

STATE OF COLORADO



DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION
Colorado Commission on Higher Education

Bill Ritter, Jr.
Governor

Raymond T. Baker, Chair
Jill L. Brake
Patricia Pacey
Michael Plachy
James T. Polsfut

Richard L. Ramirez
Edward A. Robinson
Joel S. Rosenstein
Greg C. Stevinson
James M. Stewart

David E. Skaggs
Executive Director

Colorado Commission on Higher Education Agenda

September 6, 2007, 9:00 a.m.

Via Teleconference

Call-In number: 1-866-258-0959

Meeting Room Number: *1118612*

I. Opening Business

- A. Attendance
- B. Approval of Minutes for the August 13, 2007 Commission Meeting
- C. Reports by the Chair, Commissioners, Commission Subcommittees, Advisory Committee Members and Executive Director
- D. Public Comment

II. Action Items

- A. Degree Authorization Act – Shimer College – Matt McKeever
- B. HB 1023 Lawful Presence Verification Policy Update – John Karakoulakis
- C. Peer Gap Analysis: Institutional Peer Group Concurrence – Diane Lindner

III. Consent Items

- A. Technology Advancement Grant Program Status Report – John Karakoulakis

IV. Information Items

- A. Report on Out-of-State / Out-of-Country Instruction- Matt McKeever
- B. Degree Authorization Act – Higher Learning Commission Accreditation Process Changes- Matt McKeever

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COLORADO COMMISSION
ON HIGHER EDUCATION
AUGUST 14, 2007**

Chairman Raymond Baker called the meeting to order at 10:15am.

Commissioners Raymond Baker, Jill Brake, Patricia Pacey, Michael Plachy, James Polsfut, Edward Robinson, and Joel Rosenstein were present. Commissioners Greg Stevinson and James Stewart were excused. Commissioner Richard Ramirez was absent.

Commissioner Brake moved to approve the July 10, 2007 minutes with a second by Commissioner Robinson. The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Report: Chairman Baker reported Commissioner Plachy disclosed that his law firm, Rothgerber Johnson and Lyons, is counsel for Colorado Christian University in litigation against CCHE and certain Commissioners. Mr. Plachy is not personally involved as counsel in that litigation and will recuse himself from any decisions CCHE makes regarding the litigation. In addition, Mr. Plachy will not participate in any privileged communications between CCHE and its counsel regarding the litigation. All Commissioners were instructed to have no communications with, and to not disclose the substance of any privileged communications between CCHE and its counsel with Mr. Plachy regarding the litigation.

Chairman Baker also reported he and Executive Director Skaggs met with Senators Josh Penry, Chris Romer and Representative Randy Fischer to discuss funding mechanisms for capital construction.

Executive Director Report: Executive Director Skaggs reported on the pending Attorney General's decision dealing with the tuition status on students who are U.S. citizens as well as Colorado residents but whose parents may be undocumented aliens.

There were no Commissioner or Advisory Committee reports.

Public Comment: Mr. George Walker, of Denver, expressed his opinion that it is disingenuous to raise admissions standards without raising public funding for higher education. He also quoted an article in the Denver Post, dated November 22, 2006, wherein the University of Colorado, Boulder received the grade of F from a higher education association in recruiting black, Hispanic and Native American students and questioned the performance records of CU's Vice Chancellor for Diversity.

ACTION ITEMS

Reapproval for Participation in State Financial Aid Programs – Rocky Mountain College of Art & Design: David Skaggs presented Diane Lindner's item. Under CCHE policy, when there is a change in ownership of a private school, the school must again file and be reapproved

by the Commission to be eligible to participate in student aid programs. In the case, of Rocky Mountain College of Art & Design (RMCAD), a controlling interest has been sold but there has not been a complete change of ownership or operational management. After review of RMCAD's application, staff concludes that they continue to meet the criteria for participation in the student aid programs.

Commissioner Robinson moved to reapprove RMCAD for participation in state-funded financial aid programs. Commissioner Brake seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

2008 Higher Education Admission Requirements (HEAR): Review and Proposed Recommendations for Implementation: Dr. Julie Carnahan presented this item. Due to the likely high number of high school students who may not meet Phase I of the Higher Education Admission Requirements (HEAR 2008), DHE staff recommends that during the implementation of HEAR 2008 the Commission revise the 2008 HEAR requirements to exempt students whose index numbers exceed the minimum institutional admissions index number by more than 10 points and for Metropolitan State College of Denver by more than 15 points and that the portion of the statewide 20% exemption "window" presently unallocated to institutions under their separate window allowances be pooled and made available to institutions especially impacted by HEAR 2008 under terms to be developed by DHE staff in consultation with institutions' academic staff.

Dr. Geri Anderson, Assistant Vice President and Provost for the Colorado Community College System; Dr. Linda Curran, Acting Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs for Metropolitan State College of Denver; Dr. John Sowell, Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs for Western State College; and Dr. Alan Lamborn, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs for Colorado State University were in favor of this recommendation.

Commissioner Pacey moved to pass the recommendation as proposed. Commissioner Plachy seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Baker moved to elect Commissioner Jim Polsfut as the Vice Chairman of the Commission. Commissioner Robinson seconded the motion. Commissioner Polsfut was elected to the position of Vice Chairman unanimously.

Commissioner Robinson moved to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned at 11:45am.

TOPIC: DEGREE AUTHORIZATION ACT – SHIMER COLLEGE

PREPARED BY: MATT McKEEVER

I. SUMMARY

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

Shimer College is an existing fully accredited institution operating a main campus in Illinois. Shimer College is seeking Category I-A authorization to operate the Teaching Fellows Program in Colorado. Department of Higher Education staff has reviewed the required documentation and recommends the Commission approve Category I-A authorization for Shimer College.

II. BACKGROUND

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

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

The Commission administers the Degree Authorization Act by determining an institution's eligibility to operate pursuant to statute and CCHE policy. Commission action is required by policy in order for institutions to be authorized at any level.

To apply for Category I-A authorization, the institution must provide the Department of Higher Education proof of accreditation by a regional or national accrediting agency and must

demonstrate that the accrediting agency is aware of the new location and is prepared to perform a site visit within two years of authorization.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

Shimer College is currently accredited and in good standing with the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. Shimer College's main campus is located in Chicago, Illinois. Shimer College has requested authorization to operate the Teacher's Fellow Program in Colorado at the Thompson Schools District. Shimer College has provided sufficient documentation to demonstrate accreditation and compliance with the requirements of the Degree Authorization Act. Staff has confirmed that the Higher Learning Commission is aware of this program and that Shimer College is working towards an onsite visit for full accreditation of the Colorado location. Copies of all relevant application materials are on file in the Academic Affairs Office.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Commission approve Category I-A authorization for Shimer College.

