

CCHE Agenda
November 9, 2001
Colorado History Museum
Boettcher Auditorium
Denver, Colorado
10:00 a.m.

I. Approval of Minutes

II. Reports

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

III. Consent Items

- A. One Percent Base Appropriation Reduction - Foster
- B. Authorization of Secondary Endorsements in School Library Media Specialist at the University of Denver - Gettle

IV. Action Items

- A. Auraria Higher Education Center Campus Facility Master Plan 2001 - Adkins/Hoffman (15 Minutes)
- B. Red Rocks Community College Facility Master Plan 2001 - Adkins/Ferris (15 Minutes)
- C. CCHE 2001-2002 Master Plan - Foster (5 minutes)
- D. Revisions to the Adopted FY 2002-03 Budget Request- Jacobs/Von Achen (30 Minutes)
- E. University of Northern Colorado Tuition/Inflation Proposal-Fiscal Year 2002-2003
CCHE Budget Request Jacobs/Van Achen
- F. University of Colorado Health Sciences Center Tuition Proposal – FY 2002-2003 CCHE
Budget Request Jacobs/Van Achen

V. Items for Discussion and Possible Action

- A. Policy Interpretation Discussion FTE Funding for Department of Corrections Inmates - Adkins/Haddock (30 Minutes)
- B. Colorado State University Residence Hall Program Plan - Adkins (10 Minutes)

VI. Written Reports for Possible Discussion

- A. FY 2002 Tuition and Fee Survey - Mullen
- B. Concept Papers:
 - 1. Bachelor of Science (B.S.) Degree in Biomedical Sciences at Colorado State University - Evans
 - 2. Bachelor of Science in Biomedical Engineering at Colorado State University - Evans
- C. Report on Out-of-State Instruction - Breckel

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE)
November 9, 2001
Agenda Item II, A

TOPIC: CHAIR'S REPORT

PREPARED BY: PEGGY LAMM

This item will be a regular monthly discussion of items that he feels will be of interest to the Commission.

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE)
November 9, 2001
Agenda Item II, B

TOPIC: COMMISSIONERS' REPORT

PREPARED BY: COMMISSIONERS

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

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE)
November 9, 2001
Agenda Item II, C

TOPIC: ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORTS

PREPARED BY: ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

This item provides an opportunity for Commission Advisory Committee members to report on items of interest to the Commission.

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE)
November 9, 2001
Agenda Item II, D

TOPIC: PUBLIC COMMENT

PREPARED BY: TIM FOSTER

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

TOPIC: 1% BASE APPROPRIATION REDUCTION

PREPARED BY: TIM FOSTER

I. SUMMARY

The State's revenue projections are significantly less than originally forecast for the current budget year and for the FY02-03 budget year. As a result, Governor Bill Owens has directed that all agencies implement a 1% reduction in base appropriations for the current year. In alerting institutions and governing boards of this reduction, a method for holding financial aid harmless was proposed to institutions. After discussing this with all governing board chief executive officers, CCHE has forwarded this suggestion for reducing the budget to the Office of State Planning and Budgeting. The alternative holds the financial aid line in the current budget – and again in the next budget cycle – harmless.

II. BACKGROUND

On October 18, 2001, all governing board chief executive officers were asked to consider an alternative to ensure that the mandatory recisions would not impact students – in particular to hold the financial aid line harmless.

As the economy has slowed, the most critical link between Coloradoans and a college education is financial aid. In particular, we have attempted to examine ways to eliminate financial aid cuts or keep those cuts as minimal as possible in these economic times. CSU independently indicated its agreement with the above by suggesting that we eliminate any potential financial aid cuts by spreading the cost of those cuts elsewhere within the Department of Higher Education.

CCHE proposed the following:

1. That it take approximately a 5.5% cut within its administrative and special purpose lines and add \$300,000 of that to what would be anticipated from a 1% cut to the financial aid pool. This would defray \$300,000 of the estimated \$850,000 cut required if an across-the-board cut were taken in financial aid.

2. That the six governing boards absorb proportionately among their allocations the remaining \$550,000 in cuts needed to hold financial aid harmless (which amounts to slightly less than one-tenth of one percent). A proposed schedule is attached.

All governing boards responded in agreement to the proposal, which was forwarded on October 19 as the department's recision proposal to the Office of State Planning and Budgeting and the Governor's office.

The spreadsheet attached provides the budget line item changes. The top agencies listed are within the department, but not typically thought of as higher education agencies.

The \$300,000 is from not-yet-allocated Technology Advancement Group grant funds provided to CCHE. The grants go for technology transfer research purposes. Typically, the Commission would have sought proposals from institutions to spend these research funds, the majority of which have already been allocated for the current fiscal year, and chosen recipients from among those proposals submitted. Discussion of budget reduction proposals with commission members who provide oversight of this internal program resulted in agreement that in prioritizing department functions, access for students to higher education comes first.

Financial aid is one of the most critical elements in ensuring access to the state's public higher education system. CCHE has proposed this same reduction to comply with the request to reduce the FY2002-03 budget request and asked that the governing boards consider a similar approach to the cuts.

CCHE's administrative and special purpose functions are 12.1% of the total general fund department budget. The governing board and Division of Occupational Education functions account for 87.3% of the department general fund budget while the 1187 agencies (museum and arts council) are .6% of the general fund for the department.

The following information is provided for your background:

Total General Fund --	\$5,703,694,497
Total K-12 General Fund --	\$2,280,470,813 -- 40.0% of GF
Total Higher Ed General Fund	\$764,651,972 -- 13.4% of GF
Total Other General Fund	\$2,658,571,712 -- 46.6% of GF

III. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Commission affirm the decision to hold financial aid harmless in keeping with its number one priority of ensuring access and encourage the General Assembly to similarly address financial aid in the discussions of the FY 2002-03 budget.

TOPIC: AUTHORIZATION OF SECONDARY ENDORSEMENTS IN SCHOOL LIBRARY MEDIA SPECIALIST AT THE UNIVERSITY OF DENVER

PREPARED BY: PATTY GETTLE

I. SUMMARY

CCHE recommends approving endorsement in School Library Media Specialist from the University of Denver. The State Board of Education approved this endorsement at its September 13, 2001, meeting.

II. BACKGROUND

Endorsement licensure requires that a student has already met initial requirements in Elementary, Secondary and Early Childhood Education. Secondary endorsements allow a classroom teacher greater flexibility in teaching assignments. Endorsements also qualify individuals for non-classroom careers (e.g. School nurse, librarian).

Under CCHE's teacher education approval process, endorsements for specialty areas (e.g., bilingual, school library media) are reviewed and approved by State Board of Education prior to Commission action. CCHE reviews field experience and assessment if appropriate for these authorization requests.

III. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Commission approve the endorsement program for School Library Media Specialist at the University of Denver.

Appendix A

STATUTORY AUTHORITY

(C.R.S. 23-2-121 (2)) On or before July 1, 2000, the commission shall adopt policies establishing the requirements for teacher preparation programs offered by institutions of higher education. The commission shall work in cooperation with the State Board of Education in developing the requirements for teacher preparation programs.

**TOPIC: AURARIA HIGHER EDUCATION CENTER CAMPUS FACILITY
 MASTER PLAN 2001**

PREPARED BY: GAIL HOFFMAN AND JEANNE ADKINS

I. SUMMARY

The Auraria Higher Education Center (AHEC) Campus Facility Master Plan 2001, submitted to CCHE this spring, replaces the last master plan approved in 1991. The new master plan projects what buildings will be needed, added onto, or updated if full-time equivalent enrollment grows 2.5% above today's approximate enrollment of 32,500. That is called Phase I in the plan. Phase II outlines what capital construction would be needed if full-time equivalent enrollment grows an additional 2.5%. No dates are set in the plan for such enrollment growth. The focus of the master plan is on establishing a framework for growth and campus improvement through design principles; land use; an urban design framework; campus edges and gateways; circulation of vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians throughout the 126-acre campus; location of new buildings or building additions; landscaping principles; architecture; technologies; outdoor art; and additions and improvements to utilities.

To increase the percentage of students who come to campus via public transportation (about 17% today) the master plan envisions future establishment of another light-rail station at the west end of the Lawrence Street Mall and bus stops at the north end of the 10th Street Mall.

Guiding all changes to the campus is an illustrative plan showing the campus at build-out, a time beyond the scope of this plan. The illustrative plan will be used as a reference for further campus improvements.

Capital construction priorities outlined in the facilities master plan may change as academic offerings, institutional direction, or enrollments in particular programs change. AHEC officials expect to periodically update the master plan in odd-numbered years as needed. Because of the time involved in writing the facilities master plan, the first update will take place in early 2002, however. The facility needs shown below, therefore, should be regarded as subject to change.

While staff recommends approval of the plan, the lack of ties to academic planning per CCHE policy for the three institutions is noted. The Commission may wish to address this issue and the technology links to planning in its direction to the institution for its update.

Summary of Auraria Facilities Needs

Campus Priority	Project Title	Institution	Existing ASF	New ASF	Budget
Existing Needs					
	South Classroom Addition	CCD		50,000	\$12,250,000
	Science Building Addition	CCD		15,482	\$8,059,575
Phase I, 2.5% growth					
	Library Expansion	UCD	145,657	18,000	\$10,200,000
Phase II, 2.5% growth					
	Plaza Building Addition	Metro		35,000	\$ 9,800,000
	Integrated Center for Learning	AHEC		50,000	\$21,000,000 (\$2,000,000 in non-state funds)
	Research Center for Sponsored Programs	UCD		10,000	\$ 3,500,000 (\$2,500,000 in non-state funds)
	Technology Building Replacement	CCD	48,530	50,000	\$34,485,000

Source: *Auraria Facility Master Plan 2001*

II. BACKGROUND

Role and Mission

The Colorado Legislature under Section 23-70-101, Colorado Revised Statutes, established the Auraria Higher Education Center in 1970 to, among other things:

- (a) Provide for the coordination of the planning and construction of a multi-institutional higher education complex located in the city and county of Denver on land designated therefore and on land now occupied by the university of Colorado at Denver, collectively known as the Auraria higher education center and referred to in this article as the “center.”

(b) Provide for the land, physical plant, and facilities necessary to accommodate and house Metropolitan state college of Denver, the university of Colorado at Denver, and the community college of Denver, Auraria campus, referred to in this article as the “constituent institutions”, at and within the center.

History

Before the legislative action creating the Auraria campus in 1970, Metropolitan State College had operated in leased space downtown beginning in 1965. The Extension Center of the University of Colorado had leased space since the early 1900s, and was operating out of the renovated Denver Tramway Company buildings on the northeast bank of Cherry Creek in 1970. By 1967, the Community College of Denver also opened the first of three campuses near Denver’s Civic Center.

Institutional Offerings and Service Areas

The community or service area for each of the three institutions varies, in keeping with the diverse roles of its three institutions: Metropolitan State College of Denver, University of Colorado at Denver, and the Community College of Denver.

Community College of Denver, with a minority population of 50%, draws its 6,000 students largely from the six-county Denver metropolitan area. The third largest of the state-supported community colleges, it offers more than 90 programs to prepare students for new careers or transfers to four-year institutions. The programs include: two-year programs, two-year degrees and occupational certificates, remedial instruction, adult basic education, preparation for the Graduate Equivalency Diploma, and, at three non-Auraria sites, fast-track training of employees for industry. It is one of 13 state-supported colleges governed by the Board of Trustees of the Community Colleges of Colorado.

Metropolitan State College of Denver’s approximate 17,500 students come almost entirely from the Denver metropolitan area. Metro State is the largest public four-year college in the United States. It offers 49 major fields of study and 63 minors, focusing on applied, career-directed education. Its degrees include bachelors of science, fine arts, and arts through the School of Business, School of Letters, Arts and Sciences and School of Professional Studies. It offers classes at two locations off campus. The Board of Trustees of The State Colleges of Colorado governs Metropolitan State, along with Western, Adams, and Mesa state colleges.

