

STATE OF COLORADO



DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION
Colorado Commission on Higher Education

Bill Ritter, Jr.
Governor

Raymond T. Baker, Chair
Dean L. Quamme, Vice Chair
Richard L. Garcia
James T. Polsfut
Richard L. Ramirez

Edward A. Robinson
Joel Rosenstein
Greg C. Stevinson
James M. Stewart
Judy Weaver

David E. Skaggs
Executive Director

Colorado Commission on Higher Education Agenda

May 4, 2007, 1:00 p.m.

[Colorado Community College System](#)
Administrative Building, Presidents Room
9101 E. Lowry Blvd.
Denver, CO 80230

Welcome by Nancy McCallin, President, Colorado Community College System

- I. Opening Business
 - A. Attendance
 - [B.](#) Approval of Minutes for the April 6, 2007 Commission Meeting
 - C. Reports by the Chair, Commissioners, Commission Subcommittees, Advisory Committee Members and Executive Director
 - D. Public Comment
- II. Presentation
 - A. Legislative and Capital Construction Update (Karakoulakis/Carlson)
- III. Action Items
 - [A.](#) University of Colorado at Colorado Springs Facilities Strategic Plan Update (Stubbs)
 - [B.](#) Change in Vocational Authority for Pueblo Community College (Leal)
 - [C.](#) Formal Admission of Non-Degree Students: Modification to Admissions Standards Policy (McKeever)
 - [D.](#) Low Demand Program Appeal – University of Colorado at Boulder, Ph.D. in Educational Psychology (Carnahan)
- IV. Consent Items
 - [A.](#) Colorado State University - Pueblo Facilities Master Plan Amendment and University of Northern Colorado Facilities Master Plan Amendment (Stubbs)
 - [B.](#) FY 2008 COF Eligibility for Off-Campus Programs (McKeever)
- V. Informational Items
 - A. FY 2007-2008 Long Bill Update (Lindner)
 - B. Briefing on Student Loans and Preferred Providers Lists (DeMuth)

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF
COLORADO COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION
April 6, 2007**

Chairman Ray Baker called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. via teleconference.

Commissioners Ray Baker, Dean Quamme, Richard Garcia, Jim Polsfut, Rick Ramirez, Ed Robinson, Joel Rosenstein, Greg Stevinson, James Stewart and Judy Weaver were all in attendance.

Commissioner Quamme moved to approve the March 1, 2007 minutes with a second by Commissioner Robinson. Commissioner Weaver commented on the misuse of the title "The Department of Higher Education on the minutes as well as documents throughout the agenda and asked to change the titles to read The Commission on Higher Education. Executive Director Skaggs agreed with Commissioner Weaver to change the titles. Commissioner Quamme moved to approve with the modification, and Commissioner Robinson seconded. The motion passed unanimously with the change.

There were no Chair, Commissioner, or Advisory Committee reports.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR REPORT: Executive Director Skaggs invited Andy Carlson, Director of Capital Assets & Compliance for the Department of Higher Education, to give a capital construction update. Mr. Carlson informed the Commissioners of an additional \$20 M for capital construction projects is being considered in discussion between the Governor and legislative leaders. This additional funding would allow for 6 more projects, funding a total of 28 projects at the State level, 17 of which are for higher education.

Mr. Skaggs introduced and welcomed Ms. Suzanne Stark, Executive Assistant, to the Department of Higher Education. Mr. Skaggs reminded the Commissioners about the Higher Education Summit that will take place June 8-9 and confirmed the Commissioner's retreat in August.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Ryan Biehle, University of Colorado student, gave an update to the Commissioners regarding the Associated Students of Colorado group that has been recently formed. This group is comprised of 15 student governments across the state and has been active at the Capitol. The group hosted a lobby day in early March and proposed an increase of financial aid funding totaling \$2.6 M more than the Governor's proposal. Commissioner Baker thanked Mr. Biehle for his update and asked for future updates.

George Walker expressed his view on the lack of funding for higher education and the effect it has on diversity. Mr. Walker commented and was pleased with the press release Colorado State University released regarding funding and said a fighter is needed to get more support for higher education to ensure diversity in funding.

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE: John Karakoulakis gave an update on various legislative bills that will affect or potentially affect the Colorado Department of Higher Education and the institutions, noting that only a month remains in this year's legislative session. Specifically, Mr. Karakoulakis mentioned HB 1118 and SB97; the latter bill was signed by the Governor on March 22. Cathy Wanstrath commented on how pleased she has been regarding the level of cooperation with all of the institutions this legislative session.

CONSENT ITEMS

DEGREE AUTHORIZATION ACT – AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF THE HUMANITIES, ARGOSY UNIVERSITY, NEW AMERICAN COLLEGE AND WILLIAM H. TAFT UNIVERSITY: Dr. Julie Carnahan presented this item on behalf of Matt McKeever, Director of the Statewide Extended Campus, and asked for approval of both preliminary authorization for the American University of the Humanities and New America College and Category I authorization for Argosy University and William H. Taft University.

Commissioner Weaver commented on the proliferation of online institutions requesting approval to operate in the State of Colorado and asked staff to take a look at Colorado's benchmark criteria for these schools as compared to other states around the country. Ms. Weaver also commented specifically on the number of online nursing degrees competing with the state institution students for clinical site positions.

Dr. Carnahan said that Academic Affairs staff has noticed the proliferation of these types of institutions in the state and has started discussions about doing an analysis of the growth in these programs over the past three years.

Commissioner Stevinson asked Commissioner Weaver if this would be something she would like to explore and spend time at the retreat discussing. Commissioner Weaver said that would be an appropriate time and would like to see staff recommendations regarding the issue prior to the retreat.

Commissioner Garcia mentioned he would like to see the research and procedures that staff goes through before making the approval recommendation to the Commission.

Commissioner Quamme moved to approve the authorizations recommended by staff; motion seconded by Commissioner Garcia. The motion passed 9-0, with Commissioner Polsfut abstaining.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

THE 2006 LEGISLATIVE REPORT ON REMEDIAL EDUCATION: Dr. Carnahan presented the remedial education report to the Commissioners. The report assesses recent high school graduates who are going to college and then are assigned to remediation in math, reading and writing. The report notes that math requires the most remediation in both 2-year and 4-year institutions.

Commissioner Baker said that he would like to go over this report in more detail with Department staff and Commissioners.

Commissioner Polsfut asked if the remediation has proven to be effective. Dr. Carnahan said that type of data will not be available until next year, when the first cohort of students that were assigned to remediation will graduate.

THE 2006 TEACHER EDUCATION REPORT: Dr. Carnahan presented the teacher education report and highlighted some pertinent facts and tables, specifically mentioning the continued challenge of increasing the number of minority students and ethnic students enrolled in teacher prep programs.

Commissioner Weaver mentioned the small number of physics endorsement students and asked if anything was being done about that. Dr. Carnahan mentioned the existence of the WIRED project which is looking at the number of students enrolled in STEM areas in the Front Range.

Executive Director Skaggs mentioned that this particular issue is a central topic on Governor Ritter's Jobs Cabinet docket.

Commissioner Garcia asked how many of the male, minority and ethnic teachers are being hired by Colorado school districts. He mentioned fewer teachers are linguistically diverse and school districts are having a hard time recruiting bi-lingual teachers.

Vicki Leal added that the University of Colorado at Boulder is institutionalizing a program that will actively and aggressively recruit math and science teachers using federal funds and soft money from the Exxon/Mobile Foundation.

Commissioner Stewart said the WIRED grant has been implemented in El Paso county addressing K-12 and workforce issues affecting southeastern Colorado.

Dr. Mark Malone, Faculty Advisory Member and a member of the Colorado Faculty Advisory Committee, said incentives need to be created to recruit teachers. Dr. Malone added that math and science needs to be addressed for the lower grade levels as well.

THE 2006 REPORT ON THE STATUS OF PERFORMANCE CONTRACTS: Ms. Vicki Leal provided the Commissioners with an update on the institutional performance contracts as well as protocols the Department follows for proper in-take, storage and archiving of

each institution's report. Ms. Leal provided a year-by-year account of current compliance updates as well as future due dates for specific status reports. Executive Director Skaggs said the Department has received its first periodic status reports, but noted that until 2010 there is no requirement for institutions to meet the goals in the performance contracts.

Commissioner Weaver said the spreadsheets show the metrics each institution uses to measure progress toward the 2010 goals; she said she would like to see the interim reports continue to make sure the 2010 goals remain under review.

Julie Carnahan said this is only the second year of COF and performance contracts and a minimum of three years of data are needed to see trends. Future years will reflect trends, but it is too early at this point.

In response to a question about which institutions are in compliance, Executive Director Skaggs replied that only one institution, Mesa State, has not yet submitted this year's status report.

Commissioner Weaver suggested annual reminders be sent to the institutions regarding the due date of the status reports.

THE 2006 LEGISLATIVE REPORT HB06-1024: Ms. Leal gave the Commissioners a brief report on the response to House Bill 2006-1024, programs and services designed to address the retention and success of underserved students enrolled at public colleges and universities in Colorado.

STATUS REPORT ON STAFF REVIEW OF THE 2010 HIGHER EDUCATION ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS: Dr. Carnahan briefed the Commissioners on the staff review regarding the 2010 HEAR requirements. Department staff has held meetings with a number of interested and affected groups. During these meetings, consistent trends surfaced regarding implementation barriers of HEAR 2010 at high schools and in admissions processes at four-year institutions. While all groups are in favor of more rigorous admissions standards, there were concerns that once implemented, HEAR 2010 would have negative consequences on enrollment in college.

Commissioner Quamme asked how House Bill 1118 ties into the 2010 HEAR requirements. John Karakoulakis responded that HB1118 is flexible. Institutions are required to "align," but it is the school districts that will develop graduation requirements.

Executive Director Skaggs suggested with the continued interest in the HEAR requirements, a Commissioner's meeting be scheduled in July to discuss the HEAR requirements and consider any modifications. This was agreed to by the Commissioners, and the meeting will be scheduled the second week in July.