STATUTORY AUTHORITY

23-1-121 C.R.S.; 23-2-101 C.R.S

TOPIC: HB 1023 LAWFUL PRESENCE VERIFICATION POLICY UPDATE

PREPARED BY: JOHN KARAKOULAKIS

I. Summary

On August 1, 2007, the Department of Revenue promulgated permanent rules regarding the implementation of HB06S-1023 Restrictions on Defined Public Benefits, which replaced earlier emergency rules. Current CCHE policy on the College Opportunity Fund, Financial Aid, and Tuition Classification reference the outdated emergency rules. This agenda item simply updates those existing policy references to reflect the new permanent rules. The suggested changes to policy are below, with additions in bold:

Verification of Lawful Presence

Colorado law requires state agencies and institutions of higher education to verify the lawful presence in the United States of all persons 18 years of age or older for receipt of public benefits, such as financial aid, by requiring the applicant to produce one of the following forms of identification:

- (1) Valid Colorado Driver's License or a Colorado Identification Card
- (2) U.S. Military Card or a Military Dependent's Identification Card
- (3) U.S. Coast Guard Merchant Mariner Card
- (4) Native American Tribal Document
- (5) An alternative form of identification as listed in the Department of Revenue's Rules for Evidence of Lawful Presence, 1 CCR 201-17.**

An applicant also must execute an affidavit stating that he or she is a U.S. citizen or legal permanent resident; or that he or she is otherwise lawfully present in the U.S. pursuant to federal law. (C.R.S. §24-76.5-103(4)).

All applicants for state-funded financial aid must meet the identification requirements of C.R.S. §24-76.5-103(4) the Department of Revenue's **Rules for Evidence of Lawful Presence, 1 CCR 201-17, which are effective as of August 1, 2007.**

Institutions must satisfy the verification requirements of C.R.S. §24-76.5-103(4) in a manner consistent with statutory requirements, Attorney General Guidance and CCHE policy. CCHE shall audit institutions to ensure compliance.

An applicant may also meet the requirements of this statute for state-funded financial aid through any waivers granted by the Department of Revenue as provided for in the

Department of Revenue's **Rules for Evidence of Lawful Presence, 1 CCR 201-17,**
which are effective as of August 1, 2007.

II. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Commission should approve the suggested changes to the following policies:

- **Section II, Part D, Policy for Public Institutional Reporting College Opportunity Fund Student Credit Hour Stipend**
- **Section II, Part E, Policy for Participating Private Institutional Reporting on College Opportunity Fund Student Stipend**
- **Section VI, Part B, In-State Tuition Classification**
- **Section VI, Part F, State Funded Student Financial Aid Policy**

TOPIC: PEER GAP ANALYSIS: INSTITUTIONAL PEER GROUP CONCURRENCE

PREPARED BY: DIANE LINDNER

I. SUMMARY

The National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS), hired to develop a budget/finance model for the FY2008-2009 budget year, began their work this summer by recommending national peer groups for each public institution of higher education in Colorado. Each Governing Board was given the opportunity to negotiate individually with NCHEMS and to comment on both their selected peers as well as peers selected for other institutions. The Chief Executive Officers reached consensus on their respective peer groups for purposes of this study during their August 22nd meeting.

II. BACKGROUND

Last year at the request of DHE and with support from the institutions, NCHEMS addressed the fundamental question of whether Colorado institutions were adequately and equitably funded to accomplish their statutory missions. Its analysis compared Colorado's public institutions of higher education with similar ("peer") institutions across the country and showed that Colorado institutions were approximately \$832 million short in revenues compared to the average of the peer institutions selected. The study completed in Fiscal Year 2007 was discussed at length at the higher education summit in June and as a result has become the precursor to the development of a budget allocation model for FY 2008-2009.

Full results of last year's study are posted on the Department of Higher Education website, <http://www.state.co.us/ccche/> under the link of 'Budget and Finance' and then 'Higher Education Finance Study'. The finance model now recommended by NCHEMS is based on the total revenues (in the form of state and local appropriations and tuition and fees) for each peer institution and comparing those revenues to its Colorado counterpart.

The key elements for a Colorado higher education budget model include:

- A model that reflects our unique system of higher education;
- A focus on revenues (not costs), what the state should contribute and what students/families should contribute;
- Consistency and equity from year-to-year regardless of overall funding levels;
- Recognition of the unique needs of different types of institutions;
- Affordability;
- Accounting for tuition as a revenue source that reflects state priorities;
- Maintenance of the efficiencies achieved by our system of higher education during lean budget years;
- Incremental budget growth as revenues permit.

NCHEMS' key recommendation was to move the higher education funding in Colorado away from the existing cost-driven model to a revenue-driven model. NCHEMS identified two types of national models: one that uses operational costs (utilities, salaries, risk management, etc.) and one that uses benchmarks developed through comparative institution analysis primarily taking revenue into consideration. Based on NCHEMS' strong recommendation to utilize a model that benchmarks revenues, the Department of Higher Education (DHE) is moving forward in developing a budgeting model for FY2008-2009 and beyond that incorporates the NCHEMS recommendations to use a revenue model.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

The first step in developing a budget funding model for the FY2008-2009 year is to establish a group of institutional peers that are most appropriate for each institution in Colorado. NCHEMS was again hired to develop these revised peer groups for each institution, based on considerations of similarity in mission, size and program mix. Revenues were not considered until after the selection. An effort was made to include regional institutions wherever possible, and actual peers were chosen, not "aspirational" peers.

Our goal was to have concurrence from the Chief Executive Officers (CEOs) on the peers selected for financial modeling. Institutional vetting was accomplished in July and August between the DHE, NCHEMS and the CFOs at the institutions. This process allowed the institutions to provide rationale for objecting to NCHEMS-proposed peer institutions they did not feel were a good match to their institution and to suggest additions or substitutions. The institutional comments were then reviewed and an NCHEMS recommendation was made back to the institutions via DHE. The CEOs agreed on their peers and the peer institutions of other schools during their August 22nd meeting.

The peer groups for each institution are listed as Attachment A for four-year institutions and A-1 for two-year institutions. Attachment B is an Excel spreadsheet with updated peer benchmark numbers using the same methodology as the original study.

CCHE staff will now update the original study numbers based upon more recent (FY2005-2006) national data. When that is accomplished, the collaborative process between NCHEMS, DHE and the Governing Boards will focus on apportioning expected FY09 revenue increases between tuition and fees and general fund. This will begin what will likely be an extended effort to reach parity with Colorado institutions' peers over time.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Commission ratify the peer institutions recommended by the NCHEMS and concurred in by the Chief Executive Officers for use in the Peer Gap Analysis and subsequent financial modeling.

ATTACHMENT A
NCHEMS PEERS - Adams State College

Date:

Revised 7/24/2007

Institution

ADAMS STATE COLLEGE

No Peer Changes

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY AT THE WEST CAMPUS
ARMSTRONG ATLANTIC STATE UNIVERSITY
AUGUSTA STATE UNIVERSITY
BOWIE STATE UNIVERSITY
CAMERON UNIVERSITY
CHICAGO STATE UNIVERSITY
COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY-PUEBLO
COLUMBUS STATE UNIVERSITY
CUNY MEDGAR EVERS COLLEGE
CUNY YORK COLLEGE
DIXIE STATE COLLEGE OF UTAH
FARMINGDALE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
FITCHBURG STATE COLLEGE
FRAMINGHAM STATE COLLEGE
GOVERNORS STATE UNIVERSITY
INDIANA UNIVERSITY-NORTHWEST
INDIANA UNIVERSITY-SOUTH BEND
INDIANA UNIVERSITY-SOUTHEAST
LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY-SHREVEPORT
SUNY EMPIRE STATE COLLEGE
TEXAS A & M UNIVERSITY-CORPUS CHRISTI
UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS AT FT SMITH
UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON-CLEAR LAKE
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN-FLINT
WASHBURN UNIVERSITY
WESTERN CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY
WORCESTER STATE COLLEGE