The University of Colorado at Denver, so named and organized in 1972, began as an extension center for the University of Colorado in the early 1900s. Today it is the only public university in the City and County of Denver offering graduate degrees. UCD offers 36 undergraduate degrees, 43 master’s degrees and doctorates in public affairs, applied mathematics, health and behavioral sciences, civil engineering and educational leadership. Forty-three percent of its nearly 11,000 students are enrolled in graduate level courses. The university has seven distinct colleges: Architecture and Planning, Arts and Media, Business and Administration, Education, Engineering and Applied Sciences, Liberal Arts and Sciences, Graduate School of Public Affairs and Millennium College, a

“think tank” for UCD. The university is one of the four institutions under the jurisdiction of the Board of Regents of the University of Colorado. The others are the University of Colorado at Boulder, the Health Sciences Center, and the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs.

Recently Approved Master Plan Amendments/Program Plans

In recent years CCHE has approved:

- Classroom Building Revitalization (Arts Building), \$9,462,970 Capital Construction Funds Exempt. This project, however, was one of a number of higher education capital projects for which funding was rescinded in the General Assembly’s recent special session.

III. PROJECTED ENROLLMENT ANALYSIS

Projected Enrollment

When it opened in 1976, the Auraria campus had a full-time equivalent enrollment of about 10,000 students. Today it has an enrollment of 20,000 full-time equivalent students, or a headcount of 32,500. Most of the enrollment growth occurred in the first 10 years of its existence, and the enrollment has now stabilized, as have enrollments at many other state-supported colleges and universities in Colorado.

The following enrollment projections are based upon trends from the past 10 years and the state of Colorado’s demography for the next 10-20 years, compared against the state’s economy and market conditions:

FTE Enrollment Projections for CCD, Metro, and UCD

	Actual Fall 1999	Phase I	% Growth 1999 through Phase I	Phase II	% Growth Phase I through Phase II
CCD	2,653	2,672	0.7	2,738	2.4
Metro	11,184	11,463	2.49	11,743	2.3
UCD	6,051	6,202	2.49	6,354	2.4
Overall Ave. % Increase			1.89		2.36

Source: *Auraria Higher Education Center Facility Master Plan 2001*

The needs outlined in the master plan are based on the assumption that the campus full-time equivalent enrollment will be approximately 2.5% above what it is today for Phase I and an additional 2.5% above the Phase I level for Phase II. The chart above depicts the approximate enrollment distribution among the three institutions.

Demographic Information

Students for all three institutions generally come from the Denver metropolitan area. Data projections from the Colorado Department of Local Affairs – Demography Section indicate growth in the cohort ages 17 to 24 and between 24 and 39 (the primary age groups attending any of the three institutions) sufficient to support moderate growth in enrollment at the Auraria campus. Below is the most current student profile for all three institutions sharing the Auraria campus:

Student Profile for CCD, Metro, and UCD, 1999

	Enrollment Fall 1999*	% Undergrad	Geographic Origin	Gender	Age	Ethnicity
CCD	6,511	Undergrad, 100%	94% in-state; 6% out-of-state	58% female, 42% male	< 25, 49%; 25 and older, 51%	Non-White 51%, Other 5%, White 43%
Metro	17,152	Undergrad, 100%	98 % in-state; 2% out-of-state	56% female, 44% male	< 25, 57%; 25 and older, 43%	Non-White 24%, Other 5%, White, 71%
UCD	11,173	Undergrad, 56%	76% in-state; 24% out-of-state	54% female, male 46%	< 25, 60%; 25 and older, 40%	Non-White 28%, Other, 9% White, 63%

*Does not include extended studies students

Source: *Consumer Guide to Colorado's Higher Education Institutions 2001*, CCHE

However modest the projected enrollment increases are for Auraria, they must be weighed against the higher education enrollment forecast that the Legislative Council staff issued in June 2001. That forecast projects a compound annual average growth rate of no more than 0.7% from FY 2000-01 through FY 2005-06 for all state-supported institutions of higher learning. The breakdown among two- and four-year publicly supported institutions of higher learning is:

Colorado Higher Education FTE Projected Enrollment, FY 00-01 through FY 04-05

Types of Institutions	Compound Annual Average Growth Rate
Public 2-Year Colleges	0.5 %
Public 4-Year Colleges and Universities	0.8 %

Source: *Revenue and Economic Forecast*, Legislative Council Staff

While the Denver metropolitan area is among the fastest growing areas of the state, it's not necessarily a given that residents of the Denver area will attend one of the three institutions at Auraria. From all these reasons, enrollment increases of 2.5% in Phase I

and another 2.5% increase in Phase II would likely not occur within the six-year period this master plan would cover.

IV. FACILITIES NEEDS ANALYSIS

Goals and Objectives

The following goals and objectives guiding physical development of the Auraria campus are met in the facility master plan in the following ways:

➤ **Develop a collegiate atmosphere conducive for higher learning. Establish and continually build strong identity, legacy, and tradition with the environment.**

The plan establishes design guidelines (architecture, landscape, circulation) that will develop a park-like environment for the campus. The plan preserves facilities that are historically significant, such as the buildings along 9th Street Park, St. Cajetan's, St. Elizabeth's, Emmanuel Gallery and Tivoli. It also considers pedestrian improvements in great detail, outlining a system of minor and major pedestrian ways that will divide the campus into identifiable blocks.

➤ **Create an environment that fosters a sense of community among all programs. Improve the partnership/interface with metropolitan Denver. Strengthen the role Auraria plays within the community.**

The plan outlines ways campus "edges" along Auraria Parkway, Speer Boulevard, Colfax, and I-25 can be made safer, with clearly defined areas of vehicular and pedestrian access. It also illustrates a land-use plan that generally has academic uses in the core, with parking, administrative support, student services, and athletics toward the perimeter. Athletic uses should be moved from the athletic field along Auraria to property west of 5th Street that the campus hopes to acquire. Most of the possible extension of the campus is in the flood plain, but that location should not prevent it from being used for athletic fields. The present athletic field will remain open space. Possible partnerships with Denver metro area mentioned in the plan include: extending the Speer Boulevard underpass, creating a pedestrian underpass connecting Auraria with the Pepsi Center, and locating another light-rail station for Auraria at the west end of the Lawrence Street Mall and a Regional Transportation District bus stop at the north end of the 10th Street Mall.

➤ **Assure facilities and grounds support the programmatic role and mission of all Auraria institutions.**

The planning process described in the plan indicates that academic and programmatic needs are taken into account in refining the facilities development plan, the implementation part of the master plan. For example, the planning council that guides the master plan creation and implementation is made up of chief academic and financial officers, as well as planning and use representatives. The plan has design guidelines for future space changes and technology improvements that will not drastically alter the general appearance of the campus. At Auraria the emphasis will continue to be on landscaping and other elements to tie the different parts of the campus together, rather

than signature buildings. See the section below entitled “Academic and Information Technology Planning” for a fuller discussion.

➤ **Improve efficiency and use of limited resources in all areas of physical development and operations.**

Because additional land for the campus is not readily available (with the exception of the potential future athletic fields to the west of 5th Street), the plan advocates increasing campus density by adding additional stories or additions to existing buildings. Renovations are a priority in the facility development plan, although some new facilities are contemplated. Generally, buildings with a low facility condition index as measured by State Buildings Division are targeted for improvement in the facility development plan.

➤ **Maintain the health, safety, and well being of all users on the campus.**

Increasing the safety of all users of the campus through better access points for motorists, bicyclists, pedestrians, and users of mass transit is one of the strong points of the plan. The plan also addresses some ways the campus could be more accessible to the handicapped, such as creating “super-walks” that appear pedestrian but could be open to those who need to get closer to buildings via vehicles. Improving the efficiency of getting students from their vehicles to their classes by increasing the density of buildings in the student core is another aspect of the master plan.

Information Technology Planning

Work on the Auraria Facility Master Plan was well under way by the time CCHE revised its facility planning guidelines in April 2001 to require facility plans to incorporate academic and information technology planning. Thus, the possible impacts of information technology on facility needs are not directly addressed in this master plan. Information technology is only discussed in two sections. In one section, the plan states technologies are changing the way students are taught, which corresponds to needed space renovation to support the changes. In another, the infrastructure needs for technology (more conduits for fiber and copper to feed new buildings for voice and data infrastructure, with the possibility of voice data transfer going mostly wireless) are outlined.

The connection between information technology with facility needs should be more clearly drawn. In information submitted separately from the master plan, Auraria officials note that information technology impacts the campus in several ways. They are:

➤ **How it changes teaching and learning.** Teachers change from being primarily lecturers to being primarily facilitators in information distribution.

➤ **How it makes it possible for students to receive at least a portion of their education off campus through distance learning and via Web-based instruction.** Because of this, Auraria constructed its space model to count only on-campus credit hours or just those courses requiring students to come to campus. This way the enrollment projections only forecast the physically related

counts. The space model developed for the master planning process reacts annually to the impact of technologies to determine the quantitative facility needs.

- **Additional support space.** Information technology does not come without space needs, however. Additional service rooms, more space per student station, and slight adjustments in assignable to gross square footages are all affected. The space model for Auraria has variables that identify these issues so that the model continually reflects today's needs and the impact of technologies on the physical space on campus.
- **Utility infrastructure.** Auraria has relatively good connectivity between buildings. Technology is basically more wires, or wireless. Wireless technologies may play an important role within a building for personal use (palm platforms), but information is still better transported via a wire or fiber optics. The campus gradually has moved from coax cables installed in 1976 (when the campus officially opened) to multi-mode fiber optic cable installed in 1992 to the larger buildings on campus. Additional fiber was installed in 1992. Today the campus uses fiber optic cable for the voice and data infrastructure. Voice telecommunications also are using twisted copper cabling purchased from Mountain Bell in 1983. As the campus grows, more conduits for fiber and copper will be purchased to feed new buildings or building additions. Voice data transfers may be less dependent on hard wiring due to use of cellular. If that becomes the case, space in the conduits would be used for more data lines.

Academic Planning

The plan shows that chief academic officers are on the planning council that initiated the master planning process and is charged with overseeing its implementation. In later information submitted to CCHE, Auraria officials stated that establishing a strong link to its academic planning process was among the most difficult tasks. The reference manual part of the master plan was used to gather information about the academic offerings. Because all three institutions regard AHEC as the landlord of buildings and space, AHEC cannot drive academic planning issues. The reference manual takes varying academic planning processes and attempts to bring consistency to the very diverse types of institutional plans. Although the information provided is very sketchy, it is the first time facilities plans have been driven at all by academic programs. AHEC intends to improve the relationship between facilities and academic planning in subsequent updates of the master plan. The two priorities for the next updating cycle are to strengthen the justification of the Facilities Development Plan (the implementation of the master plan) and improve the link with academic planning.

One of the principle reasons for creating Auraria was to enable multiple use of state facilities by three campuses. Elimination of duplication of resources and efforts is a key component of the framework. Greater coordination of academic planning among the three institutions could better facilitate higher and more efficient use of the campus. Program emphasis and expansions need to be coordinated with facility needs more clearly. Office needs and potential student service resource combinations could be explored.

From the information presented, AHEC seems to be moving toward establishing a better link between facilities and academic planning. But that link is largely missing from the master plan. Staff believes the Commission should consider requiring a stronger connection between this plan and the three institutional academic plans in future updates.

