

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF
COLORADO COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION
May 4, 2006**

Chairperson Terry Farina called the meeting to order at 10:10 a.m.

Commissioners Terry Farina, Ray Baker, Joel Farkas, Rich Garcia, Dean Quamme, Rick Ramirez, Edward Robinson, Greg Stevinson, James Stewart and Judy Weaver were present. Commissioner Judy Altenberg was excused. Commission Staff members attending were Executive Director Jenna Langer, Matt Gianneschi, Diane Lindner, Matt McKeever, Tobin Bliss, Vicki Leal, Andy Carlson and Heather DeLange.

Dr. John Trefny, President of the Colorado School of Mines, welcomed the Commissioners and expressed his thanks for the continuous support of the School of Mines. Dr. Trefny updated the Commission on programs and initiatives at the School of Mines.

Commissioner Stewart motioned to approve the April 6, 2006, minutes with a second by Commissioner Weaver. The minutes were passed unanimously.

There were no chair or advisory reports.

There was no public comment.

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

PRESENTATION BY DAWN TAYLOR OWENS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF COLLEGE IN COLORADO: AN UPDATE ON COLLEGE IN COLORADO: College in Colorado is refocusing its efforts and resources toward the grassroots outreach approach. Counselors, teachers, parents and students have provided feedback indicating that this approach is the most effective way to convey the College in Colorado message. The CIC Website is being revamped to improve the ease of navigation. CIC has expanded student outreach efforts to include more of a one-on-one approach. A newly appointed Director of Student Outreach has been meeting with numerous middle and high school principals and counselors to set up assemblies and other group presentations. The reaction to this approach has been positive thus far. Team College in Colorado has been developed to have college athletes travel with the outreach team to various middle and high schools to talk with the students about the obstacles that they have overcome and other problems they have faced, and convey to them the importance of education. "Being that these athletes are shortly removed from high school themselves, they can positively relate to the youth on their level and further relay the message of hope through education." A CIC Daniels Opportunity Book Scholarship has been developed and has received 122 applicants from 32 rural schools. The Daniels Fund has increased its allocation from \$400 to \$800 per year. In March, 60,000 letters went out to parents of 8th graders detailing the new higher education admission requirements. As mandated by House Bill 1027, ACT follow up letters will go out to juniors in high school and their parents to let them know if, based on their ACT score, they will need remediation either

later in high school or when they start their college career. The College in Colorado Scholarship has been a success with nearly 2,000 applicants vying for a \$1,500 per year scholarship. The scholarship is based on students applying and committing to take pre-collegiate coursework throughout high school.

Ms. Weaver asked Ms. Taylor Owens for a copy of the 8th grade letter that was mailed. She also asked if Ms. Taylor Owens will be notifying the Colorado Department of Education (CDE) or the School Districts that the remediation letter is being sent. Ms. Taylor Owens said that they are working with CDE and ACT on the language of the letter and getting the letters out. Ms. Weaver suggested that for the next College Friday, CIC should contact city councils throughout the state and they can develop resolutions for the day. This will help communities tie economic development to education.

Mr. Farina asked what the size of the staff is and what each does for the organization. Ms. Taylor Owens identified a staff of 13 people.

Mr. Garcia asked if the letter that went out to 8th grade students was sent out in Spanish. Ms. Taylor Owens said that it was and is also on the Website in Spanish. Mr. Garcia asked how many College in Colorado scholarships have been given out. The response was that the money is entrusted in College Invest and they are hoping to administer 4,000 scholarships next year. Ms. Langer added that it is now up to a \$75 million endowment in the trust and as the number of potential qualifying students was projected out the \$1,500 amount was calculated. The number can be adjusted in the policy to make sure that no dollars are being unspent on the qualifying students.

PRESENTATION BY DIANE LINDNER AND TOBIN BLISS: 2007-2008 FINANCIAL AID REFORM: Diane Lindner said that her goal is to clarify and point out issues that will need to be addressed before a finalized 2007-2008 reform can be completed. Two financial aid projects are being conducted simultaneously: Providing models and recommendations for the 2006-07 academic year for allocations to institutions and the reform of financial aid for 2007-2008. The 2006-07 allocation recommendations will be brought to the commissioners in June. The budget went well this year and need based aid went up from \$42M to \$44M in 2005-06 and increased to \$52 M in 2006-07. A target of \$62M has been set for 2007-08 for reform implementation.

The following issues will be addressed before 2007-2008 reform is acted on:

- Graduate vs. Undergraduate Students
As money is allocated through the current model, the need of both graduate and undergraduate students is taken into account. Money is allocated to the institutions based on both undergraduate and graduate need but the graduate level student is awarded a lesser percentage than what the current formula supports. To keep graduate students in a state funded financial aid model, some money could be set aside apart from the general pool of funds for undergraduates.

Mr. Baker asked if the timetable is still in place as to when a decision will be made and Ms. Lindner replied that it is. He asked for an overview of the committee structure. Ms. Lindner said the financial aid advisory committee is made up of a representative from each governing board, from the private institutions, and the proprietary institutions. The meetings occur on a monthly basis and work from a specific agenda.

Mr. Farkas asked how many total dollars with reference to the 14% of funding for graduate students. Ms. Lindner said that it was approximately \$3.5M.

Mr. Farina asked what the other states do in respect to the need of graduate students is larger than what is available. Ms. Lindner said she will follow up on what other states do in terms of their graduate students.

- Pell Eligible vs. Level 1 Students

Tobin Bliss discussed the advantages and disadvantages with regard to providing the financial aid voucher to Pell eligible and/or Level 1 students.
- Role of Work Study in the Stipend Plus Aid Model

A model could be constructed that would supplement the appropriation amount for need based aid with the work study amount, due to the criticality of the work study role for underserved and low-income students. There are different ways to augment the voucher with work study.
- Student Reporting Issues

The future voucher amount relies heavily on correct and accurate data. The reliance of this data hasn't been as needed as it is now but with the determination of establishing voucher amounts it is critical to have accurate data reported.
- Administration Issues

Mr. Bliss emphasized that keeping track of students in an administrative fashion needs to be considered when evaluating the financial aid reform issue. There are numerous students (over 70,000) with numerous variables (credit hour changes, late add/drops, and transfers).
- Timing of Awards and Determination of the Stipend Account

Mr. Bliss said the timing of financial aid typically occurs in March while the financial aid voucher awards to students amount is set by the legislature and finalized in June.
- Student Impact

Mr. Bliss said that while it is unclear what the impact on students will be with the implementation of the "Stipend Plus Aid" model, it could serve to draw more low income students into postsecondary education.

- Institutional Flexibility
There are ways to give institutional flexibility and still assure the students the state is making a contribution to their financial aid. The state has some good fiscal options to look at while reforming the financial aid model.

ACTION ITEMS

REVISION TO CCHE POLICIES II-D AND II-E: Ms. Lindner introduced Andy Carlson as CCHE's Financial Audit & Compliance Officer. These are policies that need to be amended for stipend eligibility and for waivers at the institutional level and at the Commission level.

The revised policy addresses PSEO, Fast Track, and Basic Skills eligibility for stipends and waivers. Mr. Carlson said these changes are due to Senate Bill 132 and the policy now specifies that students enrolled in basic skills, PSEO, and Fast Track courses are eligible to receive COF stipends for these courses.

In addition, the policy addresses waivers granted by the Commission. The waiver granted by the Commission shall only be valid for the specific number of credit hours that students need to graduate.

Ms. Lindner said that FAQ's are posted on CCHE's website with questions on existing policy and as more questions on the new policies arise, they will be posted as FAQ's on CCHE's website as well. Meetings are held with CSLP every other week to assure coordination in administering current policies and institutions are apprised of all new policies in draft form and are given opportunities to comment on new policies.

Mr. Farina asked if there were any objections by the institutions. Mr. Carlson said there weren't any objections known.

Mr. Garcia motioned for approval of the action item and Mr. Stevinson seconded the motion, which was passed unanimously.

REVISIONS TO CCHE POLICY SECTION I: ACADEMIC AFFAIRS, PART I: POLICY AND PROCEDURE FOR APPROVAL OF PROPOSALS FOR COORDINATED DEGREE PROGRAMS:

Matt Gianneschi provided a historical summary of the Policy and Procedure for the Approval of Proposals for Coordinated Degree Programs that was written in 2000. He pointed out that the policy had a sunset clause, which led to the policy's expiration in May 2005. He noted that, as a result of renewed interest in coordinated degree programs, the policy is being re-introduced to the Commission for approval. The proposed policy ensures compliance with other existing academic affairs policies regarding approval of degree programs and the removal of the sunset clause.

Matt McKeever illustrated the modifications that were made to the policy and pointed out that any approved degree program is subject to the discontinuance of academic degree

policy to ensure specific enrollment levels. He mentioned the chief academic officers at the state institutions are in favor of this policy.

Ms. Weaver asked what the volume of students that are receiving the coordinated degree programs is. Dr. Gianneschi said there are not too many programs at this time but illustrated one that is occurring via Colorado State University intra-system and a few others. Ms. Weaver indicated her support of the coordinated degree programs but would like to see the sunset clause remain in case interest falters in the next five years.

Mr. Quamme motioned for approval of the item and Mr. Robinson seconded the motion.

Alan Lamborn, CSU System, provided testimony to support the approval of the policy and agreed with the notion that all programs will be captured in the reporting of low-enrollment programs.

Michel Dahlin, CU System, concurred with Dr. Lamborn's statement and said CU has had coordinated degree programs for many years. Mr. Farina mentioned the testimonial proof that the policy will be useful.

Mr. Quamme motioned to approve the staff recommendation with an amendment to include a five-year sunset clause. Mr. Baker seconded. All commissioners voted to approve the amending of the staff recommendation to include a five-year sunset provision. Thereafter, all commissioners voted to approve the amended staff recommendation.