Commissioner Weaver suggested using the data from the Colorado Alignment Council to inform further discussion of this issue.

The meeting adjourned at 2:25.

**TOPIC: UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT COLORADO SPRINGS
FACILITIES STRATEGIC PLAN UPDATE**

PREPARED BY: RYAN STUBBS

I. SUMMARY

The University of Colorado at Colorado Springs (UCCS) has submitted a Facilities Strategic Plan Update as an amendment to the currently approved master plan for the University. The Facilities Strategic Plan Update document, henceforth referred to as the amendment, updates the development strategy for UCCS based on an updated academic strategic plan for the university, the *Seven Year Growth Plan, Fiscal Year 2006 to Fiscal Year 2012* by Chancellor Shockley-Zalabak and changing data affecting development on the campus site and surrounding area. The amendment also places a greater emphasis on sustainable development practices and the preservation of the natural environment encompassing the campus.

In the Spring of 2000, UCCS submitted a facilities master plan which offered in depth analysis of the existing conditions of the campus in terms of land use and space use. The plan outlined development based on those conditions, the academic strategic plan at the time and various opportunities and constraints of the campus. Upon submittal to the Department of Higher Education (DHE) the plan totaled four volumes in length and was approved by the Commission on November 2, 2000. The current plan outlines a different development strategy than the one submitted with the 2000 plan, but it utilizes the same growth, land and space assessments and does not to require a complete re-write of the 2000 Facilities Master Plan.

Overall, the amendment offers a significantly different development strategy for UCCS and is based on the following guiding principles:

- *Prioritize the reduction of energy consumption*
- *Site buildings compactly to conserve open space and encourage socialization*
- *Create a walkable campus to help reduce car trips*
- *Preserve the natural landscape and make use of natural stormwater drainage to reduce infrastructure impact*
- *Build quality buildings for the long-term in a consistent architectural style*

The plan is also altered based on revised growth assumptions in FTEs, headcount and academic programs based on The Seven Year Growth Plan set forth by Chancellor Shockley-Zalabak in May 2005.

The first phase of growth is inline with *The Seven Year Growth Plan* and assumes that student headcount will increase from the current level of 7,620 by 2% in each year in the first five years of the plan and by 4% in the final two years, resulting with a total headcount of 9,100 students by 2012. The amendment corresponds with this assumption, showing that space needs will need to increase

from the current 1.4 Million Gross Square Feet (MGSF) to 2.2 MGSF to achieve the goals of the seven year plan by 2012. The amendment also plans for beyond the seven year plan for growth of student headcount to 15,000 by 2021 and 30,000 at the full campus buildout, which the campus estimates to occur in 2040. To reach these growth estimates, the amendment shows total space needs of 3.3 MGSF by 2021 and 6.3 MGSF for full buildout.

Total GSF by Phase	New GSF	Cumulative Total
2006 Existing	1,382,583	N/A
Six-Year Plan (2012)	852,385	2,234,968
Fifteen-Year Plan (2021)	1,074,296	3,309,264
Full Buildout (2040)	3,038,306	6,347,570
Total GSF	6,347,570	N/A

The above chart shows the necessary space needs compared with phased growth, summarized from the amendment. The planning document further allocates detailed space needs by assignable square feet and room types.

The Seven Year Growth Plan also identifies academic program growth which has informed the 2006 UCCS Academic Strategic Plan and the amendment. The Seven Year Plan identifies the need for two additional PhD programs, nine additional Master's programs and six additional Bachelor's programs. Potential Doctoral programs identified as possibilities in the 2006 Academic Strategic Plan include: Nursing Practice; Applied Science; Homeland Security; and, Educational Leadership. Potential Master's programs identified include: Innovation; Homeland Security; Student Affairs in Higher Education; Leadership; Nanotechnology; Sports Marketing and Management; Information Technology; and, Games Media Integration. Potential Undergraduate programs identified include: Game Design and Development; Innovation; Biomedical Engineering; Ethnic/Women's Studies; Criminal Justice; Biology; and, Honor's Programs.

Additionally, the amendment identifies a number of specific capital projects that allow for the campus to achieve the goals as identified in *The Seven Year Growth Plan*. The total amount of funds needed to accomplish all projects listed within the amendment as seeking funding from fiscal year 2005-2006 to fiscal year 2011-2012 is \$252,515,577. In order to fund the plan, the University's strategy will be to obtain \$84.2 Million in state capital funding, \$42 Million in tuition bonding/gifts, \$65 Million in campus funds/gifts/partnerships, \$55.6 Million in fee based bonding, \$1.3 Million in utility saving and \$4.4 Million in gift only funds.

In addition to the recent *Seven Year Growth Plan* and *2006 Academic Strategic Plan*, UCCS is has recently developed the *2006 Information Technology Strategic Planning Report* and is in the process of developing design guidelines for the campus.

The 2006 IT Strategic Planning report puts a greater emphasis on academic and administrative IT service and defines the following focal points:

- *Developing and enhancing programs and support for educational technology,*

including hardware, software and staff support, technology-enhanced facilities, and information and information technology literacy programs for students

- *Improving and greatly expanding web-based student services*
- *Maintaining and further developing the middleware layer of the campus's infrastructure, including security, and access and authorization*
- *Improving coordination, communication and governance of campus IT resources.*

New campus design guidelines are still being developed by the University and are being informed, in part, by the amendment.

II. BACKGROUND

The Commission is required by C.R.S. 23-1-106(3) to review and approve master planning and program planning for all capital construction projects of institutions of higher education. Additionally, C.R.S. 23-1-106(4) requires that the Commission ensure conformity of facilities master planning with approved educational master plans and facility program plans with approved facilities master plans.

Given this statutory authority, ensuring conformance with facility master plans is a major component of the Department of Higher Education program plan review process. If conformance is not apparent, institutions are required to submit amendments to their current master plans to accommodate alternate development strategies.

According to Department of Higher Education Policies Section III Part D, Commission approved facilities master plans should be re-examined every ten years. Given the changing nature of development needs and fiscal constraints, institutions can submit amendments to their master plans in the interim to incorporate new development strategies and changing needs without undertaking the task of creating a new master plan. Section III Part D of DHE policy states:

A long-range plan must be developed as a flexible framework for campus growth that recognizes the dynamic nature of higher education. As enrollments grow or decline and/or as academic programs change or become more comprehensive to serve new student needs, campus facility needs inevitably will change. A facility master plan must be capable of meeting these changing circumstances. To ensure that a Long-Range plan remains valid, an institution must do one of the following before the ten-year life of the plan expires:

- *Create a new Long-Range Plan;*
- *Send a letter to DHE stating that all assumptions contained in the master plan are still valid and that all facilities' needs outlined in it are still needed but have not yet been completed; or*
- *Amend the master plan to bring it up to date.*

Thus, at least every ten years the long-range plan for each campus must be re-examined or updated in order to keep it current.

The recent strategic updates and shifting development opportunities at UCCS have led to the need for the amendment. Since the UCCS Facilities Master Plan approved by DHE in 2001 is still valid, the amendment is the appropriate course of action for the institution.

Also, the amendment fits with the vision mission and core values of the institution.

Vision: *The University of Colorado at Colorado Springs will provide unsurpassed, student-centered teaching and learning, and outstanding research and creative work that serve our community, state and nation, and result in our recognition as the premier comprehensive, regional research university in the United States.*

Mission: *The University of Colorado at Colorado Springs shall be a comprehensive baccalaureate university with selective admissions standards. The University of Colorado at Colorado Springs shall offer liberal arts and sciences, business, engineering, health sciences and teacher preparation undergraduate degrees and a selected number of masters and doctoral degrees.*

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

Planning Process

The amendment was primarily prepared by the architecture and planning firm SLATERPAULL Architects, in association with the firms Loebel Schlossman & Hackl and EDAW. The process involved an assessment of square footage and site plan information for all campus buildings as well as assessments of campus infrastructure, program data, landscaping, paved areas, utilities and pedestrian and vehicular traffic patterns.

The SLATERPAUL team also gathered data on regional systems, campus facilities and grounds needs through meeting with UCCS administrators, faculty, staff, students, neighborhood representatives, the North Nevada Corridor Planning Group, representatives of the United States Olympic Committee and, the Planning and Transportation Departments of the City of Colorado Springs.

The result is a plan based on sound technical planning data that creates a vision for the campus based on sustainability and preserving the natural beauty of the area as well as strategic academic goals that fit with national, state and community goals and opportunities.

The plan recommends three-phases of development for future campus growth: the first will meet the needs and goals set forth by the Seven Year Growth Plan; the next will fulfill longer term initiatives and improve campus facilities and infrastructure over the next fifteen years; the third shows a possible vision of the ultimate development phase for UCCS at full buildout.

Sustainability

Stormwater drainage will be a key organizing function of street grids and preserving natural riparian habitat and vegetation. The arroyos (creeks) will be developed as riparian corridors with multiple

functions besides drainage including green space, walking and biking trails and smaller critter habitats.

The plan also calls for the arrangement of street grids and footprint placements that conform to the topographical features of the land and help facilitate campus user interaction and campus walkability.

Additionally, the campus has developed a sustainability checklist based on the preliminary LEED-ND (Neighborhood Development) rating system and plans to achieve or conditionally achieve 17 of the 19 elements listed on the checklist. The LEED-ND system identifies neighborhood sustainability goals such as location efficiency, environmental preservation and compact, complete and connected neighborhoods.

Planned New Development

The plan also divides the campus into three distinct areas with specific functions. The area designated in the plan as “North Campus” is the site with the most opportunity for new development. North Campus will include:

- Two student suite-style villages nestled between the central and south arroyos
- A Research Park/Athletic Facility District placed on the highly visible north end closest to the I-25 interchange along North Nevada Avenue
- An outdoor amphitheater nestled into a canyon on the northeast corner of the site

Central Campus is the primary location of current facilities and includes projects that are already in progress such as the new Recreation Center, Science and Engineering Building and additional housing at Summit Village and Alpine Village. Additional development at Central Campus will include:

- An internal boulevard to connect Central, North and East Campuses
- Additional academic buildings to replace surface parking lots
- A new physical plan complex.