Student Housing and Conference Space

The section on planning assumptions states that housing is needed for a few select programs, such as Metro State's approximate 75 athletes and University of Colorado at Denver's approximate 200 international students. The campus doesn't plan to build such housing on campus because of space and statutory constraints. State statute prevents Auraria from becoming a residential campus. However, the campus is willing to work with private developers to provide such housing off campus through leasing or partnerships. The housing should be within walking distance of the campus or located on a transportation corridor close to light rail or a bus line. Metro State believes its inability to provide or find affordable housing for student athletes is making it difficult to compete to enroll those athletes with other colleges that can offer housing. The policy question, however, is whether that is sufficient reason to justify a joint housing project, whether public or private. Finally, the University of Colorado at Denver also has identified the need for housing for international students, and expects this need to grow.

Staff believes that while seeking a third-party developer to build student housing is more reasonable than building the housing itself, it is still difficult to reconcile with AHEC's chief role as a commuter campus. Encroachment on residential neighborhoods south of campus could prove a sore point with the community, which has long resented the eviction of families to make way for Auraria in the 1970s. The AHEC institutions could seek alternatives to creating separate housing by developing closer working partnerships with existing multi-unit residential developers in the city.

Another planning assumption is that Auraria will work to create a conference center that may include housing for visiting clients, faculty, and others. Using the Denver Convention Center across the campus off Speer Boulevard is not a workable option for AHEC. That's because space at the Denver Convention Center is usually booked years in advance and has high costs for rentals, catering and insurance. AHEC, on the other hand, believes it needs conference space quickly and for smaller groups such as visiting faculty, guest lecturers, daily events and student organizations. A conference center on campus would not preclude AHEC from using nearby hotels and Denver Convention Center for events planned some time in advance.

Staff also questions this planning assumption. There is ample space for large gatherings with the completion of the theater/fine arts facility. Nearby hotel space is readily available. Existing historical buildings have small meeting spaces. The Denver Center for Performing Arts is a possibility for arranging multiple use partnerships. Although such a facility likely would be operated as an auxiliary enterprise, staff would point out that the land resource of this campus is finite and uses of this type are non-student centered.

Consolidating Course Offerings

The titles of courses all three institutions offer indicate some courses must be offered at the same times and perhaps in the same buildings. For example, Community College of Denver has an English Language and Literature Department, Metro State an English section in the Humanities Department, and UCD an English Department. Institutions that offer the same titled courses at the same times in the same buildings could improve building efficiency — and possibly reduce some facility needs — by consolidating courses. This is particularly true when the same subject is taught in several different classrooms at the same time in classrooms too large for the enrollment. AHEC officials note that although a course title may sound the same, it may be offered to people with varying degrees of preparation. A UCD student taking English from CCD may not be sufficiently challenged; a CCD student taking English from UCD may not be able to keep up. AHEC, which has the responsibility of scheduling classes, challenges apparent overlaps. Auraria offers about 1,700 pooled courses that are open to students from all three institutions and for which students receive credit from their home institution. To students, these are often seamless shared resources. Developing a process for regular assessment of this issue among the Auraria institutions that involves the facility manager is, from CCHE staff's perspective, an important element to the integration of academic planning.

Space Utilization

CCHE space utilization guidelines suggest that classrooms be in use 60 hours a week on a seven-day week. According to the facility master plan, average classroom use is 49 hours per week, with some rooms being used as much as 80 hours per week. Many facilities are open seven days a week and throughout the evening. Although space utilization at Auraria is the highest among higher education facilities in Colorado, increasing the utilization rates for credit-hour-producing uses would be impossible because of the need for space for such uses as project meetings, staff meetings, presentations, juries, tests, additional class meeting times, class preparation time, student organizations, faculty training sessions, professional development workshops, guest speakers, janitorial time, and other purposes. All three institutions decided that 40 credit-producing hours per week Monday through Friday during the work week would be a reasonable goal for the space model used in calculating space needs.

Percentage of Land Use

Currently, Auraria's land uses are divided this way:

- Parking, 40%
- Academic, 30%
- Athletic, 13%
- Administrative Support, 12%
- Student Services, 5%

The percentage of land devoted to parking is not surprising, given the commuter status of the campus. However, the percentage of land devoted to parking would decrease over time due to the gradual replacement of many parking lots with multi-use structures for parking, academic, and support functions.

Campus Expansion/Plans for Athletics

As mentioned previously in this analysis, Auraria intends to expand the campus to the west for athletic purposes. The intent of such an expansion is to provide room for more academic uses in the central core by moving athletic facilities and fields farther west. The precise acreage or anticipated addition to the campus isn't stated in the master plan. The plan correctly doesn't see a need for creating separate fields or athletic facilities for each institution. The existing National Collegiate Athletics Association sanctioned sports that Metro State offers are the only competitive sports that will be housed on campus. The sports are: men's and women's baseball, men's and women's soccer, men's and women's swimming and diving, men's and women's tennis, and women's volleyball. Community College of Denver and the University of Colorado at Denver are considering supporting men's and women's basketball some time in the future. Whatever sports CCD and UCD support would be limited to sports that can use existing facilities. In the student core, the existing academic sport and recreation programs will take precedence over competitive sports.

Building Stock

As of September 1, 2000, Auraria's building stock of 2,116,089 gross square feet and 1,433,692 assignable square feet consisted of the following:

- Classroom 143,409 asf
- Lab 303,283 asf
- Offices 458,708 asf
- Study 117,009 asf
- Special Use 92,344 asf
- General Use 205,347 asf
- Support 108,511 asf
- Health 2,050 asf
- Non-assignable 2,941 asf

Except for buildings that were on site before Auraria campus was built, most Auraria buildings were constructed in the 1970s, when the philosophy was to provide as much space for as little money as possible. More than 20 years later, building components are rapidly deteriorating. According to an illustrated map of building conditions, only two buildings are in acceptable condition today: the King Center for Academic and Performing Arts and the newly constructed Administration Building. The other buildings fall into these classifications:

- Remodeling needed, 69%
- Major Maintenance, 14%
- Extensive Renovation, 8%

Auraria's Facilities Management performs a physical audit on each of its buildings. Every three years, a team of facilities experts reviews building conditions and then a Facility Condition Index is calculated using the analysis completed for each building component. (Generally, a FCI of less than 76 for a building indicates its deterioration is advanced.) Using this information, campus planners and facilities personnel can evaluate actual building needs with program needs. Immediate maintenance or repair needs are incorporated into the Facilities Development Plan. High-priority projects are requested for funding through the State's Controlled Maintenance Fund. Near future needs are usually combined with high-priority program needs. This results in a building revitalization approach that updates buildings both physically and programmatically. Auraria intends to develop a complete Building Revitalization Plan for all its buildings.

Auraria submitted to CCHE after the master plan submittal a copy of the Five-Year Controlled Maintenance Program Plan that also went to State Buildings for FY 02-03. The plan indicates Auraria is seeking \$17,565,414 through FY 06-07 in controlled maintenance funding for 15 projects.

This indicates that considerable state money — from both the Controlled Maintenance Fund and Capital Construction Fund — will need to be spent on Auraria maintenance and updating.

Auxiliary vs. General Fund Buildings

Of the 54 buildings on campus, 22 are auxiliary-funded buildings or structures. The auxiliary structures are:

- Child Care
- Child Care Storage
- Reprographics and Distribution
- 15 parking huts
- Parking Kiosk
- Parking and Transportation Center
- Parking Storage
- Tivoli Student Union

Leased vs. Owned Spaces

In addition to the 1,430,751 asf of owned space, Auraria as of September 1, 2000, also leased 204,890 assignable square feet. The leased space was used for these purposes:

Classrooms	6,125 asf
Labs	30,523 asf

Office	119,160 asf
Study	1,180 asf
General Use	6,804 asf
Support	621 asf
Non-assignable	933 asf

One of the planning assumptions is that Auraria will only consider leasing space for programs that should be located on campus when the needs are likely short range or no other options are available. UCD, the institution at Auraria with the largest amount of leased space, estimates it leases about 20% of its space for programmatic reasons; the rest is leased because of the lack of space on campus.

Space Planning

Auraria developed a space-planning model for this master plan that facilities staff will use to test a variety of planning scenarios and project facility impacts due to programmatic changes under consideration. The model is people-driven and based on the amount of space needed per person for various functions. Instead of using CCHE space utilization guidelines or national standards, Auraria developed its own guidelines to more closely reflect how its campus operates. The model indicated the following space deficits:

Auraria Space Deficits, Existing and Projected in ASF

	Total	CCD	Metro	UCD	Auraria	General Space
Existing	230,217	0	120,411	50,761	0	103,732
Phase I	273,858	0	132,564	62,821	9,454	111,590
Phase II	325,482	0	145,881	74,881	18,990	120,322

Source: *Auraria Facility Master Plan 2001*

Breakdown of Total Auraria ASF Space Deficits/Surpluses

	Existing	Phase I (2.5% FTE growth)*	Phase II (2.5% additional FTE growth)
Classrooms	(18,474)	(22,258)	(26,449)
Laboratories	(28,209)	(37,270)	(46,842)
Office/Conf.	6,504	(8,302)	(24,093)
Library/Study	(1,431)	(2,337)	(3,388)
Athletic/Clinic	(53,521)	(56,374)	(59,454)
General Use	(26,833)	(39,062)	(51,771)
Shop/Storage	(16,027)	(13,796)	(16,795)
Health Care	(2,950)	(2,950)	(2,950)
Housing	(89,277)	(91,741)	(93,741)

*Includes leases

Source: *Auraria Facility Master Plan 2001*

The space model can be easily adjusted as conditions or assumptions change or to test certain planning scenarios. Auraria’s space model lends itself well to the often-fluid world in which higher education is more and more finding itself operating. Staff would point out that given Auraria’s commuter-campus role, inclusion of a housing component in the model creates an impression of a significant need that currently is outside the scope of the institution and thus exaggerates space deficits. More detail on the modeling calculations for athletic and clinical deficit assumptions would also be beneficial.

Parking/Parking Structures

The map of current needs shows two parking structures that would be operated as auxiliary enterprises. Since work on the master plan began, however, the pressing need for parking has lessened. Auraria officials attribute the decline in parking demand as a reflection of several factors: the increased use of light-rail among students, who pay only \$17 a semester for a light-rail pass; the increased use of bus passes among Auraria faculty and staff; and a change in class scheduling that inadvertently evened out parking-lot usage over the week. In addition, Auraria officials also concluded the campus lacks sufficient money to build the multi-use structures.

However, if additional parking becomes a necessity, Auraria intends to build multi-use structures that would combine parking with offices or other purposes. Bonds probably would have to be sold to finance the improvements and the reserves and revenues would be used to pay off the bonds. It usually takes 20 years to pay back bonds on parking structures. Parking needs would not be the only driver, however. Demand for more space for academic needs could force the campus to build a parking structure to free up land for other purposes. The master plan shows various strategies for creating parking spaces with a net gain of 1,969 spaces. This is considered sufficient to serve a student population of 36,525-37,025 plus required faculty and staff.

Sponsored Research

The planning assumptions part of the master plan states that research activity over the past five years at the University of Colorado at Denver has grown 15%. The majority of sponsored research at UCD is within the School of Education, College of Engineering, International Training Academy, College of Liberal Arts, and the Academic and Student Affairs Office. Future research growth at UCD is expected in the same disciplines and at approximately the same rate. Believing that research contributes to professional growth of faculty, administration and staff, Metro State has a goal of increasing research 2-3% per year in the next decade. Space for sponsored research usually is provided in leased spaces because the need fluctuates as grants fluctuate. Some research is performed in academic laboratory space if it is carried out largely as an important component of student, hands-on, laboratory education. The UCD Center for Sponsored Research would only be built if research money were sufficient to support all but \$1,000,000 of the total \$3.5 million project. State capital resources generally are not allocated for research facilities.

V. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends the Commission approve the Auraria Facility Master Plan 2001 with these conditions:

- 1. Auraria provide to CCHE an analysis of the academic plans for all three institutions — University of Colorado at Denver, Metropolitan State College of Denver, and Community College of Denver — and the implications of those academic plans on facility needs for the next update of the master plan scheduled in early 2002.**
- 2. Auraria present to CCHE a summary of the information technology master plans for all three institutions — the University of Colorado at Denver, Metropolitan State College of Denver, and Community College of Denver — and an assessment of the impact of information technology on facility needs for the next update of the master plan scheduled in early 2002.**
- 3. Auraria reassess its housing planning assumptions and its conference center space assumptions in its revisions as well as further justify the inclusion of these space need assumptions within its space model in the next update of the plan.**

STATUTORY AUTHORITY:

23-1-106. Duties and powers of the commission with respect to capital construction and long-range planning. (1) It is declared to be the policy of the general assembly not to authorize or to acquire sites or initiate any program or activity requiring capital construction for state-supported institutions of higher education unless approved by the commission.

(2) The commission shall, after consultation with the appropriate governing boards of the state-supported institutions of higher education and the appropriate state administrative agencies, have authority to prescribe uniform policies, procedures, and standards of space utilization for the development and approval of capital construction programs by institutions.

(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.

TOPIC: RED ROCKS COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACILITY MASTER PLAN

PREPARED BY: LAUREEN FERRIS AND JEANNE ADKINS

I. SUMMARY

Red Rocks Community College (RRCC) submitted its master plan to the Commission for review in May 2001. Data collection began in 1998, the base statistical year, and attempts to forecast needs and growth for a 15-year period extending to the year 2013.

The plan looks at requirements for all four Red Rocks campuses – Lakewood, the main campus, the Arvada campus, the Mountain Center located in Conifer High School, and the Health Careers Center, which is housed in leased space from Exempla, Inc., in Wheat Ridge. The three satellite campuses were established to bring services closer to the communities and to provide easier access to the ever-growing population within the extensive service area of RRCC.

The entire service area includes four counties: Jefferson, Park, Gilpin and Clear Creek. The majority of students primarily come from Jefferson County, and all but a few come from within the region. The master plan is presented for Commission review and approval. However, the Commission may wish to consider how this master plan co-exists with the Community Colleges of Colorado's overall plan for emphasis at each of the metropolitan institutions. That issue is not addressed in the Red Rocks plan.

II. BACKGROUND

In 1967, the Colorado Legislature created the community college system for the state. Red Rocks Community College began that year as the West Campus of the Community College of Denver. In 1968, three new campuses were approved and the Lakewood Campus of RRCC opened in 1969 with 780 students. Today, RRCC has four campuses with a 1998 population of 8,031 total students.

Jefferson County is the second fastest growing county in the region, and that rapid growth has been reflected in the increased enrollment at RRCC in the past 10 years. Enrollment has grown from 5,000 to 8,100, or by 62% in 10 years for an average of more than 5% annually. The Red Rocks master plan forecasts a slower growth rate of 2.5% from 2000 to 2013. The analysis currently projects that 85% of the growth will occur on the Lakewood Campus.

The Mountain Center and Health Careers Center are small campuses and significant space changes can occur with small student population shifts. A shift in emphasis, dropping or completion of a class section, all contribute, so it is hard to forecast growth

for these facilities. Fortunately, both centers have the ability to be flexible in size and nature and can accommodate the rapid changes.

The Arvada Campus is the largest of three satellite campuses. The headcount from 1992 to 1998 has increased by an average of 13% annually, with some of the largest increases in the first few years it began. Currently the headcount is between 1,300 and 1,400. The high growth rate has been attributed to a large population growth in the area, the construction of new facilities and providing programs that meet the immediate needs of the community.

The Arvada campus is unlikely to experience a major growth increase in the next few years since the neighborhood itself is not growing. The population could swing toward a younger demographic that has new or continuing educational needs, which could be handled by a shift in program emphasis.

The decision that 85% of the service area population growth should or will be handled at the Lakewood campus should be reviewed carefully since it is the foundation of Red Rocks' plan. Lakewood proper is not a growing community, but the enormous growth in Jefferson County is the resource from which Red Rocks anticipates the population growth on the campus will come over the next 10 years. The location is convenient for commuting from outlying areas of growth in Jefferson County, but it is not central to the actual expansion area. In some cases, Arapahoe Community College is actually closer in terms of commuter miles to potential students. Arapahoe does offer classes in south Jefferson County. Service to the three outlying mountain counties also is an issue. While growth there in terms of raw numbers may not seem as significant when compared to Jefferson County, these counties' proximity to the metro area could alter that circumstance quickly.

The Master Plan does an excellent job in researching the historic population growth patterns within the service areas for RRCC. The data are used to forecast the future needs of the campus, and although it anticipates a larger percentage of growth than is generally anticipated for Colorado, the historical data for the service area definitely support the assumptions. The background section of this analysis presents a summary form of the numerical data used to develop and forecast the future growth.

III. REGION AND SERVICE AREA

Red Rocks Community College is located within a large service area. It is currently a desirable place to live with land and population densities that will accommodate significant growth through the year 2013.

Service Area Population:

- Over the last 10 years, both the region and service area have experienced considerable growth in population with an annual growth rate ranging between 1% and 5%.

- Between 1988 and 1998, headcount enrollment at the Lakewood Campus has increased at a rate of 5% per year.
- The population in the service area is typically young, white-collar and middle class – a population that generally values higher education and training.
- RRCC has attracted a diverse student body with the percentage of minorities increasing from 10% to 15%.

Regional Data:

The concise Red Rocks Community College Service Area consists of:

- Jefferson County, a 772-square-mile suburban county west of Denver.
- Three mountain counties, Park, Clear Creek, and Gilpin, which have a total of 2,748 square miles.
- In addition to the main campus, the Mountain Center in Conifer serves rural mountain counties outside the Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA).
- Arvada Campus serves northern Jefferson County. There are no other institutions of higher education within the counties used to describe the RRCC Service Area.
- In 2000, a total of 555,688 people lived in the Red Rocks Community College Service Area encompassing 3,520 square miles.
- Jefferson County claims 527,056 citizens, while 28,632 constituents reside in the remaining three counties.
- Gilpin, Park and Clear Creek are designated rural counties with between 6 and 30 residents per square mile.

Service Area Population and Land Area

County	Population 1990	Population 2000	Population Increase	Percent increase	Sq. Miles Per	2000 Pop Per Sq. Mile
Park	7,174	14,533	7,349	102.4%	2,201	6.6
Clear Creek	7,619	9,322	1,703	22.4%	396	23.54
Gilpin	3,070	4,757	1,687	55%	151	31.5
Jefferson	438,430	527,056	88,626	20.2%	772	682.72
Totals	456,293	555,688	99,395	21.8	3,520	157.86

Data provided by the U.S. Bureau of the Census

Colorado Growth, High School Graduates, and RRCC Growth Rate:

- According to the U.S. Census (years 1990 and 2000), Colorado (30.6%) was the third fastest growing state in the country.
- Colorado ranked eighth in total population growth increasing from 3,294,394 to 4,301,261.
- Of this number, 555,641 or 55% moved to the Denver Metropolitan Region.
- The U.S. Census Bureau is predicting an increase in Colorado of more than 1 million people by 2015 and another 400,000 by 2025.
- Between 1990 and 2000, the region grew from approximately 1,859,000 to 2,414,649, an increase of 555,641 people, or a 29.9% increase over that 10-year time period.

- As of January 1, 1998, the region contained 916,500 households, a growth of nearly 174,000 households since 1990.
- The number of households has been growing at a rate of 2.9%, slightly faster than the annual average population growth rate of 2.4 %.
- According to figures produced from 1999 Colorado Education Facts, enrollment in high schools has increased by 10% from 1996 to 1999.
- Numbers of Colorado's high school graduates, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics' Current Population Survey, are predicted to increase by 33% between 1996 and 2008.
- Statistics show that not only is the number of high school graduates increasing, but the percentage of new high school graduates attending RRCC is also increasing.
- The Red Rocks service area population increased from 456,293 to 555,688 between 1990 and 2000, a 21.8% increase or an increase of 99,395 residents.

Jefferson County

Jefferson County remains the second largest populated county in the state. From 1990 to 2000, the Jefferson County population grew from 438,430 to 527,056, an increase of 88,626. Population growth in Jefferson County is primarily a result of migration. The U.S. Census Bureau has completed projections of how much Colorado will grow between 2000 and 2025. Numbers below also indicate demographic groups from which growth resulted between 1990 and 1999.

	Jefferson Co 1990-99	Colorado 1990-99	Colorado 2000-25
Births	60,432	513,908	1,855,000
Deaths	25,243	225,699	1,122,000
Migration: from within the U.S.	32,530	402,832	504,000
Immigration from other Countries	4,767	65,380	123,000

The data show the most significant growth comes from births and migration from other states. The migration from other countries is also increasing. Migration patterns are a factor in community college programming. Generally Colorado's immigration is from Mexico.

- The population in unincorporated Jefferson County increased from 142,138 in 1990 to 187,689 in 2000, an increase of 45,551 people.
- In Jefferson County, from 1997 to 1998, the number of households increased from 199,450 to 205,350, an increase of 5,900 households or 3% per year.
- From 1990-98 households increased from 166,545 to 205,359, or a 2.9% increase per year.

Clear Creek County

- Clear Creek County grew from 8,650 in 1997 to 8,750 in 1998 for a 1.2% population increase.
- From 1990-00 the county grew from 7,619 to 9,322 for a 22.4% population increase.
- From 1997 to 1998 the number of households increased from 3,750 to 3,850, or a 2.7% increase.
- From 1990 to 1998 the number of households increased from 3,153 to 3,850, a 2.8% increase.

Gilpin County

- Gilpin County grew from 3,070 in 1997 to 4,757 in 2,000 for a 55% population increase.
- There were 1,900 households in the county in both 1997 and 1998.
- From 1990 to 1998 the number of households increased from 1,308 to 1,900, an increase of 592 households, or a 5.7% increase during that time period.

Park County

- From 1990 to 2000 Park County grew from 7,174 to 14,533, a 102.4% population increase.

Denver Metropolitan Region

- Between 1990 and 2000, the region grew from approximately 1,859,000 to 2,414,649, an increase of 555,641 people, or a 29.9% increase over the 10-year time period.
- As of January 1, 1998, the region contained 916,500 households, a growth of nearly 174,000 households since 1990.
- The number of households has been growing at a rate of 2.9%, slightly faster than the annual average population growth rate of 2.4 %. This difference results from a decline in the number of people per household from 2.46 in 1990 to 2.40 in 1998.

Red Rocks Community College - Campus Student Profile

- In 1989, the majority of Red Rocks Community College students were between 18 and 34 with a median age of 33.
- In 1999 the median student age dropped to 29 due to the increasing enrollment of current and recent high school students.
- The typical student was enrolled for seven credits and 15% of all the students held a bachelor's degree or higher.
- Between 1988 and 1996 the percentage of minority students enrolled at Red Rocks Community College increased from 10% to 15%.
- During the same period the percentage of full-time students increased from 20% to 25%.

Projection Process

Student enrollment projections were based on a combination of data such as past population and household growth in the service area and region, and past growth in headcount and FTE at RRCC. High school graduation rates were calculated and physical condition and economic growth in the community were considered. Data were obtained from U.S. Census data, CCHE, DRCOG, high schools, other community colleges and counties in the service area.