FY 2007 COF ELIGIBILITY FOR OFF-CAMPUS PROGRAMS: Dr. Gianneschi provided a historical synopsis for approving requests from the state's public four-year institutions to offer "off campus state funded" instruction. This year these programs are COF eligible programs. CCHE staff reviewed proposals from ASC, MSCD, and UNC. Based on the FY07 budget estimate, the pool for off-campus COF eligibility is approximately 621 FTE. The recommendation for approval for these proposed programs totals 485 FTE.

Mr. Stewart motioned to approve the agenda item and Mr. Stevinson seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

WRITTEN REPORTS – NO DISCUSSION

REPORT ON OUT-OF-STATE/OUT-OF-COUNTRY INSTRUCTION

WESTERN UNDERGRADUATE EXCHANGE REPORT

REPORT TO THE COMMISSION ON STUDENT ENROLLMENT: Ms. Weaver asked for highlights of this report. Dr. Gianneschi said enrollment declined between 2004 and 2005, though it is too soon to tell if this will be a trend or an anomaly. Four-year campuses had continuous growth but the two-year campuses grew and then declined.

Minority student enrollment is increasing across all sectors with the exception of graduate first professional. Male enrollment is declining and is most profound at the two-year campuses.

There was no discussion and no action was taken.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:55.



Colorado Commission on Higher Education

Financial Aid Presentation

6-2-2006





Summary

The Colorado Commission on Higher Education is responsible for approving the institutional allocations for state-funded student financial aid programs. This presents the allocation methodology and the issues being discussed for the FY 2007 need-based aid.

During the 2006 legislative session, the general assembly increased need-based aid by 9.5M and left GOS, Merit aid, and Work study at the amount from the prior year. The table below reports the FY 2007 appropriations by program type. Approximately seventy percent of the FY 2007 appropriation goes toward need-based aid grant programs, including the Governor's opportunity Scholarship (GOS).

FY 2006 and FY 2007 General Fund Financial Aid Appropriation

FY	Need	GOS	Merit	Work Study	Federal Match	LAW/ POW	Native American	Total
2006	42,627,088	8,000,000	1,500,000	15,003,374	2,076,350	214,401	7,299,164	76,720,377
2007	52,136,963	8,000,000	1,500,000	15,003,374	1,726,350	364,922	7,634,353	86,365,962
Dollar Change	9,509,875	0	0	0	(350,000)	150,521	335,189	9,645,585
% Change	22%	0%	0%	0%	(17%)	70%	5%	13%



Need-Based Aid Allocation Calculation

Colorado Need-Based allocations to institutions are provided by taking the cost of attending college less the federally calculated family contribution and deducing the amount of need of each student based on that calculation. The cost of attending college is the sum of:

- The actual tuition and actual room and board costs at the specific institution.
- Other costs such as health insurance, travel and personal items standardized by the Commission each February.



Need-Based Aid Allocation Calculation Cont'd

The need of each student is summed by school and each school is assigned a proportional share of the state-wide need; schools are then allocated a portion of the total available dollars that is equivalent to their proportion of statewide need. Past models have considered graduate and undergraduate need equally.



Issue Analysis

As a result of the substantial research and analysis conducted by staff over the last several months with respect to the financial aid system in the state, an adjusted allocation methodology is being considered.

The two main changes to the allocation methodology are:

- 1) Distributing funds based on institutions' actual need but at least at 75% of the prior year's allocation – i.e., no school would receive less than 75% of their FY 2006 allocation.
- 2) Creating separate funding lines for graduate and undergraduate level 1 students.



Funding Based on Actual Student Need With 75% of Baseline Funding Level

This allocation methodology begins to loosen the hold harmless provision of previous years' allocation methodologies. In this instance, regardless of the need level of the students, institutional allocations were not allowed to drop below the previous year allocation. A 75% base corrects inequities that have developed for students as the allocation model stepped further away from funding based upon proportion of student need at any given institution.



Graduate/Undergraduate Student Inclusion

There is strong support for a model that excludes graduate students from the need-based grant allocations to fully focus state dollars on providing access to low income undergraduate students.

On the other hand there is some support to maintain at least a minimal level of financial awards for graduate education.

These differing views led staff to consider the development of models that maintain the level of funding awarded to graduate students by the schools.



Separate Funding Lines for Graduate and Undergraduate Student Need

Data reported by schools on the number of graduate students who actually receive need based grants provides support for this allocation methodology. Specifically, in FY 04-05 financial data show that level 1 graduate students make up a total of 14% of all level 1 students. However, data also show that only a total of 6.56% of CSG funds went to graduate students and 94.3% went to undergrads. In other words, the allocation formula supports funding approximately 14% graduate students and institutions allocate 6.56% of CSG funds to graduate students.



Separate Funding Lines for Graduate and Undergraduate Student Need Cont'd

Staff conducted a state survey of 25 financial aid funding programs similar to Colorado's student grant program to determine the funding levels for graduate vs. undergraduate students. Staff found that while offering state financial aid to graduate students differs across the country, data show that a majority of the states surveyed, 60 percent, had eligibility requirements prohibiting graduate students from receiving grants in these programs.



Separate Funding Lines for Graduate and Undergraduate Student Need Cont'd

Further support for separate treatment of graduate and undergraduate students may be found in the increased flexibility institutions have been given with respect to graduate tuition. The footnote on tuition spending authority in this year's Long Bill, limits undergraduate resident tuition increases to 2.5%. Thus, institutions were given the flexibility to adjust graduate tuition rates to appropriate market levels within overall tuition spending authority.

Under this model, the Commission would limit the amount of aid going to graduate students to prevent high graduate tuition increases from adversely impacting undergraduate students.



Separate Funding Lines for Graduate and Undergraduate Student Need Cont'd

Colorado Student Grant (CSG) funds would be split into two pots; one to be allocated based on undergraduate student need and one allocated based on graduate student need. CSG funds could be split into separate pots based on the total percentage of AY2004-05 CSG dollars that went to level 1 graduate students (6.56%) and undergrad students (93.44%). The amount of graduate dollars going to each school would be reliant upon the proportionate share of graduate need at each school that offers graduate programs.

Increasing that amount by the Higher Education Pricing Index (HEPI) of 3.5% or the average tuition increase are other potential methods to recalibrate the amount going toward graduate education.

TOPIC: REAUTHORIZATION OF THE COLORADO/NEW MEXICO RECIPROCITY AGREEMENT AND APPROVAL OF FY07 INSTITUTIONAL ALLOCATIONS

PREPARED BY: MATT GIANNESCHI AND VICKI A. LEAL

I. SUMMARY

Since 1981-82, Colorado and New Mexico have had a reciprocity agreement designed and implemented in order to provide enhanced educational opportunities for students of both states. The program extends opportunities to a specific number of full-time equivalent students from New Mexico to attend participating institutions in Colorado at the institutions' resident tuition rates. Likewise, the same number of FTE Colorado students may attend specified New Mexico institutions at the resident rate of those institutions. Participating students are treated as resident students both for tuition and FTE funding purposes. Since the program is a reciprocal one, no state funds are exchanged between the two states.

The agreed upon FTE limit for the past several years has been 300. In 2005-2006, 276 FTE students from New Mexico were enrolled in Colorado and 317 Colorado FTE students were enrolled in New Mexico under the agreement.

The current agreement expires June 30, 2006. The proposed new agreement (Attachment A) is basically an extension of the existing agreement for the three-year period July 1, 2006 to June 30, 2009.

In addition to the agreement itself, proposed in this agenda item are institutional allocations for Colorado schools named in the agreement.

II. BACKGROUND

The initiation of the reciprocity agreement with New Mexico came about primarily as a result of educational needs of New Mexicans living in the northern extremities of that state. For many of these New Mexico residents, the nearest post-secondary institution is in Colorado. The most obvious example is the close proximity of Raton, NM to Trinidad, Colorado, and its junior college, Trinidad State Junior College, while the nearest New Mexico institution is about 100 miles away.

After initiation of a limited exchange program, it became quickly apparent that many more New Mexico students were crossing into Colorado under the agreement than Colorado students going the other way. Early in 1985, a new

agreement was reached between the two states that expanded the number of Colorado border institutions participating and opened up virtually all New Mexico colleges and universities to Colorado reciprocity students. At that time, the program accommodated slightly over 200 FTE students.

The agreement has remained in much the same form since that time. Currently four Colorado baccalaureate institutions, and four two-year colleges participate: Adams State College, Fort Lewis College, Colorado State University, Pueblo, Western State College, Lamar Community College, Pueblo Community College (at its Southwest Center), San Juan Basin Technical College, and Trinidad Junior College. All of New Mexico public colleges and universities are participants except for the University of New Mexico's Schools of Medicine and Law, and the New Mexico Military Institute. The reciprocity includes only undergraduate students.

Tables one and two represent headcount and/or FTE enrollments, by state and institution, for the most recent fiscal year.

Table 1: Fiscal Year 2005-06 Enrollment in CO/NM Reciprocity: New Mexico Students in Colorado Public Colleges and Universities

	Allocation	Headcount	FTE
Adams State College	40	38	37.00
Colorado State University, Pueblo	8	9	6.80
Fort Lewis College	84	89	71.00
Western State College	8	7	7.10
Lamar Community College	22	17	15.33
Pueblo Community College (SW Center)	3	4	2.17
San Juan Basin Tech Center	25	92	14.08
Trinidad State Junior College	110	121	122.06
Total:	300	377	275.54

Table 2: Fiscal Year 2005-06 FTE Enrollment in CO/NM Reciprocity: Colorado Students in New Mexico Public Colleges and Universities¹

Institution	Location	FTE
Albuquerque Technical Vocational Institute	Albuquerque	3
Eastern New Mexico University	Portales	20
New Mexico Highlands University	Las Vegas	24
New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology	Socorro	11
New Mexico State University	Las Cruces	49
Northern New Mexico Community College	El Rito	8
San Juan College	Farmington	114
University of New Mexico	Albuquerque	84
Western New Mexico University	Silver City	4
Total:		317

Each participating institution in Colorado is given an FTE allocation by the Commission from the total available FTE's. Allocations are modified annually to accommodate changing demand among participants. Historically, the two institutions that are located on the Colorado-New Mexico border—Trinidad State Junior College and Fort Lewis College—have accounted for three quarters of the overall enrollments, and continue to do so.