East campus currently includes a retirement home and related condo development. Development of this site is scheduled for the long term as the campus nears full buildout.

DHE staff issued the following questions to UCCS regarding the amendment. Questions were given thorough and sufficient response and DHE staff has no further reservations in recommending that the Commission approve the amendment.

1. The Facilities Strategic Plan Update is 37 pages and the prior Master Plan (approved by CCHE in 2001) is 4 volumes in length. Is this plan an amendment to the current UCCS master plan? Does it update a certain section of the current master plan?

Response:

2006 found several strategic level documents at UCCS under an updating process. Our IT Strategic Plan was updated on January 26, 2006 and a copy will be provided separately. Also the UCCS Academic Strategic Plan has been updated and will be provided separately. The new Academic Strategic Plan in particular paved the way for the Facilities plan update. The University of Colorado at Colorado Springs (UCCS) Facilities Strategic Plan Update 2006 utilizes the UCCS Plan approved in 2001 as its foundation. The 2006 Update document is an amendment or update, not a comprehensive re-write of the existing plan. This is possible because most of the 2001 plan sections and analyses have not changed. A Six-Year Plan and a Fifteen-Year Plan were developed in response to CCHE policies and procedures Section III, Part D, Guidelines for Long-Range Facilities/Infrastructure Master Planning, dated April 5, 2001. We recognize these guidelines were revised on November 2, 2006 just as the UCCS 2006 Update was being finalized.

The 2006 Facilities Strategic Plan Update updates the expected enrollment growth of the campus since 2001 and lists those facilities required to support the new projections. The 2006 Update plan is a new initiative and seeks to discover “Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS)” supported by the Congress for New Urbanism and the Institute of Transportation Engineers. The plan weaves local conditions and needs into the process of designing road networks for walkable communities. The UCCS 2006 Update incorporates the concepts embodied in the new LEED™-ND (Neighborhood Development) initiative.

2. Is UCCS assuming the same assessment of existing conditions from the 2001 Master Plan apply to the updated plan?

Response:

Generally speaking, the assessments from the 2001 plan remain valid. There are however, new approaches to the development of existing land conditions that make possible the construction of facilities where previously a conservative approach ruled these facilities out. Recent soil excavation along North Nevada by SEMA Construction revealed that 10 to 12 feet below the surface of generally poor soil lies a superb R60 construction material. This enables today’s planners to conceptually terrace the northwestern campus. Doing so adds 10-15% in constructible land.

3. What new conditions have arisen to necessitate a new facilities strategic plan? Please speak specifically to the differing land uses identified in this plan when compared with the 2001 long range development plan. For example, the 2001 plan shows proposed residential uses in the North Campus area and indoor sports and outdoor sports uses on Central Campus.

Response:

The development of the western side of North Nevada Avenue was not envisioned with the 2001 plan. Today, it has become a reality as Costco and Lowes sign contractual agreements to redevelop the land into University Village, a commercial/retail center. Further, in 2001 the City of Colorado Springs’ leased use of the Four Diamonds Sports Complex was assumed to be in perpetuity. The lease of this University land expires in 2014 and with the redevelopment of North Nevada it was important for UCCS to work in concert with the City and the Urban Renewal Authority to seamlessly develop our lands to match that of the

developers to the benefit of the University and the City of Colorado Springs. The Facilities Strategic Plan Update 2006 differs from the 2001 plan in its fundamental assumptions. The 2001 plan approached land use and development in a most traditional way. In contrast, the new plan makes sustainability an integral part of the planning and development process. Creating a sense of place, pedestrian scaled environments, and an abundance of open space mark the 2006 Update plan for its highest and best use of the land while preserving and creating special places on campus. With the completion of the Science/Engineering Buildings in 2008 the "Central Campus" is nearly complete. Few additional facilities are possible, as objectives of the 2001 Plan will have been met. Still, there are concepts such as structured parking rather than on-grade parking that makes the new plan sustainable.

4. How will the different sections of campus interrelate with each other? There is over a mile between the north and south campus sections. How will student activity at each part of campus (North, East and Central) interact?

Response:

The 2006 Update acknowledges the linearity of the UCCS campus. Transportation such as today's campus shuttle bus system and perhaps an on-campus train-like or cable car system of transportation in the future are keys to keeping the campus connected. An interior frontage road concept has been included to make transport easier and more direct. We will look to a people mover transportation system, which may use technologies such as monorail, automated guideway transit or maglev. Propulsion may involve conventional on-board electric motors, linear motors or cable traction. In the interim, planning from the 2006 Update includes centers of learning concepts such as the east end of campus becoming a college of nursing center the north and west areas becoming a business, engineering, and research center, while the central campus remains the core curriculum producing facility.

5. How does proposed academic building growth overlap with proposed program growth and strategic planning?

Response:

The Facilities Strategic Plan Update took off from the recently completed update of the Academic Strategic Plan. In this way both program needs and facilities capabilities are addressed in the 2006 Update plan. The numbers, types, and locations of new facilities keep steady pace with the estimated growth in headcount and strategic program planning objectives. For example, the beginning of a research park is planned within a six-year period from the completion of the 2006 Update plan. The complete and ultimate development however depends upon the success such a research capability supplies. The final research park is not envisioned until fifteen-years after the 2006 Update plan or 2021.

6. Is there much interaction between the neighborhood that is adjacent to the central campus and the University? Do students live in or frequently traverse the adjacent neighborhoods?

Response:

Yes. There is continual interaction between the Cragmor Village neighbors and UCCS. Students park their automobiles in nearby residential neighborhoods and walk to UCCS through the Cragmor Village neighborhood. Our police officers routinely patrol there and

will respond to emergencies – the neighbors often express their appreciation of this welcomed security presence to the University staff. In winter months, as a courtesy, our grounds crew plows the street for the neighborhood. Last summer (2006) the University and the CU Foundation worked together to acquire the Ulrich House, as the owner and resident was moving away after more than 48-years next to the campus. Mr. Frank Ulrich was one of our shuttle bus drivers for many years.

7. What plans does the University have for Athletic and Recreational growth that will allow for such a large portion of the campus to be dedicated to these land uses?

Response:

In 1965 UCCS was a primarily commuter-based University campus. With 900 resident beds today and a future that will see the campus transition to a residential four-year University we recognized with the 2006 Update that recreational facilities for students today are inadequate. Up and until this past fall, our gymnasium could seat a little over 200 spectators. We replaced the seating and increased seating capacity to over 400 and still the gymnasium cannot accommodate all spectators. We understand that as UCCS grows recreational opportunities must grow too. In the future, we see UCCS competing at the NCAA Division II level for several years, but we know that Division I awaits a growing and successful University. Our plans include that eventuality perhaps in the sport of football.

8. On page 31 of the strategic plan update, seven-year growth plan is mentioned as a resource. Please submit a copy of this document.

Response:

One has been mailed separately. It is also found on the UCCS website at: <http://www.uccs.edu/~facsrvs/docs/StrategicPlan/Final%207%20Year%20Growth%20Plan.pdf>

This plan was approved by the Board of Regents of the University in the summer of 2005. Its bold and innovative format led the CU President to require all Universities in the CU System to create such a document for their campuses and to be prepared to present them to the Board of Regents early this spring. UCCS will be the first to do so in May with our update of this planning document.

9. Page 6 indicates the guiding principal to “build quality buildings for the long-term in a consistent architectural style.” Is the University developing design guidelines outside of the facilities strategic plan update?

Response:

UCCS has written Design Guidelines that were produced in 1996. A copy will be sent separately. The Facilities Strategic Planning team used these guidelines as the Facilities Strategic Plan Update proceeded. Still, we recognized that they too required an update and so the Strategic Plan Update team worked in concert with the UCCS Design Guidelines and then identified how they could be updated. Mr. Lamar Kelsey, former member of the CU Design Review Board is supporting UCCS with our update of the UCCS Design Guidelines effort, which trails the completion of the Facilities Strategic Plan Update. The new and updated Design Guidelines will also be forwarded upon their completion in March 2007.

10. Will the University be seeking LEED certification on current and future buildings? If so, do implementation costs include the associated costs of LEED certified buildings? Also, if so, what level of LEED certification will the University seek?

Response:

UCCS has registered two current projects to become LEED™ Certified. The Student Fitness Center and the University's largest project, the Science/Engineering Buildings are both currently registered with the U.S. Green Building Council to become LEED™ Certified. UCCS will not seek more than a LEED™ Certified rating of current or future buildings until our construction specifications equal or better those employed by CU Boulder. At that point it may be possible to say that a LEED™ Silver certification does not add cost. We are just not there yet.

11. Does UCCS envision any future property transactions? If so, where have opportunities for land acquisitions been identified?

Response:

Yes. As the renderings of the Six-Year and Fifteen-Year plans reveal, two residential neighborhoods are in close proximity to UCCS. Eventually, the University anticipates the acquisition of these properties, as residents become sellers. This will not happen overnight nor will it be immediate. Today, each of the properties in the Eagle Rock neighborhood, for example, would list for sale in the range of \$350K to well over \$600K.

12. Fall 2006 headcount reported to CCHE is shown as 7,547. Is there an estimate for when might a head count of 30,000 be reached?

Response:

It is anticipated that an estimated enrollment of 30,000 students (headcount) will be reached in 2040, thirty-four years from the Update Plan's completion in 2006.

13. In what ways has the University progressed towards the vision presented in the 2001 master plan? How does the new plan change/improve on this vision?

Response:

Since 2001, both Main Hall and Cragmor Hall have been renovated. Long awaited work on Dwire Hall is underway now and a Student Fitness Center has started. The campus' largest construction effort and largest facility, the Science/Engineering Buildings will open in 2008. These actions were all part of the vision contained in the 2001 plan. Taking a bold step beyond with the 2006 Update plan, UCCS embarks upon a path of sustainability. It is our hope that the 523 acres available to UCCS will become a sense of place, be a walkable campus, one with a myriad of recreational opportunities and open space. Building orientation and energy conservation take center stage in the 2006 Update plan as do carefully designed streets and roadways.

