 2004.

**Appendix A**

**STATUTORY AUTHORITY**

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

**TOPIC: FTE – SERVICE AREA EXEMPTIONS**

**PREPARED BY: ANDREW BRECKEL III**

**I. SUMMARY**

This agenda item presents approved service area exemptions that allow community colleges, local district colleges, and area vocational schools to provide short-term access to a certificate or degree program not available in another institution’s defined service area. The FTE can be claim for state support.

C.R.S. 23-1-109 limits state support eligibility to credit hours offered within the geographic boundaries of the campus. The geographic service areas for community colleges are defined in CCHE policy Section I, Part N - *Service Areas of Colorado Public Institutions of Higher Education* apply to two-year colleges, area vocational schools (AVS), Adams State College (ASC), and Mesa State College (MSC).

The Commission recognizes that the FTE Policy may not address every possible circumstance. Institutions may request an exemption from the Commission when encountering a circumstance that the policy does not explicitly address (e.g., no other institution is approved to offer this degree within the service area). Exemptions approved by CCHE staff and entered into the public record do not alter or establish the state policy, but only apply to the applying institution for the particular circumstance for a specified period of time.

CCHE staff approved the following service area exemptions. No further action is needed.

GUEST INSTITUTION	HOST INSTITUTION	PROGRAM	FTE	TIME PERIOD
ACC	CCD	Basic Electronics	4	Ongoing
ACC	PPCC	All programs in Elizabeth		Ongoing
CNCC	Mesa State	Gen Ed, Transfer & Aviation		FY 02- FY 03
CNCC	Mesa State	Health Occupations – Nursing		2003
CNCC	Mesa State	Oil and Gas Production, Equipment Management and Maintenance		2003
CCD	Aims	GED Institute	.06	ASAP
EGOS	MCC	Airframe and Powerplant	300	2003
EGOS	PPCC	Plumber Pipefitter	25	9/2003 – 5/2004
EGOS	PPCC	Electrician	40	9/2003 – 5/2004
EGOS	PPCC	Electrician	40	9/2003 – 5/2004

GUEST INSTITUTION	HOST INSTITUTION	PROGRAM	FTE	TIME PERIOD
LCC	OJC	Bio/Che/Eng/His/Mat/Spe	16	8/2003 – 5/2004
MCC	CCA	Agriculture/Animal Sciences	3	1/17/03 - ongoing
MCC	PPCC	Agriculture/Animal Sciences	1	1/17/03 – ongoing
MCC	CCA	Ag Business Management	6	1/17/03 – ongoing
MCC	PPCC	Ag Business Management	5	1/17/03 – ongoing
MCC	CCA	Construction	5	1/17/03 – ongoing
MCC	Aims	Heavy Equipment/Basic Principles	4	1/17/03 – ongoing
MCC	LCC	Heavy Equipment/Basic Principles	4	1/17/03 – ongoing
MCC	PPCC	Heavy Equipment/Basic Principles	5	1/17/03 – ongoing
MCC	CCA	Warehousing/Logistics Mgmt	2	1/17/03 – ongoing
MCC	LCC	Warehousing/Logistics Mgmt	2	1/17/03 – ongoing
MCC	PPCC	Warehousing/Logistics Mgmt	2	1/17/03 – ongoing
MCC	CCA	Young Farmers	3	1/17/03 – ongoing
MCC	PPCC	Young Farmers	3	1/17/03 – ongoing
NJC	ACC	Theatre	8	6/18/03 – 6/22/03
OJC	PCC	Computer Networking/Cisco	5	June 02 – June 04
OJC	LCC	Computer Networking/Cisco	5	June 02 – June 04
OJC	PCC	Early Childhood	10	June 02 – June 04
OJC	TSJC	Early Childhood	10	June 02 – June 04
OJC	LCC	Early Childhood	10	June 02 – June 04
OJC	PCC	Farm Ranch – Ag Bus Mgmt	15	June 02 – June 04
PCC	FRCC	Respiratory Care	11	8/26/02 – 7/26/03
PCC	FRCC	Respiratory Care	12	5/19/03 – 5/5/05
SJB AVS	D-M AVS	Ag Business Mgmt	15	7/1/02 – 6/30/03
SJB AVS	D-M AVS	CO Fire Fighters Academy	15	10/15/03 – 10/19/03
SJB AVS	D-M AVS	CO Symposium on Emergency Care	16	4/8/03 – 4/13/03
SJB AVS	D-M AVS	CO Symposium on Emergency Care	15	4/1/02 – ongoing
SJB AVS	D-M AVS	CO Young Farmers	3	9/1/02 – 6/30/03
SJB AVS	D-M AVS	Ag Business Mgmt/Young Farmers	19/3	7/1/03 – 6/30/04

**TOPIC: GENERAL EDUCATION COURSE SECTIONS REPORT**

**PREPARED BY: JETT CONNER**

**I. SUMMARY**

At its January 2003 meeting, several Commissioners requested information on the number of sections of general education courses approved for statewide transfer that were going to be offered for fall 2003, the implementation date of the statewide transfer policy. (Summary course section data for the four-year and two-year institutions are shown in Attachments A and B).