Total student headcount is expected to increase 2.5% per year from 1998 to 2013. In 1998, RRCC had a total of 8,031 students, 450 faculty and 173 staff. Future projections are:

Students

- **1998 to 2003: 13% total growth over 5 years** $8,031 \times 1.13 = 9,075$ total students
 1,044 new students
- **1998 to 2008: 28% total growth over 10 years** $8,031 \times 1.28 = 10,280$ total students
 2,249 new students
- **1998 to 2013: 45% total growth over 15 years** $8,031 \times 1.45 = 11,645$ total students
 3,614 new students

Faculty

- **1998 to 2003: 13% total growth over 5 years** $450 \times 1.13 = 509$ total faculty **59** new faculty
- **1998 to 2008: 28% total growth over 10 years** $450 \times 1.28 = 576$ total faculty **126** new faculty
- **1998 to 2013: 45% total growth over 15 years** $450 \times 1.45 = 653$ total faculty **203** new faculty

Staff

- **1998 to 2003: 13% total growth over 5 years** $173 \times 1.13 = 195$ total staff **22** new staff
- **1998 to 2008: 28% total growth over 10 years** $173 \times 1.28 = 221$ total staff **48** new staff
- **1998 to 2013: 45% total growth over 15 years** $173 \times 1.45 = 251$ total staff **78** new staff

Projected Growth Rate

A variety of data sources were used to determine the 2.5% projected growth rate. Different data produced different results. In each situation a straight-line projection was used, and each projection was based on the last 10 years of growth for the type of data used. The results were:

RRCC Statistics 1988 to 1998

- Total Campus Fall FTE: 1,300 to 1,921 = 621 increase 4.1% projected growth
- Total Campus Headcount: 5,000 to 8,100 = 3,100 increase 5.0% projected growth

Census Data

- Jefferson County Households 166,545 to 209,200 = 42,655 increase 2.3% projected growth

- Jefferson County Population 438,430 to 520,750 = 82,320 increase 1.8% projected growth

Average Growth per year

- Total Campus Fall FTE: 62
- Total Campus fall Headcount: 310
- Jefferson County Households 4,266
- Jefferson County Population 8,860

Data indicate that each time the Jefferson County population and number of households increases by approximately 2%, the Red Rocks population increases by 5%. Based on these numbers, a straight-line projection would yield a 5% rate of growth for RRCC. However, the campus determined a more conservative 2.5% growth rate was a valid planning target given other factors influencing enrollment.

Population Growth Rate on Campus – Historical Ratios

The Master Plan assumes a growth rate of 2.5% and it assumes the population growth slows to .8% per year in Jefferson County, which has a current population of just over 527,000. Combined, the Lakewood and Arvada campuses realized one new student for each 33 additional residents in the county.

Using this same ratio and assuming the service area percentage increase is cut in half from 22% to 11% over the next 10 years there should be an increase of 1,852 students solely because of population growth in Jefferson County. A high-end estimate would yield a 3,000-student increase.

Using these historical statistics to derive an FTE calculation, projections for FTE would increase 2,252 (low estimate) and 3,400 (high estimate) through 2010. The master plan calculation of a 2.5% increase per year produces a projection of 2,700 students.

Number of Students in Jefferson County Public Schools (1998)

The plan assumes that larger graduating classes will produce greater numbers of students enrolling at RRCC. Statistics show more 9th graders will be graduating in 2002. Along with the conclusions from the high school capture rate, the indication is that a greater percentage of high school graduates would attend RRCC.

Jefferson County projections show the number of people per age group is as follows:

Population by Age Group in Jefferson County

Age Group	Population in Year 1990	Population in Year 2000	Difference Between Age Groups over 10 years	Difference Between Age Groups within Year 2000
-----------	-------------------------	-------------------------	---	--

10-14	28,203	34,300	+6,063	+5,200
15-19	23,399	29,100	-337	+3,200
20-24	26,491	25,900	-576	-3,860
25-29	30,777	29,760	-1017	-3,100
30-34	39,674	32,800	-6,857	

The table shows both a decline and rise in the population age groups most closely related to median age at RRCC. This will likely result in stable or declining enrollment for the next couple of years followed by a significant increase in enrollment. These numbers support the conclusions in the plan.

Construction of owner-occupied housing units over the last 50 years is another strong indicator of growth in the service area. The example below is indicative of other statistics used to support projections for growth in the service area. The percentages below show the average increase in population during each 10-year period studied.

Increase per Year in Owner Occupied Units Over 50 Years

1950's	1960's	1970's	1980's	1990's
19.6%	10.2%	8.9%	3.0%	3.0%

This trend shows a peak in the 1950s but strong, consistent annual growth of 3.0% over the past 20 years. This is typical of rapid suburban development followed by stabilization. All indicators studied, such as location, economics, and building condition, indicate a continuation of this trend.

Some trends actually support higher enrollment projections such as an increasing percentage of high school students and senior citizens attending community colleges, increased partnering with community interest groups, and increasing percentages of FTE compared to headcount. However, multiple community colleges serve the metro area with some overlap in programming and while proximity is important, students sometimes choose to attend schools near worksites versus near their homes.

Based on the above information, RRCC uses a supportable planning rate of 2.5% growth per year for the 15 years between 1998 and 2013. Using the enrollment of 8,031 students in 1998, projections are for 9,075 students in 2003, 10,280 in 2008, and 11,645 in 2013.

IV. STAFF ANALYSIS

I. Existing Facilities

Section 5 of the Master Plan outlines the quantity and quality of the existing space, using it as a basis for determining future facility needs to meet forecasted growth. Generally, the main building on the Lakewood campus has an average Facilities Condition Index rating of 70.34. (State Buildings defines that range as Major Maintenance: recurring need to keep in good repair. Building systems or components, which have known maintenance

cycles of greater than one year). The Campus' remote buildings have ratings as low as 51.50 (Extensive Renovation: Major replacement, alteration, or upgrading of building systems or components necessitated by facility obsolescence), making it more important that RRCC incorporate major controlled maintenance decisions within its strategic planning.

The Master Plan includes a five-year controlled maintenance plan that begins to target areas within the main building for remodeling and lists the remote buildings targeted for replacement and/or demolition after new projects are built. It will be important, as new building requests come in over the next 10 years, that CCHE monitor the progress RRCC makes in accomplishing these goals. Failure to address this issue could result in significant impacts to students.

The following chart indicates the existing assignable square footage of each campus. This data is important in reviewing the decision to expand the Lakewood Campus to handle the forecasted population growth.

Estimated Gross Square Feet of Building

Campus	Assign. Sq. Feet	Leased Sq. Feet	Gross Sq. Feet
Lakewood	228,220 asf		349,200 gsf
Arvada	15,979 asf		20,000 gsf
Mountain Center (Conifer)		5,000 asf	7,700 gsf
Health Careers Center		7,676 lsf	11,700 gsf

The Lakewood Campus has one primary building, which is long, low (one to three stories), and designed to be sympathetic to the site. Programs are linearly arranged along a major corridor, which acts as an interior pedestrian street. During the last 20 years, the Lakewood Campus has received minimal funding for capital construction. Exceptions have been \$9 million for the Learning Resource Center and \$3,200,000 for student facilities space. The additions have been a considerable improvement to the facility, and Red Rocks officials believe the projects have been a factor in continued high enrollments.

The Arvada Campus was established in 1990 with nine general-purpose classrooms, a computer classroom and a Learning Resource Center. Over the last three years, Red Rocks Community College has operated the Arvada campus site out of temporary classroom facilities using 10,080 gross square feet. In January 2000 the College opened a new \$4,400,000 facility funded with state capital construction money. It has approximately 20,000 gsf and 15,979 asf. In the past, the Arvada Campus enrollment has been approximately 320 FTE. With the new facility, enrollment is expected to increase to over 400 FTE in 2000-01.

The Mountain Center at Conifer High School began in 1990 as a satellite to Red Rocks Community College. They have had a unique arrangement with Conifer High

School and Jefferson County Schools to provide college-level courses to this area. The college holds most of its classes at night and on weekends when the high school is not in session. In exchange for the facility usage, the college participates in the school district technology lease program, which equips the school with several computer classrooms/laboratories. RRCC currently uses approximately 10 classrooms and has assigned space for student support services. The Mountain Center enrollment is approximately 50 FTE in approximately 5,000 leaseable square feet.

The Health Careers Center's programs were established in 1997, and occupy a leased area totaling 7,676 square feet at the Lutheran Medical Center. Programs offered include Medical Office, Medical Assisting, RN Refresher, Continuing Education for Nurses, Radiological Technology, Physician Assistant, and Certified Nursing Assistant. The Health Careers Program has not generated predicted enrollment since moving to this facility. The college believes it would be better to move the Health Careers Center back to the main campus where it would be closer to the existing science laboratories and classrooms. Space does not currently exist on the main campus to accommodate the actual health classes, however, RRCC believes the move is important enough to try to make it work with some minor remodeling.

II. Academic Program Planning

Section 6 of the Master Plan begins outlining the objectives for the future of the academic programs. It outlines a number of areas that Red Rocks hopes to improve on or expand. Red Rocks Community College is currently finalizing its strategic planning effort called Red Rocks 2005. This college- and community-wide collaborative process will produce a plan that will be reviewed and revised annually. Some specific areas being identified for attention by the planning committees are academic advising and new student orientation, staff professional development and technology use.

Between 1989 and 1998 78 of the Red Rocks Community College programs were evaluated. Of these programs, it was found that 40% of the RRCC programs increased enrollments by 100%. Thirty-four of the 78 programs (44%) require specialized spaces for instruction as opposed to generic classrooms. Such a statistic is a strong indicator of a need for building renovation. Space inefficiencies are likely to result as RRCC tries to cope with significantly changing enrollments. The need for specialized spaces doesn't undermine the need or goal of providing generic space for multiple program uses. The creation and utilization of generic space, when possible, should always be the first priority.

The following are 14 of the fastest growing programs at Red Rocks Community College. As noted below, nine of the 14 programs require specialized space.

Program	1989	1990	1992	1994	1996	1998	Change
Special Space							
Air, Heat. & Ref.	4.8	6.4	17.1	35.5	92.1	89.2	766.7%
App. Carpentry	5.2	6.3	10.0	8.8	16.0	19.2	269.2%

App. Electrical	9.4	8.0	8.5	17.7	24.4	26.7	183.6%
Eng. Graphics Arch.	2.4	4.0	5.5	5.9	7.2	7.6	216.7%
Geography	9.0	13.7	24.7	30.8	29.6	29.2	224.4%
Health Occupations	6.0	4.1	13.1	31.1	32.3	31.3	421.0%
Music	8.0	9.5	13.6	28.6	41.7	38.8	385.4%
Physical Education	10.7	11.5	13.1	33.6	21.0	31.6	194.8%
Theater	6.5	9.0	16.5	17.3	16.2	22.1	241.0%
Generic Space							
Business	22.1	25.5	55.7	61.4	64.3	114.6	419.4%
Geography	9.0	13.7	24.7	30.8	29.6	29.2	224.4%
Health Occupations	6.0	4.1	13.1	31.1	32.3	31.3	421.0%
Philosophy	19.2	28.2	50.6	78.6	84.7	103.2	437.5%
Sociology	36.7	47.9	53.7	67.3	73.2	92.3	151.8%

The following are programs with declining FTE. Programs are eliminated on a case-by-case basis as FTE enrollment declines. A program may be kept longer if it is only taught in this location. This growth and decline in programs coincides with community needs, but the process results in lower efficiencies for room use plus a greater need for flexible space. It is possible that many of the programs below have already been eliminated.

Declining Programs by FTE

Program	1989	1990	1992	1994	1996	1998	Change
Eng. Graphics Tech.	51.7	57.7	45.1	47.9	38.7	29.7	-42.5%
German	11.9	10.8	11.9	9.4	4.2	6.9	-42.9%
Hydraulic Tech.	16.7	14.6	11.9	11.8	0.0	0.0	-100.0%
Journalism	2.6	3.0	.02	0.0	1.8	0.0	-100.0%
Sm. Business Mgt.	9.6	15.9	4.7	6.6	7.2	6.7	-30.2%
Solar Energy Tech.	4.6	5.8	6.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	-100.0%
Surveying	18.8	14.4	6.4	0.7	0.0	0.0	-100.0%
Water Quality Mgt.	28.0	37.9	38.3	29.8	27.0	15.3	-45.5%

III. Space Needs Analysis

Section 7 in the master plan is an overview of the findings from reviewing the space needs for all the existing programs. The plan establishes square footage goals for every full-time student and applies the requirement to the projected need. Again, the growth pattern is fully substantiated in previous sections, and the footage requirements follow closely with those projections.