Both plans follow sustainable design practices to some degree, although the 2006 Update plan had the added benefit of research done by ITE (CSS) and the USGBC (LEED-ND) that was incorporated into the planning process. Other than that, the Six-Year 2006 Update plan is similar to the 2001 Plan. The most significant plan difference thereafter resulted from the emergence of the North Nevada Corridor as an economic driver, coupled with the ability to

relocate the Four Diamonds Sports Complex in 2014.

The result is the 2006 Update plan's mixed-use University Village, creating a strong functional and economic connection with the commercial/retail center development on the west side of North Nevada, combined with the creation of an indoor/outdoor recreation/athletics complex at the northwest corner of the site replacing the Four Diamonds Complex as well as adding two critical functions not in the 2001 Plan, a Multi-Purpose Arena and a Competition Natatorium. University Village (ours) would not happen until the Fifteen-Year 2006 Update plan, sometime after 2014 when the Four Diamonds lease ends.

Another significant difference is in the nature of parking planning. The 2001 Plan concentrated parking in the traditional campus planning way, in big lots on the edge of the campus. The 2006 Update plan, utilizing the concepts of CSS and LEED™-ND, disperses parking to where it is needed, primarily to promote pedestrian safety and walkability and reduce total car trips for the protection of the environment.

14. Are the 6 and 15 year plans based on the space needs analysis conducted by Paulien and Associates in the 2001 Master Plan? How have space needs and utilizations changed since the 2001 analysis?

Response:

Space needs were based on student headcount targets that were similar for both plans through the year 2010. In the 2001 Plan, the Space Needs Analysis by Paulien and Associates calculated space to serve a 10,000 student headcount in Year 10 (2011). The 2006 Plan was based on a 9,100 Student Headcount for the Six-Year Phase (2012) and a 15,000 Student Headcount for the Fifteen-Year Phase (2021).

As far as total space calculated, both the 2001 and 2006 Update plans programmed space needs based on CCHE Guidelines. The 2001 Plan called for an additional 700,000 GSF by the Year 2011. The 2006 Update Six-Year plan calls for an additional 852,385 by the Year 2012.

One significant difference: the 2006 Update plan responds to changing trends in student housing needs since the 2001 Plan was developed. The 2001 Plan projected a need for 600 beds. When the 2006 Update plan was initiated the total bed count had already risen to 901. The 2006 Update plan forecasts a need for an additional 750 beds by 2011, and another 989 beds by 2021. Additionally, there is a growing market for student apartments vs. traditional residence halls, and a higher GSF/Bed accommodating some of this housing type was factored into the calculation as well.

Other significant differences: there was no plan for a Research Park, a Multi-Purpose Arena/Athletic Complex with an Indoor Track/Field house or a Competition Natatorium in the 2001 Plan.

15. The prior long range plan identifies 4 campus zones (Trembly, Heller, Meadows and Cragmor). Why is the segmentation of campus by these zones no longer being used for planning purposes?

Response:

These are still used. With the Heller property a special space is maintained separate for the most part from campus. This separation continues the rural feel one has when on the Heller Center property, a feel we want to preserve. The Trembly zone is our largest target for growth. Cragmor remains the central or main campus while additional development is planned for the Meadows zone as properties become available and as the University acquires them.

16. How does regional and local public transportation currently interact with campus and how is it planned to interact in the future?

Response:

A great deal of interaction and coordination occurs with all elements of Public Transportation as UCCS recognizes the need to facilitate the movement of students on and off campus. The City's Transportation office is in close coordination with all the current construction happening in and around the UCCS campus today. On February 13, 2007, as an example, we held a Transportation Demand Management Workshop on the UCCS campus with key transportation leadership in attendance from around the community. This Transportation Demand Management Workshop was designed to look at transportation issues at UCCS and make recommendations for creating a more pedestrian and bicycle friendly campus, increasing the connectivity with Colorado Springs through public transit, and lessening the effect of private vehicles to the campus. Currently, over 87 percent of our community drives to the campus in single-occupancy vehicles, representing over 19 million miles annually and many tons of climate changing carbon dioxide emissions. As an institute of higher education, we felt we needed to be concerned with our impacts and to provide a model for our community in taking care of our environment. We know there is more to do and plans are underway to continue this dialogue in the future.

17. Proposed academic buildings shown on the 15-year plan, south of the proposed Academic Village on Central Campus, appear to have footprints overlapping land that is not developable due to soil conditions identified in the 2001 Master Plan (Constraint Map #5). Will it be possible to safely construct these academic facilities?

Response:

Yes. As indicated in the response to question #2 above this area is planned to be terraced. Soils below the surface will support safe construction in this location.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the Commission approves the Facilities Strategic Plan Update for the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs as an amendment to the Commission approved 2000 Facilities Master Plan for the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs.

STATUTORY AUTHORITY

C.R.S. 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 source of funds, and no capital construction shall commence except in accordance with and 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: CHANGE IN VOCATIONAL AUTHORITY FOR PUEBLO
COMMUNITY COLLEGE**

PREPARED BY: VICKI A. LEAL

I. SUMMARY

The purpose of this agenda item is to request formal Commission approval for a change in vocational authority and to grant Pueblo Community College (PCC) expanded vocational service areas (additional counties) for certain allied health programs currently offered by PCC. Per their two-year mission and role PCC currently serves Pueblo, Fremont, Custer, Dolores, Montezuma, La Plata, San Juan, and Archuleta counties; the college's service area for vocational programs includes Pueblo, Fremont, and Custer counties.

PCC has requested that the Commission grant their request for vocational authority in the delivery of existing allied health programs and to expand their vocational service area for these programs to the following counties: Dolores, Montezuma, La Plata, San Juan and Archuleta. Granting PCC's request will bring their vocational service area into alignment with the eight-county area currently serviced through their two-year role and mission in the region and through the college's institutionalized Southwest Center while also strengthening their regional accreditation requirements.

II. BACKGROUND

The Colorado Commission on Higher Education is charged by statute to define geographic and programmatic service areas for Colorado public institutions of higher education [23-1-109 (2)]. In 1985 consultations with governing board representatives were conducted and, at its meeting in January 1986, the Commission approved specific geographic service areas for each institution and recognized several programmatic distinctions. Revisions were made in May 1987; March 1988; December 1992; September 1994; May 1995; and June 1995.

Community college and area vocational schools' service areas are the geographic areas in which these institutions may offer their regular programs. In some cases an area vocational school is part of a community college and the service areas generally are the same.

Pueblo Community College serves Pueblo, Fremont, Custer, Dolores, Montezuma, La Plata, San Juan, and Archuleta counties. Its service area for vocational programs includes Pueblo, Fremont, and Custer counties.

In response to Southwestern Colorado educational needs, the State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education and the Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) assigned to Pueblo Community College, in 1988, a five-county service area that

included the counties of Archuleta, Dolores, La Plata, Montezuma, and San Juan. Also serving these counties were Fort Lewis College (FLC), a liberal arts baccalaureate institution and San Juan Basin Technical School (SJBTS), a provider of vocational training at the certificate level. At the time, Pueblo Community College entered into an agreement with SJBTS and SBCCOE: “... *“to develop and deliver the necessary academic support courses and the ADN [Associate Degree in Nursing] and electronic programs.”*”

When the Southwest Center was started in 1988, Pueblo Community College received a 100 FTE per year funding allocation for two years of development of the Southwest Center. The fiscal allocation was funneled through SJBTS for budgeting and disbursement. All individuals employed to work in the PCC Southwest Center programs and services were employees of SJBTS, and the two entities were co-located in the SJBTS building located ten miles east of Cortez. The joint agreement with the San Juan Basin Technical School was terminated in October of 1992; and at that time, all personnel devoted to the efforts of the PCC course and program offerings became PCC employees. Also, all PCC programs and course offerings were placed under the direct administration of PCC.

PCC currently works with San Juan Basin Technical College (SJBTC)₁ in the area of Nursing; SJBTC offers the first year of the Nursing Program (LPN), and PCC offers the second year of the Nursing Program, which leads to the Applied Associates of Science (AAS) in Nursing. In the area of Emergency Medical Services (EMS); SJBTC offers the EMS Basic and Intermediate certificates, while PCC offers the EMS Advanced Paramedic certificate. PCC seeks to continue this articulation and partnership during the 2007-2008 academic year; SJBTC enrollment should not decline as a result of this continued partnership.

This agenda item recommends granting PCC expanded vocational authority in the following counties: Dolores, Montezuma, La Plata, San Juan, and Archuleta to offer the following programs in the allied health fields:

- Respiratory Therapy
- Emergency Medical Services Advanced Paramedic Certification
- Nursing (specifically the 2nd year of the Applied Degree in Nursing Program [ADN]).

In the future, and pending final Department of Higher Education (DHE) approval, PCC plans to move forward with offering, at the Southwest Campus, Associate of Applied Science Degrees in health-related programs that *cannot* be articulated with a non-degree granting institution (such as SJBTC) and that are not part of the current SJBTC/PCC partnership. An example of this would be the AAS Degree in Respiratory Care already offered by PCC and Radiologic Technology, an applied degree program that has yet to be delivered.

PCC is accredited by Colorado’s regional accrediting agency, The Higher Learning Commission, as a degree-granting institution. Additionally, all but one of PCC’s health programs have national health agency accreditation at the associate-degree level (by 2008 all

nursing programs are *required* to have accreditation). PCC can continue to offer these areas of study, currently not offered by any other institution in the region.

II. STAFF ANALYSIS

DHE staff have reviewed and considered PCC's request in conjunction with an overview and examination of the current delivery of educational programming in the four-corners region of the state. DHE staff have also extended consideration to the mission and role of other post-secondary institutions in the same geographical service region, (Fort Lewis College and San Juan Basin Technical College).