Table three below illustrates the institutional allocations approved by the Commission for FY2005-06, the actual FTE usage reported by the colleges, and the difference between these two numbers, reported in both actual and percentage differences.

Table 3: Fiscal Year 2005-06 Institutional FTE Enrollment Allocations for the CO/NM Reciprocity Agreement Approved by the Commission.

	Allocation	Actual	Difference (%)
Adams State College	40	37.00	-3 (-7.5%)
Colorado State University, Pueblo	8	6.80	-1.2 (-15%)
Fort Lewis College	84	71.00	-13 (-15.5%)
Western State College	8	7.10	-.9 (-11.3%)
*Lamar Community College	22	15.33	-6.66 (-30.3%)
*Pueblo Community College (SW Center)	3	2.17	-.83 (-27.7)
San Juan Basin Tech Center	25	14.08	-10.92 (-43.68)
*Trinidad State Junior College	110	122.06	+12.06 (+11%)
Total:	300	375.56	275.54 (-8.2%)

¹ Historically, the New Mexico Higher Education Department has not allocated Colorado FTE to its institutions.

* Please note that the Colorado Community College System (CCCS) did not submit properly prepared data for Colorado/New Mexico Reciprocity Agreement participants for fiscal years 2004 and 2005 to the Colorado Commission on Higher Education. As a result, accurate longitudinal data for the past three fiscal years for the noted campuses are not available via SURDS.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

Reciprocity Agreement

The New Mexico/Colorado reciprocity agreement continues to be a worthwhile reciprocal agreement/program that has afforded additional educational opportunities to thousands of students from the two states over the twenty-six years the program has been in place.

While the numerical balance between the states fluctuates from year to year, the exchange of students has remained sufficiently in balance to maintain a truly reciprocal exchange program. Therefore, it is recommended that the intent of the agreement remain unchanged and that the agreement continue to be governed according to CCHE Student Affairs Policy VI: Part D, Reciprocal Tuition Agreements. However, the following change to reflect new realities in college-going behaviors and funding mechanisms is recommended by CCHE staff; it has already been approved by the New Mexico Higher Education Department.

The new agreement clarifies that institutions will be reimbursed for credit hours, not headcount, thereby recognizing in policy the flexibility necessary to accommodate part-time students. To wit, the following language was added to section five of the reciprocity agreement:

- a. Designated institutions may divide FTE allocations to accommodate less than full-time students. For example, one 30-credit hour FTE may be divided into two 15-credit hour FTEs to accommodate two part-time enrolled students.*
- b. Designated institutions in Colorado shall be reimbursed on a credit hour basis through Fee-For-Service Contracts up to but not exceeding the equivalent of the number of FTE students allocated to the institution by CCHE multiplied by 30 semester hours or 45 quarter hours during the academic year.*

FY07 FTE Allocations to Colorado Institutions

Based upon the figures presented in Table 2, and considering the intent of the 23-1-112 C.R.S., that the Commission apply a “closest college concept,” CCHE staff believe that the institutions closest to the New Mexico border—Fort Lewis College and Trinidad State Junior College—should continue to receive the largest FTE allocations. However, because Trinidad State Junior College exceeded its FY06 FTE allocation approved by the

Commission in June 2005, staff do not recommend increasing FY07 allocations to that institution in spite of the growing FTE enrollments there.

In addition, excluding TSJC for the just mentioned reasons, CCHE staff recommend adjusting allocations to institutions whose FTE usage was significantly below FY06 allocation levels. CCHE staff recommend the following method:

1. For institutions where FY06 usage was less than 75% of their approved allocations, increase FY07 allocations to 125% of FY06 actual usage, rounded to the nearest whole number.
2. For institutions where FY06 usage was between 76% - 85% of their approved allocations, maintain FY07 allocations at the FY06 levels.
3. For institutions where FY06 usage was between 86% - 100% of their approved allocations, maintain FY07 allocations at the FY06 levels and increase these according to whatever FTE remain available, weighted by the institutions' relative FY06 participation in the program and rounded to the nearest whole number.

Applying this method to the data in table 3, we arrive at the following allocations:

Table 4: Institutional FTE Enrollment Allocations for the CO/NM Reciprocity Agreement, FY06 (Actual) & FY07 (Recommended)

	FY06 Allocation	FY06 Actual	Difference	FY07 Allocation
ASC	40	37.00	-7.5%	48
CSU, Pueblo	8	6.80	-15%	8
FLC	84	71.00	-15.5%	84
WSC	8	7.10	-11.3%	10
LCC	22	15.33	-30.3%	19
PCC (SW Center)	3	2.17	-27.7%	3
SJBTC	25	14.08	-43.68%	18
TSJC	110	122.06	+11%	110*
Total:	300	275.56	-8.2%	300

Whatever allocation levels are approved by the Commission, CCHE staff will monitor institutions' use of their allotments and, if warranted based upon institutional use and student demand from the fall 2006 term—available after October 15—recommend modifications to spring 2006 allocation levels.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Commission authorize the revised Reciprocity Agreement between Colorado and New Mexico, effective July 1, 2006-June 30, 2009, and approve the recommended FY2006-07 FTE allocations presented in Table 4.

STATUTORY AUTHORITY

23-1-112 C.R.S.: "...the commission shall identify those circumstances where the waving of the nonresident differential in tuition rates, on a reciprocal basis with other states, would enhance educational opportunities for Colorado residents. Relative to such identified circumstances, the commission shall negotiate with the other states involved with the objective of establishing reciprocal agreements for the waiving of the nonresidential differential for Colorado residents attending state institutions of higher education in other states in exchange for Colorado state institutions of higher education waiving the nonresident differential for residents of the other states. Agreements negotiated between Colorado and other states shall provide for an equal number of resident and nonresident students to be exchanged between the states. The commission shall establish regulations for the administration of this section, based on the application of the closest college concept..."

Attachment A

New Mexico-Colorado Tuition Reciprocity Agreement

THIS AGREEMENT is made by and between the New Mexico Higher Education Department (hereinafter referred to as the Department), an “agency” of the State of New Mexico and the Colorado Commission on Higher Education (hereinafter referred to as the CCHE), an “agency” of the State of Colorado. The purpose of this Agreement is to establish a tuition reciprocity program (hereinafter referred to as the Program) to enable selected students from New Mexico to enroll at designated institutions of higher education in the State of Colorado with authorization to pay Colorado resident tuition rates, and to enable an equal number of selected students from the State of Colorado to enroll at selected institutions in New Mexico with authorization to pay New Mexico resident tuition rates.

Statement of Purpose

- A. In order to improve educational opportunities for the students in their respective states, the Department and the CCHE have identified circumstances in which students from each state would have authorization to pay resident tuition rates.
- B. The Department is authorized to enter into this Agreement pursuant to Section 21-1-6, NMSA, 1978, and the CCHE is authorized to enter into this Agreement pursuant to 23-1-112, CRS.

Agreement

In consideration of the mutual promises contained herein, the Department and the CCHE agree to the following:

2. The term of this agreement shall be for three academic years, commencing on July 1, 2006 and will terminate on June 30, 2009. If a new Agreement has not been completed prior to that date, this Agreement may be extended if mutually acceptable to both states. An annual performance review by the Department and the CCHE shall be conducted at the end of each year. During each annual review, either agency may request amendments to the Agreement or terminate the Agreement at any time, provided that a minimum of ninety (90) days prior notice is given.
3. Selected Colorado residents attending accredited public colleges in New Mexico and selected New Mexico residents attending accredited public colleges in Colorado that offer the program of study desired by the resident, will be granted a waiver of the non-resident tuition differential and will be charged the in-state tuition rate at the college in which they enroll. For New Mexico participants,

- preference will be given to New Mexico residents attending the college in Colorado that is the shortest distance by passable road from the resident's place of residence.
- a. The selected Colorado residents attending New Mexico colleges must be residents of Colorado; and must be enrolled in, or have applied to a program of study that leads to a certificate, baccalaureate, or graduate degree program, and must meet other criteria established by the Department and the CCHE.
 - b. The selected New Mexico students who attend designated Colorado institutions under terms of this agreement, must be New Mexico residents, and must be enrolled in, or have applied to enroll in, a program of study leading to a certificate, associate, or a baccalaureate degree, and must meet such other criteria as may be established by the Department.
4. Designated institutions in New Mexico are state supported post secondary education institutions with the exception of New Mexico Military Institute (NMMI), The University of New Mexico School of Law, and The University of New Mexico School of Medicine. These institutions are specifically excluded from this Program.
 5. Designated institutions from Colorado are: Lamar Community College, Pueblo Community College, Trinidad State Junior College, Fort Lewis College, Adams State College, San Juan Basin Area Vocational-Technical School, Western State College, and Colorado State University-Pueblo.
 6. The state of New Mexico will accept up to three hundred (300) FTE students and the state of Colorado will accept up to three hundred (300) FTE students. An FTE student shall mean enrollment of 30 semester hours or 45 quarter hours of credit during the academic year and preceding summer.
 - a. Designated institutions may divide FTE allocations to accommodate less than full-time students. For example, one 30-credit hour FTE may be divided into two 15-credit hour FTEs to accommodate two part-time enrolled students.
 - b. Designated institutions in Colorado shall be reimbursed on a credit hour basis through Fee-For-Service Contracts up to but not exceeding the equivalent of the number of FTE students allocated to the institution by CCHE multiplied by 30 semester hours or 45 quarter hours during the academic year.
 7. No money shall be paid by either state to the other state in exchange for the waiver of the non-resident tuition differential.