Requirements at the **Arvada Campus** are currently met with the available square footage, and it is only forecasted to need 5,850 square feet of additional assignable space. The campus currently has 15,979 square feet and projects a need of 21,829 square feet by

the year 2013. This projection should be carefully evaluated once a request is made. Arvada is not a growing or expanding community, and building permanent facilities at this campus should be part of the overall community college system's needs assessment for the metro area. This need might be met more efficiently with leased space. The forecasted population assessment indicating a need for increased facilities at this campus may not be permanent but rather a transitory requirement.

The requirement for leased space is projected to be sufficient until the year 2013 when an increased need for 5,704 new square feet is projected. The current total space leased is 12,676 square feet with a year 2013 projection of 18,380 square feet.

The **Lakewood Campus's** needs analysis is much different. Based upon current enrollment counts, the existing facility has 228,220 assignable square feet and is projected to more than double in size by the year 2013. Red Rocks has calculated the current deficit to be 15,174 asf. The need lies mostly in the areas of general office space and specialty classroom labs with the largest lab deficit occurring in the construction technology program. These are highly specialized open labs to teach hands-on construction techniques. This has been identified as the first priority for the institution and was submitted as a program plan for this year's funding cycle.

By the year 2003, the forecasted total square footage need on the campus is **277,450 asf** (which includes a deficit of 48,400) By 2013, the forecasted deficit is 166,400 asf, which, if constructed, would mean a total campus size of **524,750 asf**. According to the current Master Plan configuration, this would be a total campus build out.

The remainder of the section clearly outlines the classroom and specialty laboratory needs. A deficit is clearly defined, but at present the campus is not meeting basic efficiency standards. The non-standard student population that comprises the majority of the population at Red Rocks explains this inability to meet the efficiency criteria. Based on Weekly Contact Hours, the plan forecasts that within the next 5 years (by 2003), 15 classrooms will exceed the CCHE standard of 60 contact hours per week. Within 10 years, 17 classrooms will exceed that standard, and the number will increase to 25 classrooms within 15 years.

The institution also has a problem meeting the required occupancy rates. They state that the 70% occupancy rate is excessive for an institution such as Red Rocks Community College, which has an open admissions policy. With such a policy, programs and enrollments can fluctuate widely. Significant portions of Red Rocks Community College's students are employed in business or construction trades. Consequently, enrollments are artificially deflated during the prosperous times. It is necessary to plan and design for the worst-case scenario, which is at peak enrollments. Occupancy rates will increase as the economy slows, the college contends.

Staff agrees there is significant growth and decline in community college programs; in some instances, both take place at the same time. As an expanding course outgrows its

space, it must be divided into two sections in two classrooms. Occupancy rates would drop to 50% or less. A new start-up program would be unlikely to fill a classroom when it is first offered; consequently, low efficiencies would be the result until the program gained popularity. As compared to four-year colleges, community colleges are more likely to be in the process of phasing out unpopular programs. The question becomes when to phase out a course. For example, should the course be cancelled when the occupancy rate dips below 60%, 50%, or 30%? The question obviously has a significant impact on classroom efficiencies. In the Master Plan, the impact is noted, with no planned criteria on dealing with the ongoing problem. This problem is not unique to Red Rocks and should be assessed fully from a policy perspective by the Community Colleges of Colorado governing board in evaluating a system-wide plan.

The Master Plan outlines proposed classroom growth, and these objectives should be evaluated with new program plans as they are submitted in the upcoming years. There is a strong and clear foundation presented to be used as a tool for decision-making in the future.

IV. Physical Master plan

Section 8 of the Master Plan outlines the goals and strategies used for developing the solutions presented in the physical site plan. It clearly defines some primary land use zones for areas such as the "North Zone" which is native landscape, to the "Central Zone" which is the main building area, to the "South Zone" which is parking.

Issues with regard to the overall organization of the main building, site access, building access and overall site infrastructure are also outlined, with important existing planning strategies noted along with some existing areas of weakness that need improvement. There are also five strategies for physical planning given which was the basis for developing the physical Master Plan. They are as follows:

Strategies for Physical Planning

- Strategy ONE: Maximize effective use of land for economic efficiency, while preserving site amenities, by "densifying" buildings in strategic areas rather than creating a sprawl of new, isolated buildings.
- Strategy TWO: Determine a logical, maximum build-out (on buildable land and proximate building sites): Determine the approximate amount of buildable sites irrespective of identified needs.
- Strategy THREE: Determine physical planning implications of identified needs through the year 2013. Compare to the maximum build-out. Verify strategies for providing necessary parking.
- Strategy FOUR: Identify campus strengths and determine responses that build upon and strengthen these assets.

- Strategy FIVE: Strengthen the organization of the existing buildings through strategically located additions, improved circulation systems and building connections.

The Master Plan currently indicates one primary solution for expansion, which is to add floors vertically to the existing main building, and/or expand it on the exterior to the northeast and southwest. This solution coincides with strategy one, which indicates “densifying” the building rather than creating “sprawl” with separate buildings. There are both positive and negative ramifications to making this the final decision for future facilities growth on the campus.

The current Master Plan indicates the amount of growth forecasted until the year 2013, and the amount of facility square footage needed to accommodate the population increase. The uniqueness of the Red Rocks campus is that it is basically comprised of one main building. Most other campuses are comprised of a cluster of individual buildings. The former condition has many good qualities in terms of quick and easy access for users as well as economy of equipment, shared usage of infrastructure, and economy of personnel.

The more negative aspect of this kind of facility comes when the need to expand and or remodel occurs. Modifying one large building is often more costly due to relocation requirements and accommodating users within the building during demolition and construction phases. There are often fewer places available to relocate users while the construction is occurring and temporary facilities are often necessary. Other conditions such as having to work off hours in order to shut down systems for modification can occur and create higher costs as well. Problems also can occur when it is necessary to keep systems up and operational while trying to expand and/or modify them during the addition or remodel construction. Remodeling and/or additions also become expensive because each change often affects the adjacent area, both interior and exterior, thus creating a domino affect as upgrades are made. These are all issues that commonly occur and solutions to overcome these problems are readily available. However, they do sometimes add as much as 20% to the total cost of a new facility.

Expanding a large building can also become a problematic design issue. In many cases, functions that would work better on an exterior wall or having exterior exposure, get buried within the cavernous volume. Expanding the building outward contributes to this condition, and can become the basis for deciding to demolish the older building.

Again, giving some alternatives to the current solution provided can facilitate more flexibility for future expansion projects. The option to build a separate yet adjacent facility should be available and reviewed during the program planning process. To define such strict limits in the Master Plan could end up creating costly expansion problems in the future. Building more flexibility into the Master plan would allow for more investigation and optional cost estimating in future facility-planning processes.

V. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The review and analysis of the Red Rocks Community College Master Plan clearly indicates a very thorough documentation of the past and current growth requirements, and the current and ever growing educational needs of the service area dedicated to these campuses. The current explosive growth pattern contributes greatly to the dilemma of how to accommodate the increased demand on the somewhat growth-restricted Lakewood campus. The growth demands of the service area for Red Rocks as a whole are grounds for some extended review and analysis of the campuses' service boundaries.

Clearly there is a limit to the growth that may be accommodated by the Lakewood campus. Whether expansion beyond the 2.5% is advisable should be addressed.

Limited assessment of physical parking needs is incorporated within the plan as proposed. RRCC concludes that at some point it may need a parking structure at the Lakewood campus. However, since all its campuses are commuter campuses, this issue should be addressed more fully. It is, however, more important with the limited space and growth needs projected at the Lakewood site.

The plan also does not address how Red Rocks proposes to meet needs within the smaller, but growing mountain counties. This is a fairly important issue as the Community College system plans for growth statewide. While leasing is always an important option to resolve space needs in fast-growing counties, the issue of the types of programs that might be needed in the short-term and long-term in those counties should be more fully addressed in an academic addendum to the plan.

Finally, as discussed earlier, the proximity of metropolitan campuses to each other results in the potential that should the Community College system choose to do so, some accommodation of pockets of growth in one college's service area can be met at adjacent campuses of another college. As program plans for projects at all campuses in the metropolitan area are forwarded, the system board should address this issue.

The staff recommends a conditional and approval of the submitted Red Rocks Master Plan and makes the following recommendations to the Commission.

That the institution be asked to submit to CCHE and the Commission the following information:

1. **An Expanded Technology Plan.** The rather sketchy plan included should be re-submitted with more succinct information relating to the chosen direction for its technology Master Plan and required infrastructure to accommodate that technology focus. This plan should include a foundation of information that can be reviewed by CCHE and the Office of Innovation and Technology staff to confirm the approach. It should be organized in a fashion to support the future Red Rocks requests for

- technology funding. The plan should propose a preferred direction and plan for implementation, with enough flexibility built in to allow for growth and changes in the institution and the industry in general. The plan should be incorporate this information prior to submission of any technology funding requests by Red Rocks.
2. **An Academic Planning Summary.** This summary should incorporate the objectives stated in the Master Plan with the goals and objectives for future academic programs. The Master Plan does state that strategic planning is underway, and the Commission should request inclusion of that plan and a submission date from Red Rocks to incorporate the document within the Master Plan. Any issues raised by that strategic document affecting the Master Plan should be evaluated and brought forward for Commission review. A basic overview of current program strengths and weakness is touched upon within the plan summary, but a succinct planning strategy is not clearly defined. The plan should incorporate the basic elements of the present academic plan with the forecasted headcount, growth program planning, and facilities growth requirements and how each interconnects for at least the six-year timeframe for the current plan. Section six begins to outline desired future program emphases, but no strategies are formed to evaluate and define how those decisions will be made. None are prioritized, leaving the process again undefined. Submission of this information as a supplement to the current Plan will allow CCHE to review future requests for new or expanded programs along with any expanded facilities construction requests. Again, this will serve as a foundation for making good future decisions for a college with limited physical growth options.
 3. **Second Physical Master Plan.** This plan should supply written support information on options incorporating the appropriate locations for buildings and facilities that do not require direct expansion of the existing main building. This physical site plan should incorporate all the goals important to the preservation of the site and campus as noted in the existing Master Plan, and also propose, at a minimum, a second set of options to be selected from and evaluated once a new program space or facility is required. A facility plan can review the various approaches and define which is best for the specific construction project, which is least disruptive to the current operational needs, and which is the most cost affective. The plan should indicate important axial connections, any required physical connections, appropriate building heights, and proper entry orientations to be followed by planners for buildings in the future. The existing site plan should include, and the new proposed site plan should indicate, future site(s) for structured parking. A strategic plan should be included that incorporates an analysis that coordinates the appropriate timing to begin looking at funding this type of project on the campus.
 4. **Review Team.** This team should be developed to evaluate the current service area for Red Rocks Community College. As part of developing a Master Plan for the Community College System as a whole, a more focused study of the boundaries and population currently placing service demands on RRCC should be evaluated to determine the best approach for fulfilling those requirements. The study should

evaluate several things, including whether the growth demands should continue to be met by program expansion at the Lakewood Campus, or whether there are satellite campuses more appropriate for specific needs. This review should also re-evaluate service boundaries to determine compatible accommodation of growth at adjacent community colleges and on other campuses. These questions should be reviewed and recommendations reported back to CCHE and the Commission by the State Board of Community Colleges and Occupational Education. The Commission would then be in a position to assess whether the current Master Plan assumptions should be altered, or whether they should stand as presented. Growth in the service area is a given. How it is best served is the central policy question.