Additionally, DHE staff have reviewed the current institutional capacity of all institutions operating within the region, while focusing exclusively on the delivery of educational services, including certificate programs, vocational education, the delivery of Associate of Arts and Associate of Applied Science as well as Associate of Science degrees while also considering the mission and role that the region's four-year institution provides.

In sum, DHE staff have considered both current stakeholders and residents of the region and are recommending that the Commission grant increased vocational authority by expanding PCC's vocational service area to include the counties of Dolores, Montezuma, La Plata, San Juan, and Archuleta, *however* limit the educational programming to only specified allied health fields, including: Respiratory Therapy, the Emergency Medical Services Advanced Paramedic Certificate and the *second* year of the Associate Degree in Nursing (ADN). Expanding vocational authority in support of these allied health fields will enable PCC to continue its current delivery of educational programming in these specified fields while providing for continued collaboration between the institutions and on behalf of students. Further, granting PCC vocational authority in the allied health fields in these counties will ensure that both PCC and SJBTC continue to jointly serve students through program and certification partnerships while also supporting transfer opportunities for students in the region.

This expansion of vocational authority for PCC should not alter in any way the current delivery of educational programming currently offered by SJBTC, as SJBTC is not a degree-granting institution, and as such cannot grant applied degrees nor associate-level degrees. Neither should it affect the current delivery of PCC programs not in the area of allied health fields, as PCC is currently the sole provider, per statute and policy promulgated by the DHE, of both applied and associate degrees. Further, the granting of increased vocational authority by the DHE in the specified allied health areas will in no way alter the current delivery of vocational/technical education curriculum and programs in the following school districts: Montezuma-Cortez School District RE-1, Dolores District Re-4A, and Mancos School District RE-6, as the Colorado Vocational Act of 1970 provides for the delivery of vocational and technical education by the local school districts operating vocational education programs as approved by the State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education (CRS 23-8-101 et. seq., as it may be amended from time to time).

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Commission approve staff recommendation for an expansion of PCC's vocational service region for its existing allied health vocational programs specifically: Respiratory Therapy, Emergency Medical Services Advanced Paramedic Certification and Nursing (specifically the 2nd year of the Applied Degree in Nursing Program [ADN]) in the following counties: Dolores, Montezuma, La Plata, San Juan, and Archuleta .

STATUTORY AUTHORITY

The Colorado Commission on Higher Education is charged by statute to define geographic and programmatic service areas for Colorado public institutions of higher education [23-1-109 (2)].

C.R.S. 23-1-109 (2) states that the Commission shall define, after consultation with the governing boards of institutions, the geographic and programmatic service areas for each state-supported institution of higher education. No such institution shall provide instruction off-campus in programs or geographic areas or at sites not approved by the commission, unless otherwise provided by law.

1Article 60 of title 23, Colorado Revised Statutes, is amended BY THE ADDITION OF A NEW PART to read: PART 8, AREA VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS C.R.S. 23-60-801. Area vocational schools – name. THE SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF EDUCATION OR THE BOARD OF COOPERATIVE SERVICES, WHICHEVER IS APPLICABLE, THAT ACTS AS THE GOVERNING BOARD OF AN AREA VOCATIONAL SCHOOL MAY, BY RESOLUTION, RENAME THE AREA VOCATIONAL SCHOOL TO IDENTIFY IT AS A TECHNICAL COLLEGE. ***IDENTIFYING AN AREA VOCATIONAL SCHOOL AS A TECHNICAL COLLEGE SHALL NOT CHANGE ITS STATUS AS AN AREA VOCATIONAL SCHOOL NOR CHANGE THE GOVERNANCE OR OPERATION OF THE AREA VOCATIONAL SCHOOL.***[Emphasis added]

**TOPIC: FORMAL ADMISSION OF NON-DEGREE STUDENTS:
MODIFICATION TO ACADEMIC AFFAIRS POLICY I,
PART F: ADMISSIONS STANDARDS POLICY.**

PREPARED BY: MATT McKEEVER

I. SUMMARY

Since 1986, the Colorado Commission on Higher Education has held the authority to establish statewide admission standards for public colleges and universities. In 2003, CCHE Academic Affairs Policy I, Part F (Admissions Standards Policy) was modified dramatically to include minimum academic coursework requirements, otherwise known as the Higher Education Admission Requirements (HEAR). The addition of the HEAR was accompanied by several other technical changes to the Admissions Standards Policy, such as the clarification of the admission policy as it relates to non-degree students. The implementation of the non-degree transfer policy revision created a roadblock to non-traditional students who were planning to complete their college education. The changes to the policy described herein and found in [Attachment A](#) address non-degree students, age 22 and over, making formal application into the same institution.

Staff recommends that the Admission Standards Policy be changed to allow non-degree students, age 22 years and older, applying for formal admission at the same institution to be considered transfer applicants as long as they meet Admission Standards Policy transfer standards.

II. BACKGROUND

Following the adoption of the 2003 modifications to the CCHE Admissions Standards Policy, CCHE staff began receiving requests from various constituents to revisit the non-degree transfer policy. Institutions have the ability to enroll non-degree students in courses on a space available basis. In 2003 the Commission approved changes to the Admission Standards policy to require that non-degree students applying for formal admission to the same institution would be required to meet the same standards as a first time freshman, regardless of credit hours earned. The revision was spurred by the operation of several programs in which students who elected to enroll did so as non-degree-seeking and were not subject to the freshmen admission standards. The non-degree students often enrolled in the same on-campus courses in which admitted freshmen enrolled, lived in the residence halls, and in many ways participated in campus activities and programs as if they were admitted degree-seeking freshmen. With the changes to the admission policy's transfer standards in 2003, these programs were discontinued.

However, the 2003 changes to the admission policy's transfer standards affected a population of non-traditional aged students planning to complete their degree. These non-traditional students, seeking ways to complete their degree, generally have additional responsibilities other than college (i.e. careers, family, and homes). These additional responsibilities may not allow the student flexibility to attend school outside of their area. Taking courses as a non-degree student provides non-traditional students the ability to determine if they can balance school with other responsibilities. However, taking classes as a non-degree student alters the way they can be considered for admission to that institution. Specifically, the student is considered as a first time freshman even if they have completed sufficient college credit hours to otherwise be eligible as a transfer applicant. Considering these non-traditional students eligible for transfer standard standing, after demonstrating college level success, would encourage degree completion for non-traditional students.

If these proposed changes are approved, non-degree students, age 22 and over, applying for formal admission at the same institution at which they took non-degree coursework, will be subject to the transfer standards of the Admission Standards Policy. Non-degree student, age 21 and younger, applying for formal admission to the same institution at which they took non-degree course work will be subject to freshman standards regardless of credit hours earned.

All of the policy modifications found herein were discussed with the state's senior admission officers and chief academic officers.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

The 2003 policy revision to eliminate programs that offered students an opportunity to attend an institution that they otherwise would not have been admissible was necessary. However, a consequence of the policy revision was the creation of a roadblock for non-traditional students that were place bound and wanting to complete a degree.

Non-traditional students are allowed take courses with non-degree standing. Some of the non-degree students have additional responsibilities (i.e. careers, family, and homes) and are determining if they are ready to go back to school by taking coursework prior to formally applying to the institution. Because of the 2003 revisions, these students may not be admissible to an institution even though they had demonstrated success as a non-degree student. Selected examples of students that the 2003 revisions adversely affected follow:

- Student age 50+: some college work at approx. 2.75 and recalls "doing ok in high school." A published author, the student is interested in finally completing degree, but wants to do non-degree coursework first to "get feet wet." Is concerned about getting a hold of high school transcripts, as she is not sure if the school is even still standing. If student were to take non-degree

- courses they would have to be admitted through window, not based on academic achievement of non-degree work.
- Student age 28: Poor high school grades from several schools, no SAT/ACT scores. Thought would just try some courses as a non-degree student, and has done well. For the first time in life feels academically intelligent, and would like to be formally admitted. By the end of term will meet the transfer standard, but will not be admissible as transfer and will have to be considered a window admit.
 - Student age 32: Excellent non-degree student who ended up with a 3.113 GPA and 38 hours. Student visited with admissions office right after the policies for admission changed, and was told that because of low high school GPA and low SAT scores would not be eligible for admission. Student left school at that time. Student said put school on the back-burner because they did not want to risk applying and getting denied.

Some non-traditional students are seeking ways to complete their degree and generally have additional responsibilities other than college. These additional responsibilities sometimes do not allow the student flexibility to attend school outside of their area. Taking courses as a non-degree student provides non-traditional students the ability to determine if they can balance school with other responsibilities. Changing the policy to consider non-traditional non-degree students applying for formal admission at the same institution as a transfer applicant encourages degree completion.

Recognizing that the 2003 revisions of the policy were necessary to eliminate programs that essentially admitted non-qualified students, and recognizing that some non-traditional students may be place bound and recognizing that it is in the best interest of higher education in Colorado to encourage completion of degrees; staff recommends that the Admission Standard Policy is changed to allow non-degree students, age 22 years and older, applying for formal admission at the same institution be considered transfer applicants as long as they meet all other transfer standards.

The recommended changes would not alter the policy for those non-degree students aged 21 and under applying for formal admission at the same institution.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Admission Standards Policy be changed to allow non-degree students, age 22 years and older, applying for formal admission at the same institution to be considered transfer applicants as long as they meet Admission Standards Policy transfer standards.

STATUTORY AUTHORITY

**23-1-108 C.R.S.
23-1-113 C.R.S.**

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 higher education admission requirement 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 higher education admission requirement 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 Higher Education Admission Requirements

GPA	5.00	CCHE Undergraduate Admission Standards Index and Transfer
	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 an 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 public liberal arts institution, with 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 Higher Education Admission Requirements

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 higher education admission requirements (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 higher education admission requirements 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
TOTAL	15 Units

*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 Higher Education Admission 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 higher education admission requirements, the student must complete at least two courses with laboratory work.