NCHEMS PEERS - Colorado School of Mines

Date:

Revised 7/24/2007

Institution

COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES

MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

NEW JERSEY INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

NEW MEXICO INSTITUTE OF MINING AND TECHNOLOGY

POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY

SOUTH DAKOTA SCHOOL OF MINES AND TECHNOLOGY

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA IN HUNTSVILLE

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-ROLLA

NCHEMS PEERS - Colorado State University

Date:

Revised 7/24/2007

Institution

COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY

No Peer Changes

AUBURN UNIVERSITY MAIN CAMPUS

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY

NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY AT RALEIGH

OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY-MAIN CAMPUS

OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

PURDUE UNIVERSITY-MAIN CAMPUS

TEXAS A & M UNIVERSITY

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA-DAVIS

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIV

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY

NCHEMS PEERS - Colorado State University-Pueblo

Date:

Revised 7/24/2007

Institution

COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY-PUEBLO

No Peer Changes

CHRISTOPHER NEWPORT UNIVERSITY

COASTAL CAROLINA UNIVERSITY

CUNY YORK COLLEGE

FAIRMONT STATE UNIVERSITY

LOCK HAVEN UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

MISSOURI SOUTHERN STATE UNIVERSITY

MISSOURI WESTERN STATE COLLEGE

RAMAPO COLLEGE OF NEW JERSEY

SHEPHERD UNIVERSITY

THE RICHARD STOCKTON COLLEGE OF NEW JERSEY

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA UPSTATE

NCHEMS PEERS - Fort Lewis College

Date:

Revised 7/24/2007

Institution

FORT LEWIS COLLEGE

COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON

EASTERN CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY

EVERGREEN STATE COLLEGE

GEORGIA COLLEGE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

MASSACHUSETTS COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS

MIDWESTERN STATE UNIVERSITY

NEW COLLEGE OF FLORIDA

RAMAPO COLLEGE OF NEW JERSEY

SONOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

SOUTHERN OREGON UNIVERSITY

ST MARY'S COLLEGE OF MARYLAND

SUNY COLLEGE AT GENESEO

THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA'S COLLEGE AT WISE

TRUMAN STATE UNIVERSITY

UNIVERSITY OF MAINE AT FARMINGTON

UNIVERSITY OF MARY WASHINGTON

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA-MORRIS

UNIVERSITY OF MONTEVALLO

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT ASHEVILLE

UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND ARTS OF OKLAHOMA

NCHEMS PEERS - University Of Colorado Health Sciences Center

Date:

Revised 7/24/2007

Institution

- UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO HEALTH SCIENCES CENTER
- LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY-HEALTH SCIENCES CENTER
- MEDICAL COLLEGE OF GEORGIA
- MEDICAL COLLEGE OF OHIO
- MEDICAL UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA
- NORTHEASTERN OHIO UNIVERSITIES COLLEGE OF MEDICINE
- OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY CENTER FOR HEALTH SCIENCES
- OREGON HEALTH & SCIENCE UNIVERSITY
- SUNY HEALTH SCIENCE CENTER AT BROOKLYN
- SUNY HEALTH SCIENCE CENTER AT SYRACUSE
- TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY HEALTH SCIENCES CENTER
- THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT SCH OF MED AND DENT
- THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS HEALTH SCIENCE CENTER
- THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS HEALTH SCIENCE-SAN ANTONIO
- THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS MEDICAL BRANCH
- UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS FOR MEDICAL SCIENCES
- UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS MEDICAL CENTER
- UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS MEDICAL SCH WORCESTER
- UNIVERSITY OF MEDICINE AND DENTISTRY OF NEW JERSEY
- UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI MEDICAL CENTER
- UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA MEDICAL CENTER
- UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS-HLTH SCI CTR AT FT WORTH
- UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA HEALTH SCIENCES CENTER
- UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS SOUTHWESTERN MEDICAL CENTER AT DALLAS

NCHEMS PEERS - Mesa State College

Date:

Revised 7/24/2007

Institution

MESA STATE COLLEGE

BEMIDJI STATE UNIVERSITY

EAST STROUDSBURG UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

EASTERN NEW MEXICO UNIVERSITY-MAIN CAMPUS

FERRIS STATE UNIVERSITY

INDIANA UNIVERSITY-EAST

LANGSTON UNIVERSITY

LEWIS-CLARK STATE COLLEGE

MANSFIELD UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

OKLAHOMA PANHANDLE STATE UNIVERSITY

RAMAPO COLLEGE OF NEW JERSEY

SHAWNEE STATE UNIVERSITY

UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS AT PINE BUFF

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT PEMBROKE

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA-AIKEN

NCHEMS PEERS - Metropolitan State College of Denver

Date:

Revised 7/24/2007

Institution

METROPOLITAN STATE COLLEGE OF DENVER

No Peer Changes

APPALACHIAN STATE UNIVERSITY
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY-CHICO
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY-FRESNO
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY-SAN BERNARDINO
COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON
EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY
JAMES MADISON UNIVERSITY
KENNESAW STATE UNIVERSITY
SAINT CLOUD STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL OKLAHOMA
UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON-DOWNTOWN
UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA
WESTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

NCHEMS PEERS - University of Colorado at Boulder

Date:

Revised 7/24/2007

Institution

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT BOULDER

INDIANA UNIVERSITY-BLOOMINGTON

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

TEXAS A & M UNIVERSITY

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA-BERKELEY

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA-SANTA BARBARA

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS MAIN CAMPUS

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND-COLLEGE PARK

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA AT LINCOLN

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

NCHEMS PEERS - University of Colorado at Denver

Date:

Revised 7/24/2007

Institution

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT DENVER

CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY

GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT DALLAS

UNIVERSITY OF AKRON MAIN CAMPUS

UNIVERSITY OF MEMPHIS

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-ST LOUIS

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT GREENSBORO

UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO

VIRGINIA COMMONWEALTH UNIVERSITY

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

NCHEMS PEERS - University of Colorado as Colorado Springs

Date:

Revised 8/2/2007

Institution

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT COLORADO SPRINGS

FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY-BOCA RATON

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

SALEM STATE COLLEGE

SONOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY - CORPUS CHRISTI

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE-CHATTANOOGA

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT EL PASO

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS-BOSTON

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN-DEARBORN

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-ST LOUIS

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHARLOTTE

WEST CHESTER UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

NCHEMS PEERS - University of Northern Colorado

Date:

Revised 7/24/2007

Institution

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN COLORADO

No Peer Changes

BALL STATE UNIVERSITY

BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY-MAIN CAMPUS

ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY

INDIANA UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA-MAIN CAMPUS

MIAMI UNIVERSITY-OXFORD

NORTHERN ARIZONA UNIVERSITY

NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

SUNY AT BINGHAMTON

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT GREENSBORO

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

NCHEMS PEERS - Western State College of Colorado

Date:

Revised 7/24/2007

Institution

WESTERN STATE COLLEGE OF COLORADO

CHRISTOPHER NEWPORT UNIVERSITY

CONCORD UNIVERSITY

MANSFIELD UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

ST MARY'S COLLEGE OF MARYLAND

SUNY COLLEGE AT OLD WESTBURY

THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA'S COLLEGE AT WISE

UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS AT PINE BLUFF

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII AT HILO

UNIVERSITY OF MAINE AT FARMINGTON

UNIVERSITY OF MARY WASHINGTON

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH-GREENSBURG

UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND ARTS OF OKLAHOMA

WEST LIBERTY STATE COLLEGE

ATTACHMENT A-1

NCHEMS PEERS - Community Colleges Group A

Data Source: NCHEMS NCES Finance Dataset, 2004-05

Prepared by: Linda Keep (303) 497-0314

Date:

Institution

PIKES PEAK COMMUNITY COLLEGE

FRONT RANGE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

AMARILLO COLLEGE

CENTURY COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGE

CUESTA COLLEGE

DEL MAR COLLEGE

ELGIN COMMUNITY COLLEGE

FOOTHILL COLLEGE

GUILFORD TECHNICAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE

HENRY FORD COMMUNITY COLLEGE

J SARGEANT REYNOLDS COMMUNITY COLLEGE

KALAMAZOO VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

LORAIN COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

MIDLANDS TECHNICAL COLLEGE

OAKTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE

ROCK VALLEY COLLEGE

SOUTHWEST TENNESSEE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

SOUTHWESTERN ILLINOIS COLLEGE

SPOKANE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

TRITON COLLEGE

WASHTENAW COMMUNITY COLLEGE

NCHEMS PEERS - Community Colleges Group B

Data Source: NCHEMS NCES Finance Dataset, 2004-05

Prepared by: Linda Keep (303) 497-0314

Date:

9/7/06

Institution

COLORADO NORTHWESTERN COMMUNITY COLLEGE
OTERO JUNIOR COLLEGE
MORGAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE
ALABAMA SOUTHERN COMMUNITY COLLEGE
BIG BEND COMMUNITY COLLEGE
CENTRAL ALABAMA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
CHIPOLA COLLEGE
COLLEGE OF EASTERN UTAH
CRAVEN COMMUNITY COLLEGE
DANVILLE AREA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
EAST ARKANSAS COMMUNITY COLLEGE
ENTERPRISE-OZARK COMMUNITY COLLEGE
FEATHER RIVER COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
HIGHLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE
ILLINOIS EASTERN COMMUNITY COLLEGES-LINCOLN TRAIL COLLEGE
JAMES SPRUNT COMMUNITY COLLEGE
LENOIR COMMUNITY COLLEGE
MARTIN COMMUNITY COLLEGE
MAYLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE
MIDDLE GEORGIA COLLEGE
MITCHELL COMMUNITY COLLEGE
NORTH CENTRAL MICHIGAN COLLEGE
NORTHEAST TEXAS COMMUNITY COLLEGE
PANOLA COLLEGE
PAUL D CAMP COMMUNITY COLLEGE
RANDOLPH COMMUNITY COLLEGE
RICH MOUNTAIN COMMUNITY COLLEGE
RICHLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE
ROXBURY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
SOUTHWESTERN COMMUNITY COLLEGE
WEST SHORE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
WESTERN PIEDMONT COMMUNITY COLLEGE
WILSON TECHNICAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE

NCHEMS PEERS - Community Colleges Group C

Data Source: NCHEMS NCES Finance Dataset, 2004-05

Prepared by: Linda Keep (303) 497-0314

Date:

Institution

COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF AURORA

COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF DENVER

ARAPAHOE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

PUEBLO COMMUNITY COLLEGE

RED ROCKS COMMUNITY COLLEGE

ALAMANCE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

ARKANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY-BEEBE

BALTIMORE CITY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

CARL SANDBURG COLLEGE

CENTRAL ARIZONA COLLEGE

CENTRAL CAROLINA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

CENTRAL VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

CHATTAHOOCHEE TECHNICAL COLLEGE

CLEVELAND STATE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

COASTAL CAROLINA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

COCHISE COLLEGE

COLUMBIA STATE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

DARTON COLLEGE

EASTERN ARIZONA COLLEGE

FLOYD COLLEGE

FORSYTH TECHNICAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE

GATEWAY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

GRAYSON COUNTY COLLEGE

HUTCHINSON COMMUNITY COLLEGE

JACKSON STATE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

JOHN A LOGAN COLLEGE

JOHNSTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE

KASKASKIA COLLEGE

KELLOGG COMMUNITY COLLEGE

KILGORE COLLEGE

KISHWAUKEE COLLEGE

LAKE WASHINGTON TECHNICAL COLLEGE

LARAMIE COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

MERIDIAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE

MOHAVE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

MUSKEGON COMMUNITY COLLEGE

NASHVILLE STATE TECHNICAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE

NORTH IDAHO COLLEGE

NORTHEAST COMMUNITY COLLEGE

ODESSA COLLEGE

OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY-OKMULGEE

PARADISE VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

PATRICK HENRY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

PENINSULA COLLEGE

PRAIRIE STATE COLLEGE

ROANE STATE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

SKYLINE COLLEGE

SNOW COLLEGE

SUNY COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY AT CANTON

TEMPLE COLLEGE

TRINITY VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

WALLA WALLA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

WAYNE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

WENATCHEE VALLEY COLLEGE

NCHEMS PEERS - Community Colleges Group D

Data Source: NCHEMS NCES Finance Dataset, 2004-05

Prepared by: Linda Keep (303) 497-0314

Date:

9/7/06

Institution

TRINIDAD STATE JUNIOR COLLEGE

LAMAR COMMUNITY COLLEGE

NORTHEASTERN COMMUNITY COLLEGE

BAINBRIDGE COLLEGE

BAY DE NOC COMMUNITY COLLEGE

BEAUFORT COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

BLACK RIVER TECHNICAL COLLEGE

BLADEN COMMUNITY COLLEGE

CENTRAL OHIO TECHNICAL COLLEGE

CLOUD COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

DABNEY S LANCASTER COMMUNITY COLLEGE

HALIFAX COMMUNITY COLLEGE

HAYWOOD COMMUNITY COLLEGE

HENDERSON COMMUNITY COLLEGE

ILLINOIS EASTERN COMMUNITY COLLEGES-FRONTIER COMMUNITY COLL

ILLINOIS EASTERN COMMUNITY COLLEGES-OLNEY CENTRAL COLLEGE

JEFFERSON DAVIS COMMUNITY COLLEGE

LABETTE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

LAMAR STATE COLLEGE-ORANGE

LUNA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

LURLEEN B WALLACE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

NEOSHO COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

NORTH ARKANSAS COLLEGE

NORTHERN MAINE TECHNICAL COLLEGE

NORTHERN NEW MEXICO COMMUNITY COLLEGE

PIEDMONT COMMUNITY COLLEGE

ROCKINGHAM COMMUNITY COLLEGE

SAUK VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

SOUTH ARKANSAS COMMUNITY COLLEGE

STANLY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

TECHNICAL COLLEGE OF THE LOWCOUNTRY

VIRGINIA HIGHLANDS COMMUNITY COLLEGE

WYTHEVILLE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

ATTACHMENT B

Ranked in order according to Highest Peer Benchmark

8/3/2007

Summary 06-07 General Fund and Tuition and Fees				Summary 06-07 General Fund and Tuition and Fees With Peer Changes			
HSC	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	HSC % of Peers	HSC	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	HSC % of Peers
		77,715	58.19%			81,679	55.36%
CSU	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	CSU % of Peers	CSU--NO PEER CHANGES	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	CSU % of Peers
		18,724	57.20%			18,724	57.20%
UCB	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	UCB % of Peers	UCB	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	UCB % of Peers
		17,298	72.24%			17,636	70.86%
CSM	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	CSM % of Peers	CSM	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	CSM % of Peers
		17,210	80.88%			17,416	79.93%
FLC	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	FLC % of Peers	FLC	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	FLC % of Peers
		13,600	49.05%			12,137	71.52%
UCD	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	UCD % of Peers	UCD	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	UCD % of Peers
		13,335	75.64%			13,265	76.03%
UNC	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	UNC % of Peers	UNC--NO PEER CHANGES	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	UNC % of Peers
		13,296	53.30%			13,296	53.30%
UCCS	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	UCCS % of Peers	UCCS	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	UCCS % of Peers
		12,283	66.70%			12,858	63.71%
MSC	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	MSC % of Peers	MSC	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	MSC % of Peers
		10,992	50.30%			11,178	49.46%
WSC	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	WSC % of Peers	WSC	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	WSC % of Peers
		10,555	87.89%			10,647	87.13%
MSCD	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	MSCD % of Peers	MSCD- NO PEER CHANGES	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	MSCD % of Peers
		10,348	47.48%			10,348	47.48%
ASC	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	ASC % of Peers	ASC- NO PEER CHANGES	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	ASC % of Peers
		10,235	42.69%			10,235	64.38%
CSU-P	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	CSU-P % of Peers	CSU-P NO PEER CHANGES	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	CSU-P % of Peers
		9,915	61.25%			9,915	61.25%

Summary 06-07 General Fund and Tuition and Fees				Summary 06-07 General Fund and Tuition and Fees With Peer Changes			
CNCC	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	CNCC % of Peers	CNCC	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	CNCC % of Peers
		8,596	55.34%	4,757		8,620	55.19%
OJC	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	OJC % of Peers	OJC	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	OJC % of Peers
		8,596	61.76%	5,309		8,620	61.59%
LCC	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	LCC % of Peers	LCC	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	LCC % of Peers
		8,596	74.08%	6,368		7,415	85.93%
NEJC	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	NEJC % of Peers	NEJC	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	NEJC % of Peers
		8,596	67.54%	5,806		7,415	78.32%
FRCC	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	FRCC % of Peers	FRCC	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	FRCC % of Peers
		7,649	62.64%	4,791		7,653	62.60%
PPCC	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	PPCC % of Peers	PPCC	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	PPCC % of Peers
		7,649	61.62%	4,713		7,653	61.58%
MCC	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	MCC % of Peers	MCC	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	MCC % of Peers
		7,415	88.36%	6,552		8,620	76.01%
TSJC	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	TSJC % of Peers	TSJC	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	TSJC % of Peers
		7,415	76.52%	5,674		7,415	76.53%
ACC	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	ACC % of Peers	ACC	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	ACC % of Peers
		7,171	81.37%	5,835		7,286	80.08%
CCA	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	CCA % of Peers	CCA	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	CCA % of Peers
		7,171	75.79%	5,434		7,286	74.59%
CCD	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	CCD % of Peers	CCD	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	CCD % of Peers
		7,171	53.29%	3,821		7,286	52.45%
PCC	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	PCC % of Peers	PCC	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	PCC % of Peers
		7,171	57.11%	4,095		7,286	56.21%
RRCC	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	RRCC % of Peers	RRCC	GF + Tuition and Fees Per FTE	Peers	RRCC % of Peers
		7,171	77.44%	5,553		7,286	76.21%

Note:
Data pulled from IPEDS FY 04-05 inflated for FY 06-07 figures

**TOPIC: TECHNOLOGY ADVANCEMENT GRANT PROGRAM STATUS
REPORT**

PREPARED BY: JOHN KARAKOULAKIS

I. SUMMARY

Pursuant to C.R.S. §23-1-106.5(9)(d), the Colorado Commission on Higher Education is required to submit to the General Assembly a status report on the Technology Advancement Grant (TAG) program. This will be the final TAG status report from the CCHE since in the 2007 legislative session SB07-182 moved the program to the Colorado Department of Health and Environment effective July 1, 2007. This report summarizes the last round of grants from the TAG program that were awarded from October 2006 to March 2007.

The report is attached in its entirety.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Commission should approve the release of the attached status report to the General Assembly.

COLORADO COMMISSION ON
 **HIGHER
EDUCATION**

ACCESS TO HIGH-QUALITY, AFFORDABLE EDUCATION FOR ALL COLORADANS

TECHNOLOGY ADVANCEMENT GRANT
STATUS REPORT
AUGUST 2007

INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to C.R.S. §23-1-106.5(9)(d), the Colorado Commission on Higher Education is pleased to submit to the General Assembly a status report on the Technology Advancement Grant (TAG) program. This will be the final TAG status report from the CCHE since in the 2007 legislative session SB07-182 moved the program to the Colorado Department of Health and Environment effective July 1, 2007. This report summarizes the last round of grants from the TAG program that were awarded from October 2006 to March 2007.

TAG PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The Colorado Commission on Higher Education's Technology Advancement Grant (TAG) program is intended to fund research, development or technology transfer to develop or implement waste diversion or recycling strategies, including the use of waste tires. As well as other environmental research, development or technology transfer for materials or products of any kind. The funds are intended to help spur new innovation within these fields by utilizing Colorado's institutions of higher education and partnerships with the private sector.

Funds for the TAG program are available from the state's advance technology fund, which is financed by the waste tire recycling fee. Legislation passed by the General Assembly and signed by the Governor that went into effect on July 1, 2006, redefined the criteria for expending money from the advanced technology fund.

Prior to the 2006 legislation, grants from the advance technology fund financed a variety of projects across many different technological and scientific disciplines. However, under the 2006 statutory changes, the scope of the grants were changed to focus on waste diversion, recycling and research and development of environmental applications.

At the CCHE's October 2006 meeting, the Commission approved staff's policy, priorities, criteria, and request for proposals for the TAG program. Following approval, staff issued the request for proposals for the last round of the TAG program. Proposals were due by December 5, 2006. A total of 20 proposals were received totaling \$1,949,676 in funding requests. All proposals were reviewed separately three different times according to the same criteria. Staff from CCHE and the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment reviewed each proposal once and the third review was based on field specific knowledge depending on the focus of the proposal from either, the Office of Economic Development, the Governor's Office of Policy and Initiatives, or various out of state university professors recommended by the National Science Foundation.

Each review evaluated proposals based on overall quality, technical innovation, viable results, ability to complete the project, benefits, and economic impact.