TOPIC: CCHE 2001-2002 MASTER PLAN

PREPARED BY: TIM FOSTER

I. SUMMARY

The purpose of the master plan is to establish an outline of the goals and objectives of the Colorado Commission on Higher Education for 2001 through 2003. The goals and objectives were developed in consultation with representatives of the higher education governing boards.

The Master Plan was available for discussion with students, citizens and the higher education community at the October 4, 2001, meeting. The development of the Master Plan is an ongoing process. The Master Plan will undergo continuous updates and reviews and it is anticipated that it will be finalized before the end of 2002.

COLORADO COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Master Plan 2001-2002

I. Introduction

The Colorado Commission on Higher Education's mission is to provide access to high-quality, affordable education for all Colorado residents that is student-centered, quality driven and performance-based. CCHE's primary "customers" are Colorado students and citizens. CCHE is committed to providing the best quality education at the best price with the best possible service for its customers.

The Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) has developed this master plan for 2001-2002 to outline the Commission's vision for higher education. This Master Plan builds on the Commission's previous Master Plan and sets Commission priorities for the coming year. The goals and strategies outlined in this master plan implement CCHE's mission to provide access to high-quality, affordable education that is student-centered, quality driven and performance-based.

II. Overview of the Colorado Commission on Higher Education

The Colorado Commission on Higher Education, an agency within the Department of Higher Education, is the central policy and coordinating board for Colorado's system of public higher education. CCHE serves as a bridge between the Governor, the General Assembly, and the governing boards of the state-supported institutions of higher education.

Eleven commissioners oversee the state's system of higher education, working with one constitutional and five statutory governing boards.

By statute, CCHE is responsible for the following:

Higher Education Finance and Appropriations: CCHE's total state-appropriated budget for FY2001-02 was approximately \$1.63 billion. The total general fund appropriation (including the orphan agencies) contributed 48 percent of the funding, while tuition and fee revenues (cash funds) provided most of the remaining appropriation. Higher Education's \$759 million in general fund support equates to 13.6 percent of total statewide general fund appropriations. Total revenue to Colorado's public institutions of higher education exceeded \$2.8 billion in FY 2000. Total revenues (including federal grants and contracts, as well as private and other gifts and grants) rose by 91 percent over the past decade, increasing from the \$1.5 billion in 1990. State general fund support, tuition and fees and state and local grants amounted to 48.9 percent of total current funds revenues in FY 2000-01.

Academic Programs and Systemwide Planning. The Commission adopts statewide policies for academic planning; undergraduate and graduate degree approval and discontinuance; higher education access, including financial aid and transfer/articulation policies; teacher education, admission standards, remedial assistance, minority

participation and achievement; school – college partnerships; and pre-collegiate academic preparation. The Commission ensures that academic programs offered across the state are broadly responsive to student needs as it reviews and approves new degree programs and coordinates statewide planning activities. In addition, Colorado is addressing the issue of quality in the general education portion of the curriculum by defining and adopting competencies and criteria for general education courses. If a student completes a general education course at a Colorado institution, he or she can be assured that the course will transfer and satisfy the general education requirements for an associate or baccalaureate degree at any public institution. These standards will also make it easier to collect data on retention, academic achievement, teacher education, and student assessment.

Capital Construction and Long-Range Planning. CCHE has a statutory and fiduciary responsibility to ensure institutions manage the system's capital assets effectively. The State of Colorado has made a significant investment in the construction and maintenance of higher education institutions. The majority of campus buildings have been paid for by Colorado taxpayers. Institutions are a party to a contract with Colorado taxpayers: the public's funds purchase and construct buildings and campus amenities, and, in return, institutions are obligated to protect and maintain those facilities for future generations. Commission goals include: to encourage increased use of existing facilities, encourage and expand multiple use of these facilities, including agreements between two-year and four-year institutions and ensure that funds are set aside annually for routine maintenance and for structural, mechanical and technical upgrades needed every 10-20 years. Working with the State Buildings Division, the Commission will focus on developing a plan for long-term maintenance and upkeep for higher education facilities, building on the proposal submitted in 2001 to the General Assembly. Establishing benchmarks for institutional budgeting for this purpose and addressing initial allocations is a priority for 2002.

Advanced Technology. CCHE is responsible for overseeing the administration of a research grant program that focuses on developing new technologies and materials in the universities' research laboratories and bringing them into the marketplace for the benefit of all Colorado residents. This responsibility ties the often-misunderstood benefits of research on campuses directly to the citizens whose tax dollars help provide the seed money for dozens of research grants. CCHE has established criteria for evaluating projects and disbursing the grant funds. A follow-up review process is in place. Working with the Science and Technology Committee, the Commission will review emerging business areas and evaluate whether the program is currently focusing on the appropriate industry segments for Colorado. First-year implementation of the Advanced Technology Fund, which will provide funding for waste recycling research, is a priority.

III. Trends in Higher Education in Colorado

Higher Education Financing: Tuition and fee revenue has assumed a larger role in the funding mix for Colorado's institutions. Colorado tuition and fee revenues totaled 46

percent of general funds and cash in FY 1987-88. This percentage increased to 50 percent in FY 2001-02. The decreasing reliance on general fund dollars follows a national trend. Nationally, funding of public higher education is increasingly reliant on tuition and other cash revenue sources to meet operational costs.

According to a recent article by Travis Reindl (“Financing State Colleges and Universities: What is happening to the “Public” in Public Higher Education?” Perspectives, American Associations of State Colleges and Universities, May 2001,) a combination of economic, political, and philosophical currents have contributed to a shift away from public funding of colleges and universities toward private funding of these institutions (i.e., student tuition revenues, external fundraising, and entrepreneurial activities).

Funding higher education continues to be a significant issue for the Commission in examining how best to provide higher education resources to all of Colorado’s citizens.

Between 1988-89 and 1998-99, the current fund revenues generated by tuition and fees at public four-year institutions nationally increased 107.4 percent. Revenues from state and federal appropriations increased 30.9 percent and 1.5 percent, respectively, during the same period. *U.S. Department of Education, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System Finance Survey, Fiscal Year 1988-89 and 1998-99 (early release data)*. In Colorado, the current fund revenues generated by tuition and fees at public four-year institutions increased 80.5 percent. Colorado revenues from state and federal appropriations increased 39.4 percent and 119.4 percent, respectively, during the same period.

Tuition increases have reflected inflation in the past three budget years, although those increases leave Colorado’s tuition levels below the national averages for most four-year institutions.

In the four fiscal years, beginning in FY 1995-96, approved tuition increases for resident students were two percentage points below nonresident increases. This resulted from a legislative tuition “buy-down” policy to keep resident tuition affordable. While out-of-state students pay more than the full cost of their education via nonresident tuition rates, Colorado resident students receive a state subsidy of about 70 percent to 75 percent of the cost of their instruction.

The Legislature has in the past three years supported tuition increases at or slightly under inflation rates for in-state students for the past three years and slightly above the inflation rate for non-resident students. The non-resident increases provide additional resources for the five higher education institutions in Colorado who enroll the majority of the non-resident students statewide – Fort Lewis College where 33.8 percent of its total FTE are non-resident students, the University of Colorado at Boulder with 32.3 percent, Western State College with 30.5 percent, Colorado School of Mines with 27.3 percent, and Colorado State University with 20 percent. The remaining institutions are less impacted

than these five campuses because non-residents make up a much smaller proportion of their student populations.

Commission initiatives, including the Governor's Opportunity Scholarships for low-income students, continue to focus on access. Maintaining access for all economic groups in the state remains a critical challenge for the Commission.

Enrollment Trends: Public postsecondary institutional enrollment grew over the past decade by 11,441. Since FY1992-93, FTE have had an average annual growth rate of only 0.5 percent statewide. Reductions in total FTE student enrollment occurred in FY 1993-94 and FY 1994-95, at -0.4 percent. Since then, total enrollment increased by 0.5 percent in FY 1996-97, 1.1 percent in FY 1997-98, 1.7 percent in FY 1998-99, 1.1 percent in FY 1999-2000, and 0.5 percent in FY 2000-01.

Projections of growth for the next five years indicate Colorado's higher education enrollment will show modest increases -- from 139,610 to 143,960 full-time-equivalent students. These enrollment figures neither conform to state population growth nor to growth in the numbers of eligible graduating high school students who could be enrolling in the state's public institutions. The enrollment figures raise concerns about access and have implications for long-term capital construction planning as well as for hiring new faculty and administrators, and authorizing new degrees and certificates.

Enrollment declines or static enrollments are or have negatively affected some of the state's smaller institutions. Fluctuating enrollment poses significant resource problems for smaller institutions that can more easily be absorbed year-to-year by the larger colleges and universities. If access to higher education statewide is important, and the Commission believes it is, continuing to subsidize student growth at the state's most expensive institutions at significantly greater rates forces those with more static enrollments to continue to reallocate resources to support even the most basic programs at smaller institutions.

While overall enrollment trends are of concern to the Commission, there are particular trends that are equally disturbing among demographic segments of the state's population. These trends are evident in examining enrollment and graduation rates of Hispanics in the state. Although a growing segment of the state's population, their rates of participation in higher education do not reflect that growth. With the significant difference in earnings reflected over time between high school graduates in the workplace and college graduates, these numbers concern the Commission.

Recent federal analyses indicate that college graduates are more than twice as likely to engage in volunteer work and political activity than high school dropouts, and are less than half as likely to participate in public assistance. *Thomas Mortensen. "Why College? Private Correlates of Higher Education." Postsecondary Education Opportunity, Number 81, March 1999.*

Faculty Retention: Attracting and retaining quality faculty is not an overall issue in the state. However, competition in high-demand disciplines continues to create hiring and retention discussions. Overall faculty turnover is not significantly greater than in other states. In addition, disproportionate workloads between tenured and non-tenured faculty at some institutions should be addressed.

IV. Commission Mission, Goals and Objectives

A. Mission Statement

The Colorado Commission on Higher Education's mission is to provide access to high-quality, affordable education for all Colorado residents that is student-centered, quality driven and performance-based. CCHE's primary "customers" are Colorado students and citizens. CCHE is committed to providing the best quality education at the best price with the best possible service for its customers.

B. Goals and Objectives

Building on a student-centered higher education system, the Colorado Commission on Higher Education intends to focus the state's resources on improving services to students in five priority areas, each with initiatives that challenge the institutions to look toward the future. These five goals are discussed fully below.

Goal #1: Improved Access to Higher Education

The Commission's goal is to ensure that income levels and geographic location do not exclude Colorado residents who want an education beyond high school. To that end, Colorado will have the nation's highest rate of Colorado's high school graduates enrolled in a two-year or a four-year degree program regardless of income level or geographic location.

In pursuit of this goal, CCHE implemented the Governor's Opportunity Scholarship Program, in the fall 1999 semester that targeted \$1.9 million to provide significant financial aid to approximately 450 students whose family incomes fall in the bottom quartile within the state. These scholarships have allowed these students, many of whom are the first ever to attend college from their families, to pursue two-year and four-year degrees.

The Governor's Opportunity Scholarship Program: Data show the long-term benefits of acquiring a bachelor's degree are great. Yet, students from low-income families do not pursue a postsecondary education. The largest barrier to entry into higher education for these students is financial: they simply are not able to pay for college. Low-income families also do not view student loans as a way of overcoming that barrier. On the other hand, they do view grants and

scholarships as incentives but find limited resources at both the federal and state levels. Students from low-income families also face cultural issues as first generation attendees at institutions of higher learning. To increase college participation among low-income students, the Colorado Commission on Higher Education developed a new financial aid program, known as the Governor's Opportunity Scholarship (GOS), in August 1999. The GOS provides assistance to a limited number of low-income students who are able to attend institutions of higher learning at no cost. An important goal of the Governor's Opportunity Scholarship program is to provide assistance for students to not only enroll in an institution of higher education but also to provide counseling so that these students complete their program.