8. An official designated by the Department and the CCHE will annually review the Program and this agreement and recommend desirable changes to the Department and the CCHE.
9. The Department and the CCHE, each, will fulfill the following requirements:
 - a. Designate an official to be responsible for communication about and reporting for the Program;
 - b. Determine the eligibility and selection criteria to be used in determining which residents living in their own state may participate in the Program;
 - c. Develop such rules for selection of students for participation, as it may desire subject to the requirements that the procedures make it possible to limit the number of participants;
 - d. Inform each other and designated institutions in each state of Program requirements in a timely manner;
 - e. Refrain from discrimination on the basis of race, sex, national origin, religion, age or disability in the administration of the Program;
 - f. Designate an official from each participating higher education institution with the responsibility to:
 - i. Accurately evaluate students' eligibility for the Program, according to the criteria specified in the Rules of this Program;
 - ii. Limit the number of participants to the specified level;
 - iii. Charge the selected participants the in-state tuition rate of the institution they are attending;
 - iv. Maintain records of the program/residents at their higher education institution; and
 - v. Provide the Department and the CCHE the following information on or before October 15 of each year:
 1. name, social security number, and permanent mailing address of each participant for each academic period;
 2. program of study and degree objective of each student participant;

3. number of hours attempted each academic period by each student participant;
 4. number of hours completed each academic period by each student participant; and
 5. the cumulative grade point average of each student participant.
10. The Department and the CCHE will cooperate to the greatest extent possible in order to effectively manage the Program.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have entered into this Agreement as of the
_____ day of _____, 2006.

New Mexico Higher Education Department,

By: _____
Dr. Beverlee McClure, Cabinet Secretary

Colorado Commission on Higher Education,

By: _____
Jenna Langer, Executive Director

**TOPIC: COLORADO ACADEMIC COMPETITIVENESS GRANT
PROGRAM MATCH**

PREPARED BY: JENNA LANGER

I. SUMMARY

The General Assembly appropriated \$800,000 to the Commission for FY 06-07 to be awarded to students who participated in a pre-collegiate program at the high school level. Staff is recommending that the funds be used to create a match to the new federal Academic Competitiveness Grants program with the additional requirement that students must have participated in an eligible precollegiate program.

II. BACKGROUND

In recognition of the important role pre-collegiate programs can play in the success of students at the post-secondary level, the General Assembly appropriated \$800,000 to the Commission for "Scholarships for Precollegiate Programs." The footnote in the Long Bill provided:

It is the intent of the General Assembly that to receive a grant from the Scholarships for Pre-collegiate Programs a student must be a Colorado high school graduate eligible for resident tuition and have been accepted into an institution of higher education in Colorado. Further, the student must have been enrolled in and successfully completed an eligible pre-collegiate program of at least one year offered during the high school academic year. It is the intent of the General Assembly that the Colorado Commission on Higher Education or their designee will determine which pre-collegiate programs are eligible.

Although the footnote was vetoed by the Governor, the Commission was directed to comply with its intent.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

The United States Department of Education recently introduced a new Pell Grant program known as the Academic Competitiveness Grant (ACG) Program. The ACG program provides additional grant moneys to Pell-eligible students who are enrolled as full-time, degree-seeking students in their first or second year at a 2- or 4-year institution. The intent of the ACG program is to promote more academic rigor in the classroom and provide an incentive to students to take a rigorous secondary school program of study.

These goals align with those of the Commission in adopting the Higher Education Admission Requirements and establishing the College In Colorado Scholarship Program. The Commission has submitted a request to the Secretary of Education to approve a course of study that satisfies the Higher Education Admission Requirements as qualifying as a rigorous secondary school program of study for purposes of ACG grants.

Because the ACG Program is designed to address the same important goals of the Commission -- targeting Pell-eligible (low-income) students who are academically prepared (satisfying the Higher Education Admission Requirements), staff recommends that the Commission direct that the subject \$800,000 in state funding be used to establish a Colorado match to the ACG grants.

Further, to comply with the intent of the Long Bill footnote, the Colorado ACG match should include an additional requirement that students participate in an eligible pre-collegiate program. Importantly, to qualify as an eligible pre-collegiate program, entities should be required to be in compliance with the requirements of 22-30.5-516(b), C.R.S., which requires precollegiate programs to report data to CCHE with respect to students participating in their respective programs.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Commission create a Colorado Academic Competitiveness Grant Match Program and direct that the \$800,000 appropriated for “Pre-Collegiate Scholarships” in the Long Bill for FY 06-07 be used to fund the program.

The Commission directs staff to develop and publish to eligible schools, precollegiate programs, and students appropriate guidelines for the Colorado ACG Match, which shall include but need not limited to the following:

- 1) To be eligible for the Colorado ACG Match, students must qualify for and receive a Federal Academic Competitiveness Grant;**
- 2) To be eligible for the Colorado ACG Match, students must participate in an eligible precollegiate program; and**
- 3) A precollegiate program shall not be deemed eligible unless it is reporting the data required by Section 22-30.5-516(b), C.R.S.**

TOPIC: AUTHORIZATION OF AN ENDORSEMENT PROGRAM IN INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY-SPECIALIST AT THE UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT DENVER AND HEALTH SCIENCES CENTER

PREPARED BY: MATT GIANNESCHI AND DAVID WHALEY

I. SUMMARY

The University of Colorado at Denver and Health Sciences Center has requested authorization of a new graduate-level endorsement program in *Instructional Technology-Specialist*.

The Instructional Technology- Specialist endorsement is intended for teachers who wish to earn an additional endorsement as technology leaders in their schools and districts. Teachers participating in this program must meet the Colorado Department of Education's requirement that, "The candidate must provide documented evidence of...holding a Colorado provisional/professional license, with an Instructional Technology-Teacher endorsement or with eligibility to hold it." The IT-Specialist curriculum builds on the skills and knowledge gained from the initial Instructional Technology-Teacher endorsement program, focusing on leadership and service—mentoring, assisting, and teaching other teachers to integrate technology in *their* classrooms.

II. BACKGROUND

At the University of Colorado at Denver and Health Sciences Center, the Instructional Technology-Specialist program is based on a series of performance based activities:

1. Teachers develop a design for a learning environment or experience, integrating technology for learning. They work with other teachers to improve learning resources and environments;
2. Teachers develop a unit of instruction that incorporates learning technologies to increase learning and student productivity, and conduct teacher training or mentoring on the integration of technology into the classroom;
3. Teachers critique, develop, validate, and implement learning assessments that incorporate technology;
4. Teachers reflect on their teaching practices, conduct inquiry into technology-based interventions and their impact on student achievement, and relate findings to different audiences;

5. Teachers become knowledgeable about human issues surrounding technology integration and complete a policy analysis relating to legal, political, and ethical issues;
6. Teachers engage in planning, policy, and budgeting related to technology integration; and
7. Teachers engage in a leadership and shared visioning process concerning technology integration and planning within their school or district.

The University of Colorado at Denver and Health Sciences Center proposal for this endorsement was presented first to the Colorado Department of Education for content review and approval by the Colorado State Board of Education. The proposal was approved and a recommendation for approval was forwarded by the State Board to the Commission on Higher Education, pending an analysis of the program's compliance with the state's six performance based measures for teacher education found in 23-1-121, C.R.S. The application included a matrix linking courses and performance based assessments to the IT-Specialist standards; an orientation and introduction (titled "FAQ on IT Endorsement"); performance based assessment rubrics; and course syllabi. Within these course syllabi are found full descriptions of the internship/field based experiences required for this endorsement.

The proposal for this graduate-level endorsement was reviewed for alignment and compliance with the six CCHE Performance Based Teacher Education Program Measures (pursuant to 23-1-121, C.R.S.) relevant to a graduate-level endorsement. The six CCHE Performance Measures for teacher education are:

Statutory Performance Measure 1: The unit maintains a comprehensive admissions system that includes screening and counseling for students who are considering becoming teacher candidates.

Statutory Performance Measure 2: The unit ensures that ongoing screening and counseling of teacher candidates occurs by practicing teachers or faculty members.

Statutory Performance Measure 3: The unit's coursework and field-based training integrate theory and practice (e.g. early field experience) and educate teacher candidates in the methodologies, practices, and procedures of teaching standards-based education.

Statutory Performance Measure 4: Each teacher education candidate completes a minimum of 800 hours of field experiences that relates to predetermined learning standards.

Statutory Performance Measure 5: Teacher education candidates demonstrate the skills required for licensure as specified by the Colorado State Board of Education.

Statutory Performance Measure 6: The unit ensures that there is a comprehensive assessment of each candidate's knowledge of subject matter.

Further, the program must be offered at 126 or fewer credits.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

Based on the materials submitted in the proposal and the information gleaned from the recently completed on-site review by the Colorado Commission on Higher Education and the Colorado Department of Education, this endorsement program was found to be in compliance with the state's statutory performance measures applicable to graduate-level programs. Further, it is recognized that the importance of this endorsement program in meeting a significant need for technology educators in the Denver Metro area.

All coursework content has been approved by the State Board of Education (December 8, 2005) as meeting the Colorado content model standards and Colorado performance based teacher education standards. The required coursework and field-based training in this program adequately demonstrate the integration of theory and practice.