Specifically proposals were judged on the following criteria:

1. **Overall Quality:** *What is the overall quality of the proposal in regard to merit and importance of the proposed tasks? What are the strengths and weaknesses?*
2. **Technical Innovation:** *What is the degree of innovation and relevance to introducing useful technology transfer, research, or development to cited fields?*
3. **Viable Results:** *Does the proposal have a high potential for success beyond initial funding? Are proposed results attainable and useful?*
4. **Ability to Complete Proposed Project:** *Does proposal staff have a sufficient background and qualifications to complete the project?*
5. **Benefits and Economic Impact:** *Is there a potential for new industry, business opportunities or job growth for the State of Colorado? Is this project a worthwhile and efficient use of the TAG funding?*

To ensure that TAG funding was used to its greatest advantage and highest impact, the CCHE wanted to make sure that worthwhile projects which had a high potential of success were funded. Reviewers were asked to give an overall rating of each proposal based on the following scale: Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, or Poor. Proposal reviews were assigned a point score ranging from 3-15, with each review having the possibility to assign a total of 5 points for the highest rating. Proposals earning a score of 13 and above were funded.

PROPOSALS

Below are summaries of the 20 proposals that were submitted in. The proposals that were funded are listed first.

FUNDED Proposals

Proposal Number: 12050601

Title: “Viability of Engineered Fuel Briquettes from Biomass and Power Plant Waste Streams”

Principal Investigator: R. Malhotra

Organization: ICAST

Funding Request: \$58,000

Proposal Summary: Proposes to evaluate the viability of commercially manufacturing engineered fuel briquettes composed of 40% fly ash and 60% biomass waste. Project is expected to produce economic, environmental and community benefits. Briquettes have already been produced in the laboratory based on prior research conducted over three years from a partnership between iCAST and CSU-P, CU Boulder and CSU Fort Collins.

Proposal Number: 12050610

Title: “Three Waste-to Value Technologies for Sustainable Urban Infrastructure in Colorado”

Principal Investigator: A. Ramaswami

Organization: CU- Denver

Funding Request: \$155,000

Proposal Summary: Proposes three waste-to value technologies for urban sustainability in Colorado cities; high performance green concrete; zero waste and negative biodiesel processes; and converting organic municipal waste to energy. If the technologies were adopted they would make Colorado a leader in waste diversion and sustainability.

Proposal Number: 12050617

Title: “Durable Roof Tiles from a Fly-Ash/Tire Composite: Testing and Manufacturing Toward a Sustainable World”

Principal Investigator: P. Heyliger

Organization: CSU

Funding Request: \$113,126

Proposal Summary: Proposed project focuses on refining the development of “green composite roof tiles” consisting of structural composite combinations of fly ash, the by-product of coal combustion in power plants, and ground up used tires. The project will: refine composite mixtures to find the most durable tile; produce enough for a real life test against benchmark standards for concrete roof tiles; conduct cost analysis for various production scales; and create a marketing and overall commercial strategy.

Proposal Number: 12050618

Title: “Expansive Foundation Soils Stabilized with Waste Tire Rubber”

Principal Investigator: J. Carraro

Organization: CSU

Funding Request: \$128,913

Proposal Summary: Proposes to carry out original basic research to evaluate and demonstrate the feasibility of using waste tire rubber to reduce the swell potential of local expansive foundation soils from Colorado.

UNFUNDED Proposals

Proposal Number: 12050602

Title: “University/Industry Cooperative Membrane Research”

Principal Investigator: A. Greenberg

Organization: CU-Boulder

Funding Request: \$197,074

Proposal Summary: The Membrane Applied Science and Technology (MAST) Center and CU Boulder proposes five separate projects on membrane research: polymerization techniques to fabricate high capacity membranes; membrane processes for fractionation and recovery of lignins; micro sensors for detection of biofouling; separation of divalent and trivalent copper and iron species in liquid solutions; and organic carbon components.

Proposal Number: 12050603

Title: “Creating Engineered Structural Building Components from Oriented Strand Board that has been Diverted from Landfill Waste Stream”

Principal Investigator: W. Schmelzer

Organization: Green Giant LLC

Funding Request: \$86,600

Proposal Summary: Proposes to confirm that scrap oriented strand board (OSB) can be laminated into thicker boards and beams that are suitable for replacing new lumber in residential building. Commercial success in reusing OSB would divert tens of thousands of tons of waste from the waste stream as well as reduce the need for new lumber.

Proposal Number: 12050604

Title: “Green Water Reuse Investigation to Create New Colorado Jobs, Develop New Technologies, and Conserve Colorado Water”

Principal Investigator: J. Flobeck

Organization: Aqua Prima

Funding Request: \$98,000

Proposal Summary: Proposes to investigate individual county health requirements for green and gray water usage, then analyze these requirements and develop standards that all counties will agree on. Then take the company’s existing green water device and adapt it to the standards agreed on by counties and formulate a business plan to manufacture and market the devices across the West.

Proposal Number: 12050605

Title: “The Colorado Roadmap to Construction and Demolition Recycling and Reuse”

Principal Investigator: T. Plant

Organization: ReSource Conservation

Funding Request: \$65,175

Proposal Summary: Proposes to comprehensively analyze the construction and demolition waste stream and determine the most effective ways to manage and maximize diversion of that waste stream from the landfill for communities throughout the state. Project will examine model legislation and innovative procedures gathered from around the country and the world as well as potential market opportunities for waste products.

Proposal Number: 12050606

Title: “Development and Marketing of In-Situ Soil Mixing for Cleanup of Contaminated Soils and Reuse of Contaminated Lands”

Principal Investigator: T. Sale

Organization: CSU

Funding Request: \$148,440

Proposal Summary: The objective of this project is to broaden the scope and realize the full commercial potential of two environmental technology patents donated by DuPont to CSU, covering in situ admixing of waste zero valent iron and stabilizing agents for treatment of chlorinated solvents in subsurface settings. The net benefit of this technology is a dramatic reduction in future releases of contaminants to down-gradient groundwater.

Proposal Number: 12050607

Title: Web-Based Image Processing System for Environmental Resource management

Principal Investigator: L. Johnson

Organization: CU-Denver

Funding Request: \$148,945

Proposal Summary: Proposes to use web based image processing for utilization in enterprise spatial decision support systems. Project will harness satellite and data processing technology to provide distributed image processing to various organizations for environmental monitoring and removal of waste.

Proposal Number: 12050608

Title: “Construction Site Recycling; Model for Efficient Landfill Diversion and Industry Growth”

Principal Investigator: L. Skumatz

Organization: Econservation

Funding Request: \$24,790

Proposal Summary: Proposes to demonstrate successful recycling programs for the construction industry and communicate this information to private sector construction companies. The project will examine models of successful recycling programs, establish a pilot program and conclude with a manual of best practices for construction site managers and an analysis of future opportunities.

Proposal Number: 12050609

Title: “Development of High Durability Rubber-Modified Concrete”

Principal Investigator: Y. Xi

Organization: CU-Boulder

Funding Request: \$50,000

Proposal Summary: Proposes to use crumb rubber in concrete to enhance the ductility and toughness of concrete and reduce disposal of waste tires. The project will research rubber modified concrete to find the optimal mix and proper coupling agents to improve the long-term durability which could be used later on various projects such as roadways and bridges.

Proposal Number: 12050611

Title: “Promoting Rubberized Asphalt and Other Scrap Tire Products in Colorado”

Principal Investigator: R. Amme

Organization: DU

Funding Request: \$110,958

Proposal Summary: Proposes laboratory and field efforts relating to rubberized asphalt. The project will provide technical support for additional Terminal Blend rubberized asphalt as it is used in paving projects by monitoring roadway noise reduction and skid resistance. The project will also attempt to promote new asphalt rubber chip seal maintenance projects among C-DOT entities.