A course with laboratory work shall not be limited to textbook or lecture instruction, but shall include a variety of hands-on/minds-on activities including experiments and investigations, whether occurring in a classroom laboratory, a simulated online environment, or the field. Emphasis should be placed on inquiry skills that nurture and support high-level thinking, such as developing scientific questions, writing hypotheses, designing and/or refining experimental procedures, collecting/or analyzing data, and drawing conclusions.

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 higher education admission requirements, 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 higher education admission requirements beginning in spring 2010.

4.02 Approved Alternatives for Fulfilling Higher Education Admission 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 higher education admission requirements.
- 4.02.02 Precollegiate courses taken prior to ninth grade may be counted as meeting the higher education admission requirements 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.
- 4.02.03.01 Students may demonstrate proficiency in Foreign Languages and earn two units of credit toward the Higher Education Admission Requirements in 2010 and all years thereafter by earning a score of “Novice-Low” or higher or its equivalent on an assessment that employs the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) performance guidelines.
- 4.02.03.02 Successful completion (grade of “C” or better) of certain remedial (basic skills) mathematics and English writing courses at certain levels (see Table 1) will be accepted as equivalent to high school level, HEAR qualifying courses.

Table 1: Comparability of HEAR Qualifying Remedial Level (Basic Skills) College Courses to High School Level, HEAR Qualifying Courses

Subject Units	Course Description/Level	HEAR
English Writing	English Language Fundamentals (e.g. 060)	1
English Writing	Basic Composition (e.g. 090)	1
Mathematics	Pre-Algebra (e.g. 060)	1
Mathematics	Introductory Algebra (e.g. 090)	1*
Mathematics	Survey of Algebra (e.g. 106)	1**

*The successful completion of Introductory Algebra (i.e. 090) will be considered as comparable to three years of high school level, HEAR qualifying mathematics courses.

**The successful completion of Survey of Algebra will be considered as comparable to four years of high school level, HEAR qualifying mathematics courses.

4.03 Students Required to Meet Higher Education Admission Requirements

- 4.03.01 Completion of the higher education admission requirements 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 higher education admission 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 Studies Program.
 - 4.03.04.01 Persons who wish to enroll in a degree or certificate of completion program offered either through the Statewide Extended Studies 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 A student who has been formally admitted to the institution may enroll in courses through the Statewide Extended Studies 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.

- 4.03.05 Non-degree students age 21 and younger who apply for formal admission at the same institution at which they took non-degree coursework are required to meet the HEAR standards regardless of credit hours earned.

4.04 Students Exempt from Higher Education Admission Requirements

The following students are exempt from the higher education admission 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 higher education admission requirements until they are formally admitted by an institution.
- 4.04.03 Students entering a baccalaureate-degree program, including non-degree students age 22 and over who apply for formal admission at the same institution at which they took non-degree coursework, who have 30 or more college-level semester credit hours and a minimum grade point average that meets or exceeds that specified in Table 2.
- 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.
- 4.04.11 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

Studies Program. The sponsoring institution/campus may implement policies regarding enrollment of non-matriculated off-campus students.

- 4.04.11 Students who have completed 30 or more college-level credits hours while enrolled in a concurrent high school diploma and associate of arts or associate of sciences program. Such students will be subject to the Transfer Standard, but counted as first-time freshman for reporting purposes.

4.05 Higher Education Admission 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 Higher Education Admission Requirements

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

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.

Non-degree students applying for formal admission at the same institution are also subject to the freshman standard if they are age 21 and under, regardless of college credit hours, or if they are age 22 and over with 12 or fewer college credit hours, except those applicants who meet one of the admission standards index exemptions listed in section 5.02.

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 2.

Table 2: CCHE Index Scores for First-time Freshman Applicants

Institution	Freshman Admissions Index
Adams State College	80
Colorado School of Mines	110
Colorado State University	101
Colorado State University – Pueblo	86
Fort Lewis College	86*
Mesa State College	80**
Metropolitan State College of Denver	76
University of Colorado at Boulder	103
University of Colorado at Colorado Springs	92

University of Colorado at DHSC	93
University of Northern Colorado	94
Western State College	80

*Fort Lewis College's index score for 2006 and 2007 will be an 86; in 2008 it will be increased to 92 pursuant to SB 05-194 and CCHE action on October 6, 2005.

**Mesa State College's index will increase to 85 in summer 2007 pursuant to CCHE action on March 2, 2006.

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 non-graded students: When a GPA is not calculable institutions shall use a proxy GPA of 3.3 to generate an admission index, which should be used to render an admission decision and may be used in the awarding of financial aid according to institutional guidelines consistent with other applicants.

5.03.04.01 When a GPA is provided or calculable, institutions must use it for the calculation of an admission index regardless of the academic setting through which it was earned, that is, regular or non-traditional (e.g., home schooling). Institutions must not differentiate between index scores calculated according to grade point averages earned by way of either a regular or non-traditional academic setting when rendering admission decisions or awarding financial assistance according to official institutional guidelines otherwise consistently applicable to other applicants.

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.
 - 5.04.01.03 be a non-degree student applying for formal admission at the same institution and be at least age 22 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 3.

Table 3: Minimum Grade Point Average Requirement for Students Transferring from Another Institution with More Than Twelve Collegiate Semester Credit Hours

Receiving Institution	GPA	Transfer Window Size
Colorado School of Mines	2.70	20%
University of Colorado at Boulder	2.70	20%
Colorado State University	2.50	20%
Fort Lewis College	2.40	20%
University of Colorado at Colorado Springs	2.40	20%

University of Colorado at DHSC	2.40	20%
University of Northern Colorado	2.40	20%
Adams State College	2.30	20%
Colorado State University – Pueblo	2.30	20%
Mesa State College	2.30	20%
Western State College	2.30	20%
Metropolitan State College of Denver	2.30	20%

5.04.04 Higher Education Admission Requirements

Transfer applicants with under 30 college-level semester credit hours, must also demonstrate academic preparation comparable to the higher education admission requirements to meet the transfer standard, if they graduated from high school in spring 2008 or later and are not subject to any exemptions listed in section 4.04. Such preparation can be demonstrated by completing the higher education admission requirements 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 3 and 4).

Table 4: Projected Window Size for Freshman Admission Standard for Colorado Public Four-Year Institutions

	FY 2007*	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010**
Highly Selective				
Colorado School of Mines	10%	10%	10%	10%
Selective				
University of Colorado at Boulder	14%	12%	10%	10%
Colorado State University	16%	14%	12%	10%
Fort Lewis College	19%	18%	17%	15%
University of Colorado at Colorado Springs	19%	18%	17%	15%
University of Colorado at DHSC	19%	18%	17%	15%
University of Northern Colorado	19%	18%	17%	15%
Moderately Selective				
Adams State College	20%	20%	20%	20%
Colorado State University – Pueblo	20%	20%	20%	20%
Mesa State College	20%	20%	20%	20%
Western State College	20%	20%	20%	20%
Modified Open				
Metropolitan State College of Denver	20%	20%	20%	20%

*Evaluation year for assessing the impact of freshman admission window changes.

**Evaluation year for assessing the impact of the implementation of the Higher Education Admission Requirements.

The window applies to the entire pool of admitted students. 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 applicants must meet both the institution's index standard and have completed the required higher education admission requirements (if applicable) to meet an institution's freshmen admission standard. Only units completed, in progress, or planned at the time of application will count toward a freshman student's meeting the higher education admission requirements. Freshmen who have not completed the required higher education admission requirements 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 higher education admission requirements, 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.

TOPIC: LOW DEMAND PROGRAM APPEAL

PREPARED BY: JULIE CARNAHAN

I. SUMMARY

This agenda item summarizes the status of a low-demand program that has been operating below CCHE’s minimum benchmarks for the last three years and the governing board actions regarding this program.

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 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 from closure.

Four months after receiving notification of low demand programs—typically no later than March 31 of each year—governing boards shall inform the Commission of the degree programs it discontinued, the degree programs it exempted, and any appeals for extensions.

II. BACKGROUND

C.R.S. 23-1-107 authorizes the Commission on Higher Education to define criteria and ensure that governing boards discontinue those academic degree programs that do not satisfy state criteria. Moreover, C.R.S. 23-5-129 (6)(b) states that, governing boards “Need not consult with nor obtain approval from the Colorado Commission on Higher Education to create, modify, or eliminate academic and vocational programs offered by

the institution, so long as such creations, modifications, and eliminations are consistent with the institution's statutory role and mission." While this latter provision limits Commission authority with regard to discontinuance actions initiated by governing boards, it does not repeal Commission authorities or responsibilities found in C.R.S. 23-1-107 or Commission academic affairs policy Section I, Part G.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

According to CCHE policy, the Commission will notify the governing boards of low demand academic degree programs, that is, those that fail to meet minimum enrollment and graduation standards as specified in policy. The degree programs will consist of those degree programs that are under the governing board review policies and not included in the Commission's annual follow-up of newly approved degree programs.

The identification of low demand academic degree programs is done by compiling a three-year history of degrees conferred and identifying degree programs that fall below the following parameters (CCHE Academic Affairs policy, Section I, Part G, 4.02.01):

1. Baccalaureate degrees must graduate ten (10) students in the most recently reported year or a total of 20 students in the last three years.
2. Masters degree programs must graduate three (3) students in the most recently reported year or a total of five (5) in the past three years.
3. Doctoral degree programs must graduate at least one (1) student in the most recently reported year or a total of three (3) students in the last three years.

The tables in Addendum A illustrate the total number of degrees awarded, by institution, program level, and program name for the past five years. The program requiring action in 2007 is one that failed to meet one of the parameters just described.

The following program requires action in 2007:

Doctor of Philosophy in Educational Psychological Studies at the University of Colorado at Boulder.

Under CCHE policy, each governing board must act on degree programs that remain on the low-demand list for three consecutive years, voting whether to discontinue the degree programs operating below the benchmarks. The governing board shall provide the Commission a summary of its actions and the documentation that supports its actions by April 1 of each year.