IV. RECOMMENDATION

That the Commission authorizes the teacher licensure program in Instructional Technology-Specialist at University of Colorado at Denver and Health Sciences Center.

V. STATUTORY AUTHORITY

C.R.S. 23-1-121

VI. ACCOMPANYING MATERIALS

The application the Instructional Technology-Specialist from the University of Colorado at Denver and Health Sciences Center is on file in the office of the Chief Academic Officer.

TOPIC: TEACHER EDUCATION REAUTHORIZATION: ADAMS STATE COLLEGE

PREPARED BY: MATT GIANNESCHI / DAVID WHALEY

I. SUMMARY

The Adams State College educator licensing program was reviewed for reauthorization on November 15-16, 2005, by a team of Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) and Colorado Department of Education (CDE) representatives. In addition to three CCHE staff and one CDE staff, one teacher education faculty member from Western State College participated on the site visit team. Members were:

- Dr. Matt Gianneschi, Chief Academic Officer, Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE representative)
- Ms. Dorothy Gotlieb, Deputy Commissioner and Director, Professional Services, Colorado Department of Education (CDE representative)
- Mr. Matt McKeever, Director of Extended Studies, Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE representative)
- Dr. Nella B. Anderson, Director, Teacher Education Program, Western State College (CDE representative)
- Dr. David Whaley, Academic Policy Officer for Teacher Education, Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE representative)

The site review team concluded that the Adams State College teacher education program demonstrated sufficient quality and met the state standards on the six statutory measures: comprehensive admissions system, advising and screening of candidates, content knowledge aligned to standards, skills required for Colorado Department of Education licensing, 800 hours of field experiences, and assessment of student progress.

The site review team did, however, identify specific areas requiring attention, with specific recommendations. These are noted in the staff analysis section and detailed in the site review report, available from the Office of the CAO.

The Colorado State Board of Education also determined that the Adams State College program meets the requirements as specified in C.R.C. 22-2-109(3) and approved the program for a one-year conditional approval on May 11, 2006.

II. STAFF ANALYSIS

Policy Overview

Pursuant to 23-1-121 (C.R.S.) and CCHE teacher education policy, Colorado institutions with authorized teacher education preparation programs must be evaluated at least once every five years. The focus of each review is to ensure the teacher education program's compliance with the Colorado Teacher Education Performance Measures (23-1-121 [2 et seq.]) and the Colorado State Board of Education adopted content standards:

1. the admissions system employed by the teacher education program,
2. the extent and efficacy of ongoing screening and counseling of teacher candidates by practicing teachers or faculty members,
3. comprehensive coursework and field based training integrating theory and experience,
4. effective field based/clinical experiences for education candidates exceeding a minimum of 800 hours,
5. evidence that education candidates can demonstrate the skills required for licensure as specified by the SBE, and
6. the comprehensive assessment of education candidates' knowledge of subject matter.

CCHE teacher education policy permits three possible outcomes of a review: a) reauthorization, b) probation, or c) discontinuance. Following statute, the State Board of Education is the first organization to review and act upon the findings from a reauthorization site visit. Upon SBE approval of preparation program content, the Colorado Commission on Higher Education takes its action. A recommendation of approval or probation may include specific recommendations or for requests for additional activities or information from the educator licensing program based upon the site team's findings. Programs that are reauthorized by the Colorado Commission on Higher Education are permitted to continue their operations unimpeded for the following five years. However, upon a Commission finding for probation or discontinuance, the teacher education preparation program may no longer admit new students.

Site Visit Details

The review team received written documentation, in advance, prepared and submitted by Adams State College. The site review occurred over one and one-half days, during which time team members met with,

- key university administrators,
- teacher education faculty and administrators,
- "content" (discipline-specific) faculty,

- staff from the teacher education office,
- current teacher education candidates, including student teachers,
- clinical/cooperating teachers, and
- program completers (alumni).

Team members also visited elementary and secondary sites to observe teacher education candidates in action and to meet with local school administrators and school faculty.

The Adams State College teacher education unit was initially authorized in 2000 under the mandate of SB 99-154. The following items represented areas needing improvement which were described in the 2000 report:

1. Inconsistencies in the advising of students.
2. Lack of training for cooperating teachers concerning the Adams State College expectations.
3. Review of mathematics curriculum.
4. Demonstration of proficiency for each element of the Colorado Performance-based teacher education standards.

These areas were re-examined by the site visit team during the 2005 Adams State College reauthorization visit. At the time, the only area acknowledged for continued attention was the lack of training for cooperating/mentor teachers. The other areas were corrected. However, as reported there still existed some confusion around the roles, responsibilities, and expectations of match-up/mentor teachers. Adams State College therefore was commended on satisfactorily ameliorating three of the four areas recommended for improvement during the 2000 reauthorization visit but was required to further refine its strategies for training match-up teachers as they work with Adams State College teacher education candidates. This was successfully accomplished by Adams State College in its follow-up report to CCHE and CDE in March 2006.

Educator Preparation Programs at Adams State College

ASC delivers initial/undergraduate licensure programs in early childhood education, elementary education, secondary education (art, social studies, mathematics, science, English/language arts, business education, and foreign language (Spanish)). At the graduate level, the following programs are offered: special education teacher 1- moderate needs, educational leadership (principal), linguistically diverse, reading teacher, and school counselor.

Following changes adopted by the State Board of Education, Adams State College has submitted a proposal, which is presently under review by the State Board of Education, for a new Special Education-Generalist program.

III. FINDINGS

The on-site review team found that ASC is proficient or partially proficient on CCHE’s six state teacher education performance measures. These measures include the State Board of Education Performance-based teacher education standards as well as the State Board of Education content/discipline specific rules.

Teacher Education Performance Measures	Level of Proficiency		
	PROFICIENT	PARTIALLY PROFICIENT	NOT PROFICIENT
<i>The program has an effective and fair admission system.</i>	X		
<i>There is ongoing screening and counseling of teacher education candidates by practicing teachers or faculty members.</i>		X	
<i>Coursework and field based training integrate theory and practice.</i>	X		
<i>Candidates complete a minimum of 800-hours of field experience that relates to predetermined learning standards.</i>	X		
<i>Candidates demonstrate the skills required for licensure as specified by the State Board of Education.</i>	X		
<i>The program provides for comprehensive assessment of candidates’ knowledge of subject matter.</i>		X	

As a result of the team’s findings, a number of commendations of Adams State College were made:

1. Teacher education faculty members were commended on their efforts in providing regular orientation sessions for prospective candidates and for enrolled candidates. Candidates commented on the relevant information provided in these seminars. The emphasis on professionalism and high ethical standards was evident at the partner school sites.
2. One adviser in the Teacher Education Office advises all undergraduate and post-bachelor initial licensure students. While utilizing only one adviser for undergraduate and post bachelor students assures consistency in the information provided, the question was raised by the review team as to whether this system provides for adequate access to advising for these students. Teacher education candidates, teacher education office staff, and faculty were consulted on this and the determination made that this system works effectively in serving the advising needs of candidates. Graduate students are advised by individual

faculty advisers.

3. The review team commended Adams State College on providing a curriculum that effectively integrates theory and practice. The curriculum aligns to the Colorado model content and performance-based standards.
4. Content/discipline specific faculty were aware of the Colorado Content Standards and were able to work well with teacher education faculty to ensure that content coursework taken by teacher education candidates meets or exceeds state standards. Because of this, students and recent graduates reported that they are well-informed with respect to the Colorado Model Content Standards and Performance-Based Teacher Education Standards.
5. The site review team commended Adams State College on its field experience requirements established for all candidates. Placements in teacher education occur at approved sites, where candidates learn and experience the environment and expectations of public schools, classrooms, and students.
6. The review team found that education candidates at Adams State College were aptly able to demonstrate the skills required for licensure specified by the State Board of Education. The review team commended the institution for the thoroughness with which Adams State College teacher education embeds the performance-based standards for Colorado teachers throughout the teacher education program.
7. Adams State College was also commended on the quality of student work (most notably the teacher work samples) presented to and reviewed by the site review team. The teacher work samples were excellent examples of candidates' attainment of the performance based standards.

Also, and as a result of the team's findings, a number of recommendations for improvements of were made:

1. Adams State College students indicated that they would prefer greater feedback on their performances on the written essay and the interview required for admission into teacher education. Thus, Adams State College faculty and staff were asked to consider the possibility of providing this requested feedback in the future.
2. A Professional School Council comprised of both teacher education faculty and content (discipline-specific) faculty was not functioning during the on-site visit. Previously this Council did exist but was subsequently dissolved. Communication occurred among faculty on an ad-hoc or individual basis or by e-mails sent by the department chairpersons. Content faculty expressed that communication with teacher education faculty was inadequate and further expressed that they would greatly support the resurrection of this Council. Faculty commented that such a Council would enable more consistent exchanges of information.

Also, this Council would provide a forum for the discussion of emerging issues. Therefore, a recommendation was made to re-establish this important council.

3. It was established that course syllabi do not always accurately align objectives and assessments with specific standards. Further, in doing so, it is important to identify the level of proficiency that the student will reach when meeting each course's objectives and by completing course assignments and that this is reflected in these course syllabi. Instead of merely referencing the standard(s) addressed in the particular course, faculty were encouraged to stipulate if the student will be at the "basic," "developing," "proficient," or "advanced proficient" levels.
4. The site review team expressed a concern that the background check for criminal or legal histories of candidates does not occur until after students complete student teaching. The backgrounds of candidates cannot be left to chance and therefore must be established at the time of the first contact of teacher education candidates with school children.
5. During this on-site visit, the ASC Teacher Education Program shared program evaluation data from 2004 and 2005. However, little evidence of other assessments was provided. Both CCHE and CDE expect that data assembled through multiple assessments will be used in the process of making informed decisions concerning all elements of the program. These data are essential for ensuring appropriate and needed changes to the program, its policies, and its curriculum. Therefore, to ensure that assessment data are used appropriately to assess candidate performance and to identify areas within the program which require improvement, it was recommended that Adams State College develop a strategy for the use of assessments, both individual and aggregated, in internal and external information sharing .