Proposal Number: 12050612

Title: “Development of an Inventory & User Matching Database to Support Colorado Recycling”

Principal Investigator: M. Griek

Organization: Colorado Assoc. of Recyclers

Funding Request: \$70,328

Proposal Summary: Proposes to develop and implement a system to collect, manage, and share baseline data on sources of recycled materials and potential users of these materials within the Colorado business community. The project will obtain tonnage of diverted waste materials that were processed and brokered in 2006 in the state and the tonnage that was exported creating the most complete record of the sources and uses of the state’s recyclable commodities.

Proposal Number: 12050613

Title: “Gap Analysis, Best Practices “Technologies” and Technology Transfer for Residential and Commercial Waste Diversion in the State of Colorado”

Principal Investigator: L. Skumatz

Organization: Econservation

Funding Request: \$46,830

Proposal Summary: Proposes to gather technical information on programs, tonnage, and demographics to identify current waste diversion levels, assess gaps in service, and analyze best practice programs and policy technologies within and outside the state. The project will also provide a practical toolkit for environmental or recycling coordinators to facilitate technology transfer on best practices.

Proposal Number: 12050614

Title: “Development of a Near Real-Time Technique for the Measurement of Carbonyl Compounds in the Atmosphere”

Principal Investigator: L. Anderson

Organization: CU-Denver

Funding Request: \$65,161

Proposal Summary: Proposes to design and construct a laboratory prototype for an automated, continuous system for sampling and analyzing carbonyl compounds in the ambient air. The goal is to develop and test a near real-time system that is capable of sub ppb detection of a broad series of carbonyl compounds. It is intended that this system will be an economically viable option as a replacement for cartridge sampling and laboratory analysis systems that are currently used.

Proposal Number: 12050615

Title: “Low Maintenance, Self-Cleaning Membranes for Water Reuse”

Principal Investigator: R. Wickramasinghe

Organization: CSU

Funding Request: \$92,241

Proposal Summary: Proposes a one year proof of principle research and development project which will result in the development of new low maintenance, self-cleaning nano-filtration and reverse osmosis membranes for water treatment. The project would focus on wastewater and water co-produced during oil and gas exploration.

Proposal Number: 12050616

Title: “A Biological Assessment Tool for Metal Toxicity – Ensuring Colorado’s Environmental Health”

Principal Investigator: T. Roane

Organization: CU-Denver

Funding Request: \$65,999

Proposal Summary: Proposes developing a bacterial indicator for environmental cadmium toxicity. Specifically, the study will take a soil-borne bacterium and investigate it for use in sensing cadmium toxicity. The long-term goal of the research is to create a marketable biosensor for environmental quality indication.

Proposal Number: 12050619

Title: “Building an Environmentally Sound and Sustainable Infrastructure for Electronics Recycling in Colorado”

Principal Investigator: M. Griek

Organization: Colorado Assoc. of Recyclers

Funding Request: \$75,513

Proposal Summary: Proposes to research Colorado’s e-scrap industry in order to determine what business and technology investments will best help it grow. Research and activities will look at access, current environmental health and safety practices, estimate the number of potential jobs, determine best practices, and expand re-use opportunities to bridge technology gaps.

Proposal Number: 12050620

Title: “Optimizing the Effluent from the Vertical Tube Reactor for Agricultural Application”

Principal Investigator: J. McGrew

Organization: Applied Science

Funding Request: \$148,601

Proposal Summary: Proposes to evaluate the environmental effect of direct field application of the reacted effluent from a Vertical Tube Reactor which employs air to oxidize the impurities in aqueous hog waste. The project will utilize a unique laboratory reactor to subject hog waste to different temperatures, pressures, and reaction times to produce different end products which will then be evaluated on plant growth in soil types found in Colorado.

CONCLUSION

The last round of the TAG program funded four proposals totaling \$455,039. The CCHE believes these projects will have a high rate of success and will fulfill the goals of the TAG program. With the passage of SB07-182, the TAG program has now been transferred to the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment. CDPHE will continue to grant proposals according to the same statutory requirements. Given CDPHE’s departmental mission and the role and mission of the CCHE, this change is logical and a more efficient use of the program and funds.

SB07-182 also created a new Innovative Higher Education Research Authority whose aim will be to provide matching state funds for large federal research proposals from our state’s research universities. The new Innovative Research Authority and the TAG program under CDPHE will share the existing waste tire recycling fee funding stream 40% and 60% respectively. The CCHE believes this split satisfies the parties interested in the TAG money in the best manner and makes the most efficient use of the available funds.

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

PREPARED BY: MATT MCKEEVER

I. SUMMARY

The Commission holds statutory responsibility to approve instruction offered out-of-state beyond the seven states contiguous to Colorado. By action of the Commission in 1986 the Executive Director may act for the Commission to approve or deny requests from governing boards for approval of courses and programs to be offered by their institutions. This agenda item includes instruction that the Executive Director has certified as meeting the criteria for out-of-state delivery. The Trustees at Adams State College and the Board of Regents at the University of Colorado sponsor these programs.

II. ACTION

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

The Board of Trustees of Adams State College submitted a request to offer the following out-of-state instructional programs:

- “ED 589: Field Studies at the Zoo” in Bronx, NY; July 16-20, 2007
- “ED 589: Standards-Based Assessment & Instruction in Science” in Austin, TX; August 9-10, 2007
- “ED 589: 4MAT 4 Algebra Workshop” in Crystal Lake, IL; July 23-24, 2007

The Regents of the University of Colorado submitted a request to offer the following out-of-state instructional programs:

- “78th Annual Meeting of the American Thyroid Association” in New York, NY; October 3-7, 2007

The Commission is given responsibility for approval of out-of-state instruction beyond the contiguous states contiguous to Colorado in C.R.S. 23-5-116.

**TOPIC: DEGREE AUTHORIZATION ACT – HIGHER LEARNING
COMMISSION ACCREDITATION PROCESS CHANGES**

PREPARED BY: MATT McKEEVER

I. BACKGROUND

The Commission has statutory responsibility for the administration of Title 23, Article 2 of the Colorado Revised Statutes, commonly referred to as the Degree Authorization Act. Commission policies and procedures have been developed to include an application process for any degree granting institutions wishing to begin operation in Colorado.

The policies rely on the accreditation status of the applicant institution for authorization purposes. New institutions are granted preliminary state authorization for a time period of six months. Within that period the institution shall satisfactorily complete preliminary information as required by the regional or other appropriate, United States Department of Education-approved accrediting association. Until the institution demonstrates the potential for successful accreditation, documented by the accrediting agency, it shall not accept students, offer instruction, award credits toward a degree, or award a degree. Upon receipt of documentation, the institution may be granted Category II status and may begin to enroll students and award degrees as long as timely progress is made towards full accreditation.

II. INFORMATION

The Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Schools and Colleges (HLC) is the regional accrediting organization that some new institutions choose to work with upon receiving preliminary authorization to operate. The HLC has concerns that their eligibility process has been misunderstood or misrepresented by Department of Higher Education staff. The attached document clarifies their eligibility process and the requirements necessary for affiliation and accreditation.