For fall 2003, a total of 4,187 general education course sections were offered. The four-year institutions offered 1,420 general education sections (34%) and the community colleges offered 2,767 sections (66%).

Two-year institutions offered almost twice as many general education course sections as the +four-year institutions. Among the four-year institutions, MSCD offers the highest number of general education course sections. Among two-year institutions, Front Range Community College, Red Rocks Community College and the Community College of Denver offer the three highest numbers of general education course sections, respectively.

When analyzing the course section numbers, there are several points to remember:

- General education courses guaranteed for statewide transfer are chosen following a statewide course nomination process. Not all general education courses approved for statewide transfer are offered by all institutions. Some general education courses were not nominated by an institution or were not approved during the first cycle of general education course offerings. Some courses are offered only for the fall term, others in the spring.
- The number of course sections does not necessarily indicate the numbers of students taking general education courses at a college. For example, UCB offers four chemistry sections that collectively serve our 900 enrolled of the introductory general education chemistry course approved for statewide transfer.

**II. BACKGROUND**

In 2002, CCHE convened the General Education Council (GE-25 Council), composed of college administrators, faculty and students, to oversee the statewide general education

course transfer project. The Council developed content and competency criteria for five content areas of general education (communication, mathematics, arts & humanities, social and behavioral sciences, and physical & life sciences).

All general education courses nominated for statewide transfer guarantee are reviewed against the appropriate content and competency criteria established by the GE-25 Council. Then, following a review process established by GE-25 Council and CCHE staff, courses are recommended to the Commission for its approval.

More than 450 general education courses were nominated for approval for guaranteed transfer during the first cycle of course nominations. Some 250 of these courses were approved by the Commission at its January 2003 meeting for inclusion in the program. As this is an annual process, the numbers of general education courses and course sections offered with statewide transfer guarantee likely will increase each year.

### **III. STAFF ANALYSIS**

CCHE staff will monitor the numbers of general education course sections offered as part of its evaluation of the statewide guaranteed general education transfer program, to ensure that adequate numbers of course sections of guaranteed general education courses are being offered to students.

## Appendix A

### STATUTORY AUTHORITY

**23-1-125. Commission directive - student bill of rights - degree requirements - implementation of core courses - on-line catalogue - competency test.** (1) **Student bill of rights.** The general assembly hereby finds that students enrolled in public institutions of higher education shall have the following rights:

(c) Students have a right to clear and concise information concerning which courses must be completed successfully to complete their degrees;

(d) Students have a right to know which courses are transferable among the state public two-year and four-year institutions of higher education;

(e) Students, upon completion of core general education courses, regardless of the delivery method, should have those courses satisfy the core course requirements of all Colorado public institutions of higher education;

(f) Students have a right to know if courses from one or more public higher education institutions satisfy the students' degree requirements;

(g) A student's credit for the completion of the core requirements and core courses shall not expire for ten years from the date of initial enrollment and shall be transferable.

(3) **Core courses.** The commission, in consultation with each Colorado public institution of higher education, is directed to outline a plan to implement a core course concept, which defines the general education course guidelines for all public institutions of higher education. The core of courses shall be **designed to ensure that students demonstrate competency in reading, critical thinking, written communication, mathematics, and technology.** The core of courses shall consist of at least thirty credit hours, but shall not exceed forty credit hours. Individual institutions of higher education shall conform their own core course requirements with the guidelines developed by the commission and shall identify the specific courses that meet the general education course guidelines. If a statewide matrix of core courses is adopted by the commission, the courses identified by the individual institutions as meeting the general education course guidelines shall be included in the matrix. The commission shall adopt such policies to ensure that institutions develop the most effective way to implement the transferability of core course credits.

(b) The council shall recommend to the commission a statewide articulation matrix system of common course numbering to which the general education courses for each higher education institution may be mapped.

(c) (I) On or before October 1, 2002, the council shall recommend to the commission a list of general education courses to be included in the course numbering system. In identifying said general education courses, the council shall review the course descriptions, and may request summaries of course syllabi for review, focusing first on lower division general education courses. The commission shall review the council's recommendations and adopt a statewide articulation matrix system of common course numbering for general education courses, including criteria for such courses, on or before January 1, 2003.