Adams State College was required to submit written responses with plans for correcting each of these areas for improvement to the Colorado Department of Education and the Colorado Commission on Higher Education. Adams State College responded appropriately and has or is in the process of adopting changes to meet these areas of improvement.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Commission reauthorizes Adams State College for one-year, pending subsequent action by the State Board of Education in FY07, to offer educator licensing programs as a part of undergraduate degree programs or as post-baccalaureate/graduate programs in the following areas:

- early childhood education,
- elementary education,
- secondary education (art, social studies, mathematics, science, English/language arts, business education, and foreign language [Spanish]),
- special education teacher 1- moderate needs (graduate only),

- educational leadership (principal) (graduate only),
- linguistically diverse (graduate only),
- reading teacher (graduate only), and
- school counselor (graduate only).

If the State Board of Education recommends full reauthorization of the Adams State College educator licensing programs in FY07, CCHE staff recommend that these programs be reauthorized by the Commission through October 2010.

V. STATUTORY AUTHORITY

23-1-121 (4)(a)(II) C.R.S.

VI. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

The following related documents are available from CCHE's Chief Academic Officer:

- Report of the on-site review team
- Responses from Adams State College to concerns raised by the review team (3/06)
- Letter reauthorizing the content of the Adams State College teacher education program from the Colorado Department of Education

**TOPIC: REVISED LIST OF PROGRAMS EXEMPTED FROM THE
CCHE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS POLICY I-G:
DISCONTINUANCE OF ACADEMIC DEGREES WITH
LOW DEMAND**

PREPARED BY: MATT GIANNESCHI

I. SUMMARY

The Commission on Higher Education has the authority and responsibility to monitor demand for academic degree programs at Colorado public colleges and universities, pursuant to C.R.S. 23-1-107, as implemented in Commission Academic Affairs Policy Section I, Part G: Policy and Procedures for the Discontinuance of Academic Degrees with Low Program Demand.

Commission policy requires that, each year, CCHE staff review degree production in all academic programs offered at public colleges and universities throughout the state. According to CCHE policy, it is intended that, in November of each year, CCHE staff will analyze institutional degree production and then notify governing boards of programs that fail to meet graduation requirements for three consecutive years.

Following identification of low demand programs, Commission staff notify the governing boards of low demand programs. The Commission expects the governing boards to discontinue degree programs that fail to meet the graduation criteria. However, each institution may exempt from closure no more than five (5) low demand baccalaureate degree programs that are central to the institution's role and mission or where access is not available elsewhere in the state.

The table appearing in Attachment A has been revised to reflect action taken by the University of Colorado Board of Regents at its April 11, 2006 meeting.

II. STAFF ANALYSIS

CCHE Academic Affairs policy I-G, Policy and Procedures for the Discontinuance of Academic Degrees with Low Program Demand, section 4.03.02 states that, "each institution may exempt no more than five (5) low-demand baccalaureate degree programs from closure." Further, the policy states that, "The Commission intends this exemption privilege to offer certain baccalaureate degree programs that may have low demand but are central to the institution's role and mission or where access is not available elsewhere in the State."

At its April 11, 2006 meeting, the University of Colorado board of Regents acted to remove the exempt status from the Bachelor of Science in Physics program at the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs and request an exemption for the Bachelor of Science in Medical Sciences program at the University of Colorado at Health Sciences Center.

Staff have determined that the Bachelor of Science in Medical Sciences at the University of Colorado at Health Sciences Center is central to the institution's role and mission and therefore meets the intent of CCHE Academic Affairs policy I-G, section 4.03.02.

A complete, revised list of low-demand academic degree programs, including exempted programs, appears in Addendum A.

III. RECOMMENDATION

That the Commission approve the exemption for the Bachelor of Science in Medical Sciences at the University of Colorado at Health Sciences Center made by the University of Colorado Board of Regents.

IV. STATUTORY AUTHORITY

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

Attachment A

Table 1: Revised Low Demand Programs, Including Exemptions, by Institution

Inst	CIP	Degree	Program Name
ASC	40.0501	B.A./B.S.	Chemistry
	40.0601	B.A./B.S.	Geology
	27.0101	B.A./B.S.	Mathematics
	16.0905	B.A.	Spanish
CSU	1.0103	B.S.	Agricultural & Resource Economics
	14.1301	B.S.	Engineering Science
CSU-P	16.0101	B.A.	Foreign Languages
	40.0801	B.S.	Physics
	40.0501	B.S.	Chemistry
FLC	45.0601	B.A.	Economics
	40.0801	B.S.	Physics
	50.0501	B.A.	Theatre
MSCD	5.0201	B.A.	African American Studies
	40.0401	B.S.	Meteorology
	40.0801	B.S.	Physics
UCB	05.0103	B.A.	Asian Studies
	16.0902	B.A.	Italian
	30.9999	B.A.	Distributed Studies
UCDHSC	40.0801	B.S.	Physics
	26.0102	B.S.	Medical Sciences
UNC	5.0201	B.A.	Africana Studies
	5.0203	B.A.	Mexican American Studies
WSC	40.0501	B.A.	Chemistry
	27.0101	B.A.	Mathematics
	50.0901	B.A.	Music

**TOPIC: DEGREE AUTHORIZATION ACT RECLASSIFICATION –
SPIRITUAL PATHS INSTITUTE**

PREPARED BY: MATT GIANNESCHI / MATT MCKEEVER

I. SUMMARY

The Commission has statutory responsibility for the administration of Title 23, Article 2 of the Colorado Revised Statutes, commonly referred to as the Degree Authorization Act. Commission policies and procedures have been developed to include an application process for any institutions wishing to begin operation in Colorado. Institutions meeting the applicable requirements will be granted authority to operate upon the Commission's approval.

Spiritual Paths Institute previously requested and was granted preliminary state authorization as a private non-profit college or university offering a graduate program in interspiritual studies.

Spiritual Paths Institute has demonstrated reasonable and timely progress toward accreditation by completing initial interviews with The Higher Learning Commission, as required by CCHE Academic Affairs policy. As a result, Spiritual Paths Institute qualifies to be considered for Category II Authorization, Maintaining Reasonable and Timely Progress Toward Accreditation. Staff recommends that Spiritual Paths Institute be granted Category II Authorization since the institution is making reasonable and timely progress toward accreditation.

II. BACKGROUND

The Commission has statutory responsibility for administration of Title 23, Article 2 of the Colorado Revised Statutes, which authorizes certain types of institutions to offer degrees and/or degree credits. These are: (1) Colorado publicly-supported colleges and universities; (2) properly accredited private colleges and universities; (3) postsecondary seminaries and bible colleges; and (4) private occupational schools authorized by the Private Occupational School Division to offer associate degrees. Persons or unauthorized organizations that violate the provisions of the statute are subject to legal penalties.

All private colleges and universities, out of state public colleges and universities, and seminaries or bible colleges are required to register with the Commission and to meet criteria found in Section 1 Part J, Degree Authorization Act in order to be granted authorization to offer degrees within Colorado. Such authorization must be received by the institution prior to offering any program of instruction, credit, or degree; opening a place of business; soliciting students or enrollees; or offering educational support services.

The Commission administers the statute by seeking information from any entity offering degrees and/or degree credits to determine its authority under this statute. In order to determine the institutional type and to identify those institutions that are subject to the specific accreditation requirements of the statute, criteria have been established for each institutional type authorized to offer degrees or credits leading toward a degree. Procedures for Commission administration of the statute also have been developed.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

Spiritual Paths Institute has previously requested and been granted preliminary authorization as a private non-profit college or university offering a graduate program in interspiritual studies. On May 12, 2006 The Higher Learning Commission notified CCHE staff that Spiritual Paths Institute completed the preliminary eligibility interview for accreditation (confirmation letter is on file in the Division of Academic and Student Affairs at CCHE). Consequently, Spiritual Paths Institute has complied with the requirement of making reasonable and timely progress toward accreditation and is therefore eligible for authorization with Category II classification. Category II classification will allow Spiritual Paths Institute to accept students, offer instruction, award credits toward a degree, and award a degree as long as the institute continues to demonstrate maintaining reasonable and timely progress toward accreditation. Upon approval, Spiritual Paths Institute is required to host the on-site accreditation visit within 24 months.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Commission reclassifies Spiritual Paths Institute as a Category II institution.

V. SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Copies of all relevant statute, policy, and the application materials are on file in the Division of Academic and Student Affairs.

VI. STATUTORY AUTHORITY

23-2-101 C.R.S.

23-2-103 C.R.S.

TOPIC: STATE GUARANTEED GENERAL EDUCATION COURSES, REVIEW CYCLE IV, ROUND II

PREPARED BY: MATT GIANNESCHI AND VICKI LEAL

I. SUMMARY

In compliance with C.R.S. 23-1-125, the Student Bill of Rights, contained in this agenda item are recommendations for courses nominated by institutions, reviewed by faculty, and recommended for the general education guaranteed statewide transfer program, gtPathways, during Cycle IV, Round II (April 14, 2006). Guaranteed transfer means that a course is universally transferable among all Colorado public institutions of higher education and applicable to general education requirements within the Associate of Arts, Associate of Science, Bachelor of Arts, and Bachelor of Science degree programs.

The recommendations contained in this agenda item represent the outcome of faculty consideration of 117 course nominations for the gtPathways program. The Commission has previously approved 597 general education courses in over 20 disciplines (e.g., English, math, history, biology, etc.) during the first four cycles of gtPathways course nominations, which began in January 2003.