Governing Boards may: (1) discontinue programs; (2) grant an exemption for up to five undergraduate programs per campus that are considered central to the campus; (3) or

adopt revisions in the program that lead to an increase in demand that acts to remove the program from consideration for discontinuance. If the board does not discontinue a low enrollment program, it submits a summary of its position to the CCHE.

Summary of Response from the Regents of the University of Colorado

The Regents of the University of Colorado, on behalf of the University of Colorado at Boulder, have filed an appeal for a one year extension for the Doctor of Philosophy in Educational Psychological Studies at the University of Colorado at Boulder.

Recent revisions to the Educational Psychology program have strengthened the program. As a result, two students recently graduated and two others are due to defend their dissertations in academic year 2007-2008. Nine additional students are enrolled in the program, with expected graduation dates between 2008 and 2011. These numbers are consistent with CCHE's expectation that the program graduate one student each year or three in the preceding three years, and will support a graduation rate of 1-3 students per year.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Commission approves the Ph.D. program in Educational Psychology, for a one year extension (through Spring 2008) of exemption from low demand program closure.

STATUTORY AUTHORITY

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

Attachment A

Table 1: Low Demand Programs, by Institution

Inst	CIP	Degree	Program Name	Status	Degrees Awarded In-						Action By
					2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-2005	2005-2006	
ASC	40.0501	B.A./B.S.	Chemistry	E	5	9	1	7	3	7	--
	27.0101	B.A./B.S.	Mathematics	E	2	3	4	2	7	2	--
CSM	45.0601	M.S.	Economics	L.D. 1						0	2009
CSU	01.0000	B.S.	Bio-agricultural Science	L.D. 1						0	2009
	01.0103	B.S.	Agricultural & Resource Economics	E	0	4	2	3	5	4	--
	14.1301	B.S.	Engineering Science	E	7	3	4	5	7	6	--
	51.2306	B.S.	Occupational Therapy	L.D. 1						1	2009
CSU-P	26.0403	Ph.D.	Anatomy	L.D. 1						0	2009
	31.0301	B.A.	Recreation	L.D. 1						0	2009
FLC	40.0801	B.S.	Physics	E	3	0	1	2	2	0	--
	45.0601	B.A.	Economics	E	3	5	2	5	5	7	--
	40.0801	B.S.	Physics	E	1	2	1	2	5	2	--
	50.0501	B.A.	Theatre	E	5	2	5	5	2	4	--
MSC	27.0101	B.A.	Mathematics	L.D.3	4	12	0	5	7	3	2007
	45.0101	B.A.	Social Sciences	L.D. 1						5	2009
MSCD	05.0201	B.A.	African American Studies	E*	2	1	2	3	2	2	--
	40.0401	B.S.	Meteorology	E*	4	7	5	5	7	4	--
	40.0801	B.S.	Physics	E*	3	3	0	3	5	6	--
	50.0501	B.A.	Theatre	L.D. 1				2	9	8	2009
UCB	16.0902	B.A.	Italian	E	7	4	13	5	5	2	2009
	16.1200	Ph.D.	Classics	L.D.2	2	0	0	1	0	0	2008
	40.0508	Ph.D.	Chemical Physics	L.D. 2	0	1	0	1	0	0	2008
	42.1801	Ph.D.	Educational Psychological Studies	L.D. 4	2	0	0	0	0	0	2006
UCCS	40.0801	B.S.	Physics	L.D. 1				3	10	3	2009
UCDHSC	40.0801	B.S.	Physics	E	5	2	8	2	1	5	--
	05.0203	B.A.	Mexican American Studies	E	3	1	1	2	2	2	--
WSC	40.0501	B.A.	Chemistry	E	3	3	1	4	2	5	--
	27.0101	B.A.	Mathematics	E	4	2	5	2	7	9	--
	45.0201	B.A.	Anthropology	L.D. 1	1	11	7	4	2	8	2009
	50.0901	B.A.	Music	E	4	1	5	6	4	5	--

**TOPIC: COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY- PUEBLO
AND UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN COLORADO
FACILITIES MASTER PLAN AMENDMENTS**

PREPARED BY: RYAN STUBBS, ANDREW CARLSON

I. SUMMARY

In order to accommodate changing campus needs, institutions will periodically submit amendments to Commission approved Facilities Master Plans and Long-Range Plans. This budget cycle, the Department received two such master plan amendments; one for Colorado State University Pueblo and one for the University of Northern Colorado. Both amendments are minor adjustments to accommodate Governing Board approved program plans that raised Department staff questions related to conformance with Commission approved facilities master plans. Also, both amendments sufficiently adjust current Master Plans to accommodate adjusted campus needs without the need for a major reassessment of existing conditions and trends.

The Colorado State University Pueblo Amendment to the Facilities Master Plan adjusts the most recently approved CSUP Facilities Master Plan and Addendum approved in March 2001. The amendment allows for the inclusion of a Student Recreation Center which was not included in the 2001 Facilities Master Plan and Addendum. In the original master plan, several outdoor facility projects are included to enhance physical education, recreation and intercollegiate athletics. The master plan also includes the renovation of the existing Health, Physical Education and Recreations (HPER) Building. This project is currently underway and is listed as the #1 Department of Higher Education priority for state funded and continuation projects. The project needs an additional \$887,900 Capital Construction Funds Exempt (CCFE) for FY07-08 to be completed. Although the University has made excellent progress in working towards the completion of this project, additional recreational needs and priorities have emerged. The CSU Governing Board approved the Master Plan Amendment shown as [Attachment A](#) on August 25, 2006 to accommodate the proposed addition of the Student Recreation Center and subsequently approved the program plan for the Student Recreation Center on December 6, 2006.

The University of Northern Colorado Amendment to the Facilities Master Plan adjusts the most recently approved UNC Facilities Master Plan which was approved by the Commission on April 1, 2004. The adjustment affects two projects, Bishop Lehr Hall and Michener Library, which have been submitted and prioritized by the Department of Higher Education for fiscal year 2007-2008. Michener Library Lower Level Remodel was prioritized by the Commission as a level two project at number 20 overall and the Bishop Lehr Hall Demolition was prioritized by the Commission as a level three project at number 24 overall. The UNC Board of Trustees approved the Master Plan Amendment shown as [Attachment B](#) on March 9, 2007.

II. BACKGROUND

The Commission is required by C.R.S. 23-1-106(3) to review and approve master planning and program planning for all capital construction projects of institutions of higher education. Additionally, C.R.S. 23-1-106(4) requires that the Commission ensure conformity of facilities master planning with approved educational master plans and facility program plans with approved facilities master plans.

Given this statutory authority, ensuring conformance with facility master plans is a major component of the Department of Higher Education program plan review process. If conformance is not apparent, institutions are required to submit amendments to their current master plans to accommodate alternate development strategies.

According to Department of Higher Education Policies Section III Part D, Commission approved facilities master plans should be re-examined every ten years. Given the changing nature of development needs and fiscal constraints, institutions can submit amendments to their master plans in the interim to incorporate new development strategies and changing needs without undertaking the task of creating a new master plan. Section III Part D of DHE policy states:

A long-range plan must be developed as a flexible framework for campus growth that recognizes the dynamic nature of higher education. As enrollments grow or decline and/or as academic programs change or become more comprehensive to serve new student needs, campus facility needs inevitably will change. A facility master plan must be capable of meeting these changing circumstances. To ensure that a Long-Range plan remains valid, an institution must do one of the following before the ten-year life of the plan expires:

- *Create a new Long-Range Plan;*
- *Send a letter to CCHE stating that all assumptions contained in the master plan are still valid and that all facilities' needs outlined in it are still needed but have not yet been completed;*
or
- *Amend the master plan to bring it up to date.*

Thus, at least every ten years the long-range plan for each campus must be re-examined or updated in order to keep it current.

The current CSU-Pueblo facilities master plan was approved by the Commission in March of 2001 and the current UNC facilities master plan was approved by the Commission in April of 2004. Both of these master plans were approved by the Commission within the 10-year time frame as outlined by policy and the amendments as submitted are appropriate given Department of Higher Education policy.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

Colorado State University, Pueblo

In 2003 the University President formed a task force of administrators, faculty and students to assess the institution's student life facility needs and in December of 2003 the taskforce identified a new student recreation center to be a priority. This recommendation began a discussion which led to the approval of a \$10 per credit hour mandatory student facility fee by the Associated Student Government and the CSU Governing Board. The fee was implemented in spring 2005 and since that time, student leaders and the Student Facility Fee Advisory Committee have confirmed construction of a student recreation center as a priority for revenues generated by this fee.

The Student Recreation Center will be an addition to the HPER facility which also houses recreational uses. The center and HPER will share certain amenities including the swimming pool, climbing wall, multi-use space, and racquetball courts. In addition, the new Student Recreation Center will provide a cardiovascular and strength & conditioning areas, an aerobics dance room, space for the Experiential Learning Center (ELC) programs, meeting areas, a three-court gymnasium with an elevated running track, locker rooms, and multi-purpose areas in an approximately 43,000 GSF facility. The project will cost approximately \$10 million Cash Funds Exempt (CFE).

University of Northern Colorado

The 2003 UNC Facilities Master Plan identifies Bishop Lehr Hall as a possible renovation project in order to house a student support service center. In 1999, UNC submitted a program plan to DHE to renovate Bishop Lehr Hall which would have created student support service space. Although the plan was approved by DHE, the change in the State's fiscal climate early in this decade resulted in decreased state funds and the project has remained unfunded to the present date. Although the renovation of Bishop Lehr was still seen as a need when formulating the 2003 Master Plan, the lack of funding for the project has led to the further deterioration of the facility and the need for UNC to demolish the building. The proposed demolition of Bishop Lehr Hall will demolish 120,000 gross square feet at a cost of \$1,161,875 CCFE. The project is the number two priority for the University as listed on their five-year capital improvements plan.