Staff has relied on notification from HLC to determine if the institution applying for Category II authorization has made reasonable and timely progress toward accreditation. In the past, reasonable and timely progress toward accreditation has been demonstrated with documentation from the regional accrediting association that the institution has been determined to hold the potential for accreditation and is actively pursuing accreditation within the established timetable. The attached clarifications may require changes to the Degree Authorization Act policy so that other alternatives exist for institutions wishing to demonstrate potential for successful accreditation. If DHE staff is to take on the responsibility of substantive evaluation of a school for Category II authorization, it will be necessary to seek statutory authority to assess a sufficient application fee to cover the cost of contracting out such evaluation.

STATUTORY AUTHORITY

23-1-121 C.R.S.; 23-2-101 C.R.S

THE HIGHER LEARNING COMMISSION

A Commission of the **North Central Association of Colleges & Schools**

30 North LaSalle, Suite 2400, Chicago, IL 60602
(312) 263-0456; (800) 621-7440; www.ncahlc.org

ELIGIBILITY PROCESS

OVERVIEW

The Eligibility Process is for educational organizations considering accreditation by the Higher Learning Commission. In this process the Commission determines whether the interested organization is eligible for an on-site evaluation by a team. Although the Process consists of several discrete steps, the Commission only considers successful completion of the last step—submission of a Preliminary Information Form that passes the review of a panel of consultant-evaluators—to be evidence of progress in establishing an affiliation with the Commission.

REQUEST FOR AN INTERVIEW

If the educational organization decides to pursue affiliation with the Commission it sends a letter to the President requesting an interview. The usefulness of the interview depends on the quality of the following documentation the organization must submit as part of the request:

- a. evidence that the educational organization is within the Commission's scope of service by
 - having a main campus or headquarters within the 19- state north central region or
 - holding a certificate of incorporation from a secretary of state within the region or
 - being a federal institution under the authority of the U.S. military or U.S. governmental agency or
 - participating in a collaborative endeavor, which is approved by the Commission's Board of Trustees, and having a primary purpose of assuring educational quality.
- b. evidence that the educational organization's Governing Board has determined that it seek affiliation with the Higher Learning Commission;
- c. evidence that the educational organization has legal authorization from a state or other appropriate governmental entity to operate as an institution of higher education and has sought or is seeking degree-granting authority;
- d. evidence that the educational organization has a CEO;
- e. evidence that the educational organization has a published catalog;
- f. evidence that the educational organization has the financial base to support an organization of higher education (may be shown by submission of an audit, letter of reference from a bank or accountant, etc.)

NOTE: The subsequent invitation from the staff to meet in the Commission's office for the interview does not validate the appropriateness of the documentation.

Typically the interview will occur with the CEO and with one or two other representatives whom the CEO chooses to include. The session will begin with an overview of the Commission requirements and processes. The educational organization will then present an overview of its history, structure and function. Together the educational organization and staff will explore the educational organization's readiness to begin the Eligibility Process. Educational organizations may want to do a rough draft of the Preliminary Information Form prior to the interview. Staff will not formally review the document, but the exercise of drafting the document should help the educational organization focus on its strengths and weaknesses and identify areas where there are questions. The meeting will last approximately two hours.

REQUIREMENTS FOR INTERVIEW:

- **Letter of request**
- **Specific documents (3 SETS)**
- **At least two hours of time with staff in the Commission office with the organization's identified leadership**

Interview Fee: \$1,500

SUBMIT LETTER OF INTENT

If, after completing the interview, the educational organization decides to move forward with seeking affiliation, it will file a letter of intent and will be assigned a staff liaison. The organization has two years after the interview in which to file this letter.

When it submits the letter of intent, the educational organization should have already been working on its Preliminary Information Form and should have set a date in the near future for filing the completed document with the Commission. Typically the liaison's interactions will occur via electronic or telephonic communication, although in rare instances a campus visit at the educational organization's expense might be appropriate. The goal of the staff consultation is to provide useful advice on how the Eligibility Requirements are usually interpreted and applied as well as to assist the educational organization in understanding the unique nature of the relationship with the Commission established through affiliation. The staff liaison will be available to the educational organization as a resource throughout the Eligibility Process but will typically not review the Preliminary Information Form.

If the letter of intent is not submitted within two years, the educational organization will need to complete another interview before the Commission will accept a letter of intent.

REQUIREMENTS FOR LETTER OF INTENT:

- **Letter must be filed within two years of the eligibility interview**
- **Letter designating expected date of submission of the PIF (no longer than one year)**

Letter of Intent Fee: \$1,500

FILE THE PRELIMINARY INFORMATION FORM

To continue the Eligibility Process, the educational organization will submit its completed PIF to the Commission office no later than one year after filing its letter of intent. The Commission sends these PIF materials to two reviewers selected by staff from members of the Eligibility Process Review Council. The reviewers will complete the PIF analysis and submit it to the Commission.

The reviewers will determine whether the evidence provided by the educational organization forms a justifiable basis for scheduling an evaluation team to make an on-site visit to the educational organization. **An educational organization must provide reasonable evidence to meet each Eligibility Requirement or it will not be scheduled for an on-site evaluation.** The task of the reviewers is to consider whether a team looking at the evidence presented in the PIF *could* reasonably conclude that each of the Eligibility Requirements is met. In making this judgment the reviewers will look to both the sufficiency and weight of the evidence to demonstrate that a Requirement is met and whether that evidence is sufficiently compelling.

The reviewers can determine:

1. that the educational organization is ready to prepare its Self-Study application for a team visit, OR
2. that the educational organization should submit additional information to address limited portions of the PIF, OR
3. that the educational organization is not ready to pursue affiliation with the Commission.

The reviewers' analysis will be provided to the educational organization and, if an on-site evaluation occurs, to the first team to visit the educational organization.

- A. If the reviewers determine that the educational organization is ready to prepare a Self-Study Report, the educational organization and staff liaison initiate the appropriate processes. The educational organization will have no more than two calendar years from the date of the reviewers' analysis and recommendation in which to submit its final Self-Study Report. If it does not do so by the end of the two-year period, it will need to begin the Eligibility Process again.

NOTE: It is at this point that the Commission concludes that the organization is making successful progress toward achieving affiliation.

- B. If the educational organization is asked to resubmit portions of its PIF, it will have one calendar year from the date of the reviewers' analysis and recommendation in which to successfully complete the Eligibility Process. The educational organization is limited to one resubmission during that year.

NOTE: Only after a successful resubmission will the Commission conclude that the organization is making successful progress toward achieving affiliation.

- C. If the reviewers determine that the educational organization is not ready to pursue affiliation, the educational organization must wait one calendar year from the date of the reviewers' analysis and recommendation before reapplying for the Eligibility Process.

REQUIREMENTS FOR PIF FILING:

- **PIF must be filed within a year of the Letter of Intent**
- **Organization submits 3 sets of the narrative and documentation described in the PIF form.**

File the PIF Fee: \$1,500

MOVING FROM ELIGIBILITY TO AFFILIATION

When the PIF process is successfully completed, staff will invite the educational organization to select a date for the evaluation visit and to engage in a Self-Study process that culminates in production of the Self-Study Report. Staff will provide assistance for that Self-Study process and will select the evaluation team.

The Self-Study Report is the formal application for status with the Commission. The Self-Study Report is due two months before the evaluation date.

For more information on this step, please refer to The Handbook of Accreditation, Third Edition, 4.2

Please note that all fees are non-refundable.