The following table summarizes courses nominated and reviewed for statewide transfer during Cycle IV, Round II, by content area and recommendation status.

COURSE CONTENT AREA	NUMBER OF COURSES RECOMMENDED	NUMBER OF COURSES NOT RECOMMENDED	*NUMBER OF COURSES DEFERRED
Arts & Humanities	30	9	2
Communications	2	3	0
Mathematics	6	2	0
Natural & Physical Science	15	3	0
Social/Behavioral Sciences	37	6	2
TOTAL	90/117	23/117	4/117

***Note:** Review Cycle IV, Round II deferments were necessary based on 1 of 3 reasons: courses for review had been copied incorrectly; specific content discipline faculty were not in attendance at the review, i.e. faculty teaching philosophy within the larger content area of Arts & Humanities; or, courses were in need of an additional faculty reviewer.

II. BACKGROUND

Following the passage of the Colorado Opportunity Fund (COF) legislation in 2004, the Commission began performance contract negotiations with the governing boards of all public institutions in the state. Included in performance contracts is a requirement that all institutions have lower division general education course requirements of between 30 and 40 credit hours and submit all the courses included in their required general education curricula for review and possible inclusion in the statewide transfer program. Colorado's public colleges and universities have established timelines for the submission of their general education courses to the Colorado Commission on Higher Education. Beginning with the calendar year 2005 and continuing through June 2009, all of Colorado's public post-secondary institutions are submitting their general education core courses to self-selected members of the state's public two and four year faculty for peer review and inclusion in the gtPathways curriculum for guaranteed transfer.

It is anticipated that there will be two general faculty review sessions during fall semester 2006; the reviews will complete the fourth (IV) cycle of gtPathways course reviews. As necessary to accommodate future volume, CCHE will schedule and facilitate additional review cycles throughout the 2007 academic and calendar year in order to review courses nominated for the gtPathways guaranteed transfer program.

The list of recommendations on nominated courses found herein is the result of deliberations among 37 faculty members representing various public two- and four-year institutions in the state who met in Denver at the Sheraton Four Points on April 14, 2006.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

Since the fall 2003 semester, gtPathways has guaranteed up to 35-37 credit hours of successfully completed courses taken from the list of approved state guaranteed general education courses, which are published on the gtPathways page of the CCHE website. In June 2005, the Commissioners approved changes to the statewide transfer policy that effectively reduced the guaranteed credit hours from 35-37 down to 31. Effective fall semester 2006, gtPathways will guarantee 31 credit hours of successfully completed courses taken from the approved state guaranteed general education list of courses. Additionally, the GE 25 Council, in agreement with Academic Council, has revised the procedures and forms utilized in the gtPathways course review process. The courses recommended here conform to the newly revised process, procedures, program rules and forms of the gtPathways program and the content and competency criteria.

Faculty review committees in each of the five major content areas (Communication, Math, Arts & Humanities, Social & Behavioral Sciences, and Natural & Physical Sciences) reviewed the courses presented in Attachment A and took one of three actions:

- Recommend a course for inclusion in the statewide program;
- Labeled a course as Not recommend; or,
- Deferred the review of the course nomination (due to the lack of appropriate discipline-specific faculty reviewers or errors in the copying of review materials).

CCHE staff has communicated all of the faculty recommendations to institutions, including justifications for those courses receiving the “not recommended” designation by faculty review committees.

Institutions will have the opportunity in future cycles to make any necessary corrections and/or revisions and re-nominate a course for consideration and placement into the gtPathways curriculum.

Adoption of the attached list of courses below will continue the implementation of Colorado’s guaranteed general education transfer program. Nomination and review of additional courses for consideration will continue with two fall semester 2006 reviews: September 22, 2006 and November 9, 2006 (location to be determined).

Pursuant to performance contract requirements, institutions must clearly distinguished guaranteed transfer courses from those not approved for guaranteed transfer in course catalogs and related materials. That is to say, courses nominated for guaranteed transfer, but not approved, must be easily distinguishable from courses carrying the guaranteed status. In addition, prominently placed in the general education section of the college catalog shall be explanations of the distinction between courses approved for guaranteed transfer and courses not approved for guaranteed transfer to other Colorado colleges and universities.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Commission approves the courses recommended by faculty reviewers for guaranteed statewide transfer status found in Attachment A, effective August 2006 (fall semester 2006).

V. SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Copies of all materials included in course submissions as well as copies of faculty reviewers' worksheets are on file in the Academic and Student Affairs Office.

VI. STATUTORY AUTHORITY

23-1-125 C.R.S. Commission directive - student bill of rights – degree requirements - implementation of core courses - on-line catalogue - competency test. (1) Student bill of rights.

Attachment A

Inst	Category	Course Prefix	Course #	Course Title	Action
ASC	Arts & Humanities (GT-AH1)	MUS	100	Introduction to Music Literature	RECOMMENDED
CCCS	Arts & Humanities (GT-AH1)	ART	207	Art 1900 to the Present	RECOMMENDED
CCCS	Arts & Humanities (GT-AH4)	FRE	212	French Language IV	RECOMMENDED
CSU-FC	Arts & Humanities (GT-AH2)	ECC	242	Reading Shakespeare	RECOMMENDED
CSU-FC	Arts & Humanities (GT-AH2)	ECC	276	Survey of British Literature	RECOMMENDED
CSU-FC	Arts & Humanities (GT-AH2)	ECC	277	Survey of British LiteratureII	RECOMMENDED
CSU-FC	Arts & Humanities (GT-AH4)	LCC	200F	Second Year Language-French	RECOMMENDED
CSU-FC	Arts & Humanities (GT-AH4)	LCC	201S	Second Year Language-Spanish	RECOMMENDED
CSU-FC	Arts & Humanities (GT-AH3)	PLCC	103	Moral and Social Problems	RECOMMENDED
CSU-FC	Arts & Humanities (GT-AH3)	PLCC	120	History and Philosophy of Scientific Thought	RECOMMENDED
FLC	Arts & Humanities (GT-AH1)	Art	262	Art History I: The Ancient World to the Middle Ages	RECOMMENDED
FLC	Arts & Humanities (GT-AH1)	Mu	120	Fundamentals of Music	RECOMMENDED
FLC	Arts & Humanities (GT-AH1)	Thea	126	Introduction to Dance	RECOMMENDED
FLC	Arts & Humanities (GT-AH1)	Thea	240	Ancient and Classical Theatre	DEFERRED
FLC	Arts & Humanities (GT-AH2)	Engl	176	Native American Literature	RECOMMENDED
FLC	Arts & Humanities (GT-AH2)	Engl	230	Survey of British Literature	RECOMMENDED
FLC	Arts & Humanities (GT-AH2)	Engl	280	Literature of the Southwest	RECOMMENDED
FLC	Arts & Humanities (GT-AH3)	Phil	251	Moral Philosophy	RECOMMENDED
FLC	Arts & Humanities (GT-AH4)	ML	216	Intermediate Spanish II	RECOMMENDED
FLC	Arts & Humanities (GT-AH4)	ML	224	Intermediate German II	RECOMMENDED
MSC	Arts & Humanities (GT-AH1)	DANC	115	Dance Appreciation	RECOMMENDED
MSC	Arts & Humanities (GT-AH2)	ENGL	232	Non-Western World Literature II	DEFERRED
MSC	Arts & Humanities (GT-AH1)	MUSA	266	History of Popular Music	RECOMMENDED
MSC	Arts & Humanities (GT-AH1)	THEA	141	Theatre Appreciation	RECOMMENDED
MSCD	Arts & Humanities (GT-AH2)	HON	2760	The Legacy of Arts & Letters II	RECOMMENDED
MSCD	Arts & Humanities (GT-AH3))	PHI	1110	Language, Logic and Persuasion	RECOMMENDED
UCB	Arts & Humanities (GT-AH2)	FREN/ITAL	1400	Medieval/Renaissance Women Writers in Italy and France	RECOMMENDED
UCB	Arts & Humanities (GT-AH2)	FRENCH	1700	Francophone Literature in Translation	RECOMMENDED
UCB	Arts & Humanities (GT-AH2)	FRENCH	1750	Orient in French	RECOMMENDED
UCDHSC	Arts & Humanities (GT-AH3)	RLST	1610	Introduction to Religious Studies	RECOMMENDED
UCDHSC	Arts & Humanities (GT-AH1)	FR	1000	Cultures of the French Speaking World	RECOMMENDED
UCDHSC	Arts & Humanities (GT-AH3)	RLST	2660	World Religions	RECOMMENDED