Despite the shortfall in funding responsible for the inability of UNC to renovate Bishop Lehr Hall, UNC is still in need of student support service space. UNC has identified the lower level of the existing Michener Library as the best possible solution to meeting student service needs in the current fiscal climate. DHE has approved the program plan for the renovation of approximately 40,500 gross square feet in the Library to create a student support services including career services, a teaching and learning enhancement center, a human enrichment center and a scholars program. The proposed renovation is the number one priority for the University listed on their five-year capital improvements plan and has an estimated cost of \$9,402,358 CCFE.

While the amendment does not suggest another land use for the area currently occupied by Bishop Lehr, the demolition of the facility has become a priority for the University in order to save costs associated with maintaining and securing the vacant facility. Given the immediate need to demolish the facility and the long term need to plan for a future land use at the site, UNC will reassess the best use for the site as development opportunities and constraints make themselves clear.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the Commission approves the Facilities Master Plan Amendments for Colorado State University Pueblo and the University of Northern Colorado as shown on [Attachment A](#) and [Attachment B](#).

V. STATUTORY AUTHORITY

C.R.S. 23-1-106

(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 an 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.

ATTACHMENTS

**[Attachment A](#): Colorado State University, Pueblo, Amendment to Facilities Master Plan
[Attachment B](#): University of Northern Colorado, Amendment to Facilities Master Plan**



AUGUST 2006 AMENDMENT to FACILITIES MASTER PLAN 2000

The University of Southern Colorado (now Colorado State University-Pueblo) Facilities Master Plan approved in March 2001 included several outdoor facility projects intended to enhance physical education, recreation, and intercollegiate athletics. Indoor recreation space was addressed only in the context of renovation of the existing Health, Physical Education, and Recreation (HPER) Building which did not include improvements to or creation of new recreation space. Existing recreation space on the campus consists of use of HPER facilities after all academic and athletic needs are met and the Sam Jones Recreation Center. The later was constructed as an addition to the original HPER facility in 1989 and includes a swimming pool, four racquetball courts, locker rooms, and support areas.

In fiscal year 2003-04 the University President charged a group of administrators, faculty, and students to assess the institution's current student life facility needs and to make recommendations for improvements. The Task Force Report issued December 2003 identified a student recreation center to be the priority new construction need. In fiscal year 2004-05 the University began discussions with the student about implementing a mandatory student facility fee to support student life facility needs. Those discussions culminated in the Associated Student Government (ASG) Senate approval of such a fee in spring 2005 and its subsequent approval by the Board of Governors. Those discussions and the ASG action included revalidation of construction of a student recreation center as the student's first new construction priority. A \$10/credit hour mandatory Student Facility Fee was implemented in the Fall 2005 Semester. Since that time student leaders and the Student Facility Fee Advisory Committee have confirmed construction of a student recreation center as priority use of revenue generated by this fee. As a result, the CSU-Pueblo Facilities Master Plan is amended as follows:

A student recreation center will be constructed beginning in 2007 for primary use by students with secondary use via membership purchase by campus faculty and staff and the public. It will include weight and exercise space, a gymnasium, a running/walking track, multi-purpose activity and meeting rooms, the Experiential Learning Center (ELC) programs, locker rooms, and office and building support space. The facility will be constructed as an addition to the southeast corner of the Health, Physical Education, and Recreation (HPER) Building and will be jointly operated with that facility. The existing natatorium and racquetball courts within the Sam Jones Recreation Center in the HPER facility will be renovated as part of this project and will be operated as part of the student recreation center. The student fees supporting the Sam Jones Recreation Center in the HPER facility and membership and rental revenue will support the ongoing maintenance of the student recreation center.

Funding: Debt supported by the Student Facility Fee
Cost: Estimated total project cost is \$10,116,387 in 2006 dollars

UNIVERSITY of
NORTHERN COLORADO



Department of Facilities Management

**AMENDMENT TO FACILITIES MASTER PLAN
September 8, 2006**

The 2003 UNC Facilities Master Plan is being amended to reflect changing need related to Bishop Lehr Hall and Michener Library.

The 2003 Master Plan identified the desire to renovate Bishop Lehr Hall to house a student services center. A 1999 program plan for this renovation estimated the cost at \$30 million in 1999 dollars. Bishop Lehr Hall has been vacant since 2003. The building continues to be a drain on maintenance and utility system resources and has experienced significant vandalism. The university has determined that demolition of the building is preferable to investing in the numerous deferred maintenance issues that have been identified. Due to changes in the fiscal climate of the State of Colorado which resulted in a reduction of capital appropriations for state agencies, the university has made commensurate revisions to its capital planning priorities. The changing economic conditions of the state have resulted in a reassessment of the priorities for UNC's physical plant and campus infrastructure with a goal to maximize the use of limited state resources. In 2004, the Board of Trustees approved a strategic plan, *Charting the Future*, which serves as the foundation of a comprehensive planning process for the university. As a result, the UNC Facilities Master Plan is amended as follows:

The centralization of essential student academic support programs remains a priority for the campus as identified in the 2003 Facilities Master Plan. The lower level of Michener Library has been identified as an appropriate space for development of the academic support programs. Several support programs have already been relocated to Michener Library. The remaining portions of the Michener Library lower level should be reconfigured to house additional academic support functions. Bishop Lehr Hall should be demolished to eliminate ongoing operating expenses and future controlled maintenance requests.

TOPIC: FY 2008 COF ELIGIBILITY FOR OFF-CAMPUS PROGRAMS

PREPARED BY: MATT MCKEEVER

I. SUMMARY

Under CRS 23-1-109 & 23-18-10(5)(b), the Commission holds statutory responsibility for approving requests from the state's public four-year colleges and universities to offer "off campus state-funded" instruction. This agenda item concerns programs of instruction that the Director of Extended Studies and DHE staff certify as meeting the eligibility criteria listed in CCHE policy section IV Extended Studies.

The Board of Trustees of Metropolitan State College of Denver, the Board of Trustees of Adams State College and The Board of Trustees at University of Northern Colorado sponsor the programs recommended herein for FY 2008 COF eligibility.

DHE staff recommends that the Commission approve the specified off-campus programs described herein for COF eligibility.

II. BACKGROUND

CCHE Policy Section VI: Statewide Extended Studies, Part B: General Policies for Extended Studies Instruction, Paragraph 7.00 Policies Specific to Off-Campus State-Funded Instruction; permits up to one-half of one percent of the total estimated state eligible COF credit hours to be allocated to off-campus programs beginning in FY 2007. Based on FY 2008 budget estimates, the pool for off-campus COF eligibility is 610 FTE. The programs recommended for FY 2008 approval equal 610 FTE.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

Taking into account the State of Colorado's workforce development needs, extent that the proposed program is serving underrepresented populations, state funding of the program in the prior fiscal year, and available off-campus COF stipend allocation, DHE staff recommends that the following off-campus programs be approved for COF funding in FY 2008.

Adams State College

- B.A. in Interdisciplinary Studies with Elementary Licensure at the Trinidad State Junior College campus
- B.A. in Interdisciplinary Studies with Elementary Licensure at the Otero Junior College campus

- B.A. in Interdisciplinary Studies with Elementary Licensure at the Lamar Community College campus
- B.A. in Interdisciplinary Studies with Elementary Licensure at the Arapahoe Community College campus
- B.A. in Interdisciplinary Studies with Elementary Licensure at the Morgan Community College

Total off-campus COF FTE estimates for ASC in FY 2008: 100

Colorado State University at Pueblo – Citadel Center

- B.S in Liberal Studies/Elementary Education
- B.S. in Social Science
- B.S. in Sociology
- B.S in Sociology/Criminology

Total off-campus COF FTE estimates for CSU-P in FY 2008: 110

Metropolitan State College of Denver

South Campus

- B.S. in Accounting (upper division classes only)
- B.S. in Computer Information Systems (upper division classes only)
- B.S. in Management (upper division classes only)
- B.A. in Behavioral Science, emphasis in Psychology and Sociology (upper division classes only)
- B.A. in Hospitality, Meeting and Travel Administration (upper division classes only)

North Campus

- B.A. in Behavioral Science, emphasis in Psychology and Sociology (upper division classes only)
- Upper Division Professional Elementary Education Licensure Sequence taken in conjunction with an approved major course of study

Front Range Community College

- B.A. in Behavioral Science, emphasis in Psychology and Sociology (upper division classes only)
- Upper Division Professional Elementary Education Licensure Sequence taken in conjunction with an approved major course of study
- B.S. in Management (upper division classes only)
- B.S. in Marketing (upper division classes only)

Total off-campus COF FTE estimates for MSCD in FY 2008: 185

University of Colorado at Colorado Springs – Pikes Peak Community College/Fort Carson

- B.A. in Criminal Justice

Total off-campus COF FTE estimates for UCCS in FY 2008: 10

University of Northern Colorado – Lowry Campus

- B.A. in Interdisciplinary Studies: Liberal Arts plus Elementary Teacher Licensure “Urban Education Program”
- B.A. in Special Education

Total off-campus COF FTE estimates for UNC in FY 2008: 205

Upon Commission approval, the aforementioned off-campus programs at Adams State College, Colorado State University at Pueblo, Metropolitan State College of Denver, University of Colorado at Colorado Springs and University of Northern Colorado will be required to abide by CCHE Budget and Finance Policy Section II, Part D *Policy for Public Institutional Reporting Colorado Opportunity Fund Student Credit Hour Stipend Enrollment, Effective July 1, 2005.*

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

DHE staff recommends that the Commission approve the specified off-campus programs described herein for COF eligibility.

STATUTORY AUTHORITY

C.R.S. 23-18-102 (5)(b) establishes COF stipend eligibility: *‘Eligible undergraduate student’ shall not mean a student enrolled in an off-campus, extended campus, or continuing education class that is not supported by state general fund moneys, except as approved by the commission.*

C.R.S. 23-1-109(5) establishes the Commission’s role in overseeing of state funding for off-campus instruction: *The commission shall set policies, after consultation with the governing boards of institutions, which define which courses and programs taught outside the geographic boundaries of the campus may be eligible for general fund support. The commission may include funding for those courses and programs in its systemwide funding recommendations to the general assembly.*