(II) The council shall annually review the list of general education courses and the course numbering system, including the criteria, adopted by the commission and recommend such changes as may be necessary to maintain the accuracy and integrity of the course numbering system. The council's annual review shall include consideration of the course descriptions, and the council may request summaries of course syllabi for further review.

Attachment A

Sections of GT Courses  
 Public Four-Year Colleges and Universities  
 Fall 2003

Area	Insitution												Total
	ASC	CSM	CSU	FLC	MESA	METRO	UCB	UCCS	UCD	UNC	USC	WSC	
<b>Communication</b>													
<i>Intro. Writing Course (GT-CO1)</i>	13		97	9		99	78	43	25	26	21	13	424
<i>Intermediate Composition (GT- CO2)</i>	4			2		75		18	10	21			130
<b>Comm Subtotal</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>554</b>
<b>Mathematics (GT- MA1)</b>													
	11	24	20	17	21	49	38	2	0	16	13	8	<b>219</b>
<b>Arts &amp; Humanities</b>													
<i>Arts (GT- AH1)</i>	7		6	5	2	14	3		13		9	10	69
<i>Literature (GT- AH2)</i>			11	1	5			4	2	14	4		41
<i>Ways of Thinking (GT-AH3)</i>			15	2	2		16	4	17	4			60
<b>Arts &amp; Hum Subtotal</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>170</b>
<b>Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences</b>													
<i>History (GT-HI1)</i>	12			2	14	53	7		3	11	9	6	117
<i>Economic &amp; Political systems (GT-SS1)</i>						26	6			17	5	7	61
<i>Geography (GT-SS2)</i>				1					1	12			14
<i>Human Behavior &amp; Social Systems (GT-SS3)</i>	14		5	2	2	34		10	3	10		8	88
<b>Soc &amp; Beh Sci Subtotal</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>280</b>
<b>Physical &amp; Life Sciences (GT- SC1)</b>													
	3	21	34	19	20	29	19	3	14	2	23	10	<b>197</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>379</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>1,420</b>

Attachment B

**Sections of GT Courses  
 Public Two-Year Colleges  
 Fall 2003**

Area	Insitution															Total
	Aims	ACC	CCA	CNCC	CMC	CCD	FRCC	LCC	MCC	NJC	OJC	PPCC	PCC	RRCC	TSJC	
<b>Communication</b>																
<i>Intro. Writing Course (GT-CO1)</i>	15	43	21	13	25	40	86	5	21	14	9	55	42	37	19	445
<i>Intermediate Composition (GT-CO2)</i>	9	15	12	6	0	22	40	4	1	5	5	27	15	18	6	185
<b>Comm Subtotal</b>	24	58	33	19	25	62	126	9	22	19	14	82	57	55	25	<b>630</b>
<b>Mathematics (GT- MA1)</b>	9	22	29	17	25	39	84	10	14	16	13	32	27	35	20	<b>392</b>
<b>Arts &amp; Humanities</b>																
<i>Arts (GT-AH1)</i>	9	21	13	14	10	27	37	8	3	9	10	21	19	25	19	245
<i>Literature (GT-AH2)</i>	10	10	6	10	15	14	22	4	3	4	6	14	22	10	5	155
<i>Ways of Thinking (GT-AH3)</i>	2	14	15	6	11	15	38	6	2	6	4	17	13	24	7	180
<b>Arts &amp; Hum Subtotal</b>	21	45	34	30	36	56	97	18	8	19	20	52	54	59	31	<b>580</b>
<b>Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences</b>																
<i>History (GT-HI1)</i>	12	20	20	13	17	27	71	10	9	10	11	40	20	31	13	324
<i>Economic &amp; Political systems (GT-SS1)</i>	3	6	3	1	2	5	11	2	0	1	2		3	5	4	48
<i>Geography (GT-SS2)</i>	5	10	4	3	14	5	19	2	2	1	0	14	7	8	1	95
<i>Human Behavior &amp; Social Systems (GT-SS3)</i>	13	6	9	4	13	19	44	3	1	8	9	15	15	16	10	185
<b>Soc &amp; Beh Sci Subtotal</b>	33	42	36	21	46	56	145	17	12	20	22	69	45	60	28	<b>652</b>
<b>Physical &amp; Life Sciences (GT- SC1)</b>	9	43	23	80	24	35	91	16	12	32	24	41	31	74	23	<b>558</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>248</b>	<b>543</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>276</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>283</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>2,812</b>