Inst	Category	Course Prefix	Course #	Course Title	Action
CSU-FC	Arts & Humanities (GT-AH2)	LCC	250I	Language, Literature, Culture in Translation-Italian	NOT RECOMMENDED
FLC	Arts & Humanities (GT-AH4)	ML	247	Intermediate French I	NOT RECOMMENDED
MSC	Arts & Humanities (GT-AH1)	ARTE	101	Two-Dimensional Design	NOT RECOMMENDED
MSC	Arts & Humanities (GT-AH2)	ENGL	231	Non-Western World Literature	NOT RECOMMENDED
MSC	Arts & Humanities (GT-AH1)	FINE	101	Man Creates	NOT RECOMMENDED
MSCD	Arts & Humanities (GT-AH2)	ENG	1310	Introduction to Shakespeare	NOT RECOMMENDED
UCB	Arts & Humanities (GT-AH2)	FREN	1200	Medieval Epic and Romance	NOT RECOMMENDED
UCB	Arts & Humanities (GT-AH2)	FREN	1800	Contemporary French Literature in Translation	NOT RECOMMENDED
UCDHSC	Arts & Humanities (GT-AH4)	GER	2150	Intermediate German II: Grammar Review and Oral Practice	NOT RECOMMENDED
CSU-FC	Communication (GT-CO1)	CO	130	Academic Writing	RECOMMENDED
FLC	Communication (GT-CO2)	Engl	268	Reading Texts/Writing Texts	RECOMMENDED
MSCD	Communication (GT-CO1)	RDG	1510	Cognitive Strategies for Analytical Reading	NOT RECOMMENDED
UNC	Communication (GT-CO2)	BA	205	Business Communication	NOT RECOMMENDED
UNC	Communication (GT-CO2)	ENG	225	Writing on a Theme	NOT RECOMMENDED
CCCS	Mathematics (GT-MA1)	MAT	203	Calculus III	RECOMMENDED
CCCS	Mathematics (GT-MA1)	MAT	265	Differential Equations	RECOMMENDED
FLC	Mathematics (GT-MA1)	Math	210	Survey of Calculus	RECOMMENDED
FLC	Mathematics (GT-MA1)	Math	221	Calculus I	RECOMMENDED
UCDHSC	Mathematics (GT-MA1)	Math	1110	College Algebra	RECOMMENDED
UNC	Mathematics (GT-MA1)	Math	125	Plane Trigonometry	RECOMMENDED
CCCS	Mathematics (GT-MA1)	MAT	215	Discrete Mathematics	NOT RECOMMENDED
CCCS	Mathematics (GT-MA1)	MAT	255	Linear Algebra	NOT RECOMMENDED
FLC	Natural & Physical Sciences (GT-SC1)	Ag	101	Introductory Animal Science	RECOMMENDED
FLC	Natural & Physical Sciences (GT-SC1)	Anth	236	Introduction to Physical and Biological Anthropology	RECOMMENDED
FLC	Natural & Physical Sciences (GT-SC1)	Phys	217	Physics for Science and Engineering I	RECOMMENDED
FLC	Natural & Physical Sciences (GT-SC2)	BIO	112	Introduction to Organismic and Evolutionary Biology	RECOMMENDED
FLC	Natural & Physical Sciences (GT-SC2)	Phsc	205	Introduction to Astronomy	RECOMMENDED
MSC	Natural & Physical Sciences (GT-SC2)	GEOL	104	Oceanography	RECOMMENDED
MSC	Natural & Physical Sciences (GT-SC2)	GEOL	100	Survey of Earth Science	RECOMMENDED
MSC	Natural & Physical Sciences (GT-SC2)	GEOL	103	Weather and Climate	RECOMMENDED
MSC	Natural & Physical Sciences (GT-SC2)	GEOL	105	Geology of Colorado	RECOMMENDED

Inst	Category	Course Prefix	Course #	Course Title	Action
MSC	Natural & Physical Sciences (GT-SC2)	GEOL	106	Introduction to Dinosaurs	RECOMMENDED
MSC	Natural & Physical Sciences (GT-SC2)	GEOL	107	Natural Hazards and Environmental Geology	RECOMMENDED
MSC	Natural & Physical Sciences (GT-SC1)	GEOL	113	Field-based Introduction to Physical Geology	RECOMMENDED
MSC	Natural & Physical Sciences (GT-SC1)	GEOL	113L	Field-based Introduction to Physical Geology Lab	RECOMMENDED
MSC	Natural & Physical Sciences (GT-SC1)	PHYS	105	Physics by Inquiry	RECOMMENDED
MSC	Natural & Physical Sciences (GT-SC1)	PHYS	105L	Physics by Inquiry Lab	RECOMMENDED
FLC	Natural & Physical Sciences (GT-SC2)	Ag	180	Sustainable Agriculture	NOT RECOMMENDED
FLC	Natural & Physical Sciences (GT-SC2)	Ag	203	Introduction to Medicinal Crops	NOT RECOMMENDED
MSCD	Natural & Physical Sciences (GT-SC2)	HES	2150	Complimentary & Alternative Medical Therapies	NOT RECOMMENDED
CCCS	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-SS3)	SOC	213	Sociology of Deviant Behavior	RECOMMENDED
CCCS	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-SS3)	SOC	215	Contemporary Social Problems	RECOMMENDED
CCCS	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-HI1)	History	111	World Civilization I	RECOMMENDED
CCCS	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-HI1)	History	112	World Civilization II	RECOMMENDED
CCCS	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-SS1)	POS	205	International Relations	RECOMMENDED
CCCS	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-SS1)	POS	225	Comparative Government	RECOMMENDED
CCCS	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-SS3)	PSY	205	Psychology of Gender	RECOMMENDED
CCCS	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-SS3)	PSY	217	Human Sexuality	DEFERRED
CCCS	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-SS3)	PSY	226	Social Psychology	RECOMMENDED
CCCS	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-SS3)	PSY	227	Psychology of Death and Dying	RECOMMENDED
CCCS	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-SS3)	PSY	238	Child Development	RECOMMENDED
CCCS	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-SS3)	SOC	216	Sociology of Gender	RECOMMENDED
CSU-FC	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-SS1)	ECCC	211	Gender in the Economy	RECOMMENDED
CSU-FC	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-SS1)	ECCC	212	Racial Inequality and Discrimination	RECOMMENDED
CSU-FC	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-SS3)	ETCC	100	Ethnicity in America	RECOMMENDED
CSU-FC	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-SS3)	SCC	205	Contemporary Race-Ethnic Relations	RECOMMENDED
FLC	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-HI1)	Hist	140	Survey of African History I	RECOMMENDED
FLC	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-HI1)	Hist	141	Survey of African History II	RECOMMENDED
FLC	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-HI1)	Hist	170	Survey of East Asian Civilization I	RECOMMENDED
FLC	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-HI1)	Hist	171	Survey of East Asian Civilization II	RECOMMENDED
FLC	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-HI1)	Hist	262	Tolerance and Persecution in the Middle Ages	RECOMMENDED

Inst	Category	Course Prefix	Course #	Course Title	Action
FLC	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-HI1)	Hist	263	Medieval Life-Modern Film and Literature	RECOMMENDED
FLC	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-HI1)	Hist	270	Colonial Latin America	DEFERRED
FLC	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-HI1)	Hist	271	Latin America since Independence	RECOMMENDED
FLC	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-HI1)	Hist	131	Southwest History and Culture	RECOMMENDED
FLC	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-HI1)	SW/Hist	181	U.S./SW Environmental History	RECOMMENDED
FLC	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-SS1)	PS	110	U.S. National Government	RECOMMENDED
FLC	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-SS1)	PS	120	State and Local Government	RECOMMENDED
FLC	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-SS1)	PS	205	Environmental Politics	RECOMMENDED
FLC	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-SS3)	Anth	201	Introduction to Archaeology	RECOMMENDED
FLC	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-SS3)	Anth	210	Introduction to Sociocultural Anthropology	RECOMMENDED
FLC	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-SS3)	Anth	215	Magic and Religion	RECOMMENDED
FLC	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-SS3)	Anth	217	Cultural Images of Women and Men	RECOMMENDED
FLC	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-SS3)	Soc	279	Ethnicity, Gender and Class in the Southwest	RECOMMENDED
MSC	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-SS3)	PSYC	233	Human Growth and Development	RECOMMENDED
MSCD	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-HI1)	CHS	1010	History of Meso-America: Pre-Columbian and Colonial Eras	RECOMMENDED
MSCD	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-SS3)	WMS	1001	Introduction to Women's Studies	RECOMMENDED
UCDHSC	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-SS3)	HBSC	2001	Intro to Community and Population Health Sciences	RECOMMENDED
UCDHSC	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-SS1)	PSC	1001	Introduction to Political Science	RECOMMENDED
CCCS	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-SS3)	PSY	249	Abnormal Psychology	NOT RECOMMENDED
CCCS	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-HI1)	SOC	105	US Race and Ethnicity	NOT RECOMMENDED
FLC	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-SS1)	PS	280	Introduction to Comparative Politics	NOT RECOMMENDED
FLC	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-SS3)	Anth	171	World Archaeology	NOT RECOMMENDED
FLC	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-SS3)	SW	280	Native Americans in the Modern World	NOT RECOMMENDED
MSCD	Social & Behavioral Sciences (GT-SS3)	HES	1050	Dynamics of Health	NOT RECOMMENDED

**TOPIC: REPORT ON OUT-OF-STATE/OUT-OF-COUNTRY
INSTRUCTION**

PREPARED BY: MATT GIANNESCHI / MATT McKEEVER

I. SUMMARY

The Commission holds statutory responsibility to approve instruction offered beyond Colorado and its 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. The Board of Regents of the University of Colorado, the Trustees at Metro State College Denver and the Trustees of Adams State College sponsor these programs.

The Executive Director has approved the following out-of-state instruction:

The Board of Regents of the University of Colorado submitted a request to offer out-of-country instructional programs to be delivered by the University of Colorado Denver and Health Science Center.

- **“The Society for Vascular Medicine and Biology Board Review Course,”** June 2-4, 2006 in Philadelphia, PA.
- **“Society for Vascular Medicine and Biology’s 17th Annual Scientific Sessions,”** June 2-4, 2006 in Philadelphia, PA.

The Board of Trustees of Mesa State College has submitted a request for an out-of-country instructional program to be delivered by Mesa State Extended Studies.

- **“BIOL 407: Tropical Field Biology,”** July 2006 in the Galapagos Islands.
- **“FLAV 290: Summer Study Program,”** June 15 – July 14, 2006 in Barcelona, Spain.

The Trustees of Adams State College submitted a request for out-of-state/out-of-country instructional program to be delivered by Adams State College Extended Studies.

- **“M.A. in Counseling,”** Summer 2006 in Singapore.

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.