From a policy perspective, the program is designed to change enrollment and graduation patterns and at the same time extend greater economic stability to low-income Coloradoans. State and federal financial assistance has been focused on Colorado residents who are least likely to attend college because of financial barriers. During the program's first two years (FY 2000 and FY 2001) 31 public and private institutions provided assistance to 792 students at a cost of \$4.0 million in state grant assistance. The GOS population is diverse with nearly fifty percent of the students from an ethnic origin other than white, non-Hispanic. The first year retention rates for the GOS students were similar to the entire first-time freshman population for the same given year at 63 percent.

It appears to be good public policy to broaden the postsecondary educational opportunities for this income group by refocusing financial aid, in particular, need-based grants, toward those students who might not otherwise go to college without the assistance. The Governor's Opportunity Scholarship represents an effort by the Colorado Commission on Higher Education and the General Assembly to change the postsecondary enrollment patterns of low-income students. CCHE will work with institutions to assure that GOS students succeed. A third group of approximately 350 students will enter Colorado institutions in the fall 2001.

CCHE will continue to monitor this program and encourage institutions to ensure that the Commission's goals are met and to determine whether additional resources should be added.

Pricing: The Commission has sponsored a comprehensive pricing and marketing study to assess whether tuition and fees at Colorado's various institutions are priced appropriately in today's market. In the *Tuition Pricing and Higher Education Participation in Colorado* October 19, 2000, report prepared by Donald E. Heller of the Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education, Dr. Heller stated that:

The research on the demand for higher education in this country over the last three decades has reached a number of commonly accepted conclusions, including:

- Like most goods and services, the demand curve for higher education is downward sloping, i.e., as price increases, consumers are likely to consume less of it.
- College enrollments tend to respond more to changes in tuition price than they do to equivalent-sized changes in financial aid awards, and different forms of student aid (grants, loans, and work study) have differing effects.
- Poor and minority students tend to be more price responsive than wealthier and white students.

While four-year college participation rates in the state exceed the national average (in public institutions alone, as well as in public and private institutions combined), the community college participation rate in Colorado has fallen below the national average. The evidence is clear that there is an important link between the price of college and participation rates. This evidence can be found in both the empirical studies described earlier, as well as in an examination of the relationship between tuition prices and participation rates in all fifty states.

The stated interest in increasing college participation rates in Colorado, along with the current tuition and financial aid structure in the state, leads to the following policy alternatives for consideration:

1. Cut tuition at all community colleges.
2. Increase tuition at some four-year institutions.
3. Cut tuition at all community colleges.
4. Raise tuition at selected four-year institutions and cut tuition at selected community colleges.
5. Target specific populations for aggressive financial aid and enrollment management policies.

Although achieving success in this area has been difficult, the Commission continues to believe its role is ensuring the best education at the best price for Colorado residents. Proposals for tuition buy-downs at community colleges and rural four-year institutions have not been successful. However, the Commission reaffirms its goal to ensure access across income segments in the state and intends

to work toward this end. The Commission supports strengthening financial aid and funding approaches that provide tuition relief to students.

Mentor Program. The Department of Higher Education—including the Commission, the Colorado Student Loan Program, the Colorado Student Obligation Bond Authority and the Division of Private Occupational Schools—has contracted with a private firm to develop a web-based on-line student information and application system. Colorado Mentor is designed to engage Colorado high school students early in their careers—eight and ninth grade—in exploring career options and integrating their career interests in planning for college. Integrating all higher education colleges and universities—public and private—the site will offer a full array of student information including deadlines, program offerings, financial aid resources and a detailed ability for a student to plan his/her high school career to fulfill the college requirements.

Marketing: Access to Colorado higher education opportunities is crucial to ensuring participation. The Commission believes that it is a partner with institutions in marketing the various opportunities available to Colorado's citizens. Using an array of vehicles such as the ColoradoMentor system, the Commission intends to engage the state's principals, teachers and counselors in a concerted effort to encourage more Colorado high school students to attend college. The Commission believes increasing financial aid opportunities and spreading the message that college is affordable and accessible for Colorado's high school students is central to its mission. The Commission's goal is to move from a participation rate of 38 percent of Colorado high school graduates in higher education to 55 percent of Colorado high school graduates in the next five years.

Financial Aid Policy: At its April 2000 meeting, the Commission approved a new Financial Aid Policy that was designed to achieve four policy goals:

- Maximize the amount of financial aid funds available for Colorado residents.
- Direct state need-based dollars to those with the least ability to pay.
- Direct merit dollars to students who demonstrate academic achievement.
- Recognize the importance of student responsibility in paying for higher education costs, either through scholarship, work-study, or outside employment.

With the assistance of the Financial Aid Advisory Committee, CCHE refined the allocation model to match the policy goals.

- The methodology is student-based. It means that need-based dollars are directed toward students with the least ability to pay and merit dollars are directed toward academic achievers.

- The need-based dollars are distributed on the calculated need of Level 1 students attending a particular institution, i.e., those whose income level is 150 percent above PELL eligibility (i.e., approximate family income of \$45,000 or below). This methodology directs the greatest percentage of need-based dollars to the community colleges. Even so, the community colleges alone have \$11.4M of unmet need for Level 1 students.
- The merit allocation is based on the premise that the top four percent of degree seeking undergraduate in-state students deserves scholarship assistance. It multiplies the number of undergraduate degree-seeking students by four percent and this number by the actual tuition and fees. At the graduate level, it multiplies two percent of the graduate enrollment by the graduate tuition. The advisory committee recommended an aggressive strategy to achieve parity among institutions, infusing dollars in the four-year institutions that were furthest from the undergraduate four percent merit target. An additional \$1.2 M is required to fully serve the top four percent attending college at Colorado public and private colleges and universities.
- The work-study allocation is distributed based on the number of need-based undergraduate students.
- In 2001, the Commission added a new program to assist student teachers with demonstrated need. It allocates dollars based on the number of student teachers and students enrolled in REAP programs. Students who are enrolled in teacher education programs and demonstrate need will receive a grant to cover tuition and fees. The first priority are student teachers and students enrolled in the REAP.

Since adopting the new policy and model, a greater share of need-based dollars is going to the two-year institutions that serve a higher percentage of low-income students. A greater share of the merit dollars is shifting to the four-year public and private institutions because the allocation follows a classic scholarship model indexing the award by actual tuition and fees. The implementation of the new policy has simplified the administration of student financial aid as well. In short, because the dollars are following students almost all institutions maximized the use of their 2000-01 financial aid allocations.

Rural Education Access Program: The Rural Education Access Program (REAP) was implemented during FY 2001. The program provides financial support to deliver degree completion programs on the campuses of rural community colleges. These programs may be delivered either on-site or electronically. During the implementation year degree completion programs were developed by Adams State College in teacher education and business at Lamar community College, Otero Community College and Trinidad State Junior College.

Enrollments in the teacher education programs were strong, but not as robust in business as anticipated.

Metropolitan State College of Denver began the development of an online Criminal Justice degree completion program in partnership with Northeastern Junior College. Once the first cycle has been offered and refined, it will be available to other community colleges.

The University of Northern Colorado (UNC) partnered with Northeastern Junior College and Morgan Community College to offer a teacher licensure programs. UNC also partnered with Morgan Community College to offer a business degree completion program. And like Adams State, they experienced lower than anticipated enrollments.

Mesa State College partnered with Colorado Mountain College to deliver a Post Baccalaureate Teacher Licensure Program in Elementary Education.

Within the past eleven months significant progress has been made on the goal to improve access to higher education for citizens living in rural Colorado communities through the REAP program.

Goal #2: Performance-Based Funding

House Bill 1219, enacted during the 1996 legislative session, changed the framework for accountability and performance funding for higher education. This new approach is based on a quality indicator system, which measures the annual progress of the institutions in achieving statewide expectations and goals.

SB99-229 revised the quality assurance standards and indicators used to measure performance and required the Commission, in cooperation with the governing boards, to establish standards. A QIS report was presented and outlined the 28 measures used in the analysis. Institutions were measured against national or comparison institution benchmarks.

CCHE submitted the first budget request using performance funding in the fall of 1999. The General Assembly adopted performance funding as a portion of the higher education allocation formula beginning with the FY 2001 budget. Over \$12.65 million was distributed to governing boards on the basis of institutional performance on nine indicators. Indicators included: graduation rates, faculty instructional productivity, freshmen persistence, achievement rates on examinations, lower division class size, diversity plans, institutional support costs and two indicators selected by each institution. This funding accounted for 2.0 percent of total general funds allocated to the governing boards for FY 2001. This same allocation mechanism was used this budget year, amounting to \$20.6 million for FY 2001-02.

1. Raise the Benchmark

In 2001 the Commission expects to raise the bar/benchmark for performance funding indicators. The performance-funding indicators for 2002-2003 are as follows:

- a) Graduation Rates
- b) Freshmen retention and persistence rates
- c) Support and success of minority students
- d) Scores/passing rates on tests and exams Technical graduates employed – two year schools
- e) Institutional support/administrative expenditures per SFTE
- f) Undergraduate class size
- g) Number of credits required for degree
- h) Two Indicators identified by each institution – will not be scored

The Commission plans to add a new indicator for 2003-2004.

- a) Faculty instructional workload – pending receipt of comparative data

2. Measures (Quality Indicator System)

The Commission's goal is to implement a comprehensive Quality Indicator System which addresses the issues first identified in the 1996 legislative session and amended by SB 99-229 during the 1999 legislative session.

Senate Bill 99-229 identifies eleven goals and twenty-three required institutional actions to implement these goals. These provide the framework for the Quality Indicator System, which initially, measures achievement in five basic areas:

- a. Institutional performance in achieving the goals for improved faculty and administrative efficiency and productivity and student performance;
- b. Student satisfaction and success, including access to services at all levels and affordability of the institution;
- c. Employer satisfaction;
- d. The level of performance of the statewide system of higher education and progress toward meeting the statewide goals and expectations; and
- e. Institutional performance in achieving increased productivity and effectiveness in providing services to students.

Financial Reporting. In 2001-2002, the Commission expects to work toward increasing uniformity in higher education institutions' accounting systems to allow better comparisons between institutions, more relevant financial reporting and ways to assess institutional performance. As a follow up to HB1289's NORED study, CCHE created a common accounting practice sub-committee. The

sub-committee reviewed current financial reports from the Colorado Financial Reporting System (COFRS), institutional Budget Data Books, governing board budget decision-making data and numerous other financial reports from the institutions. Outcomes from this effort include:

- Revisions to the higher education COFRS chart of accounts that now provide significantly more financial data than were available previously.
- Further changes to higher education financial reporting as a result of the implementation of new GASB34/35 reporting requirements.
- Additions to the Budget Data Books that include information on institutional, lobbying, legal services, student recruiting and marketing.
- Development of a ten-year history of information on institutional foundations, revenues, expenditures and contributions to the institutions.

Areas that still may need to be addressed include:

- Discussions among institutions on best practices in internal institutional/governing board budgeting.
- Reviews of existing reports submitted to CCHE by the institutions to determine the need for such reports and whether any reports are duplicative.
- Discussions to standardize definitions so that management and overhead costs by the institutions and governing boards are comparable.

Goal #3: Quality of Student Learning

General Education: In 2001 the Commission will expand its academic initiatives by implementing the new general education legislation -- HB 01-1263 and SB 01-1298. The General Assembly charged the Commission with ensuring that the general education curriculum at all public colleges and universities provides the core skills and knowledge to its undergraduate students and that these courses transfer to other public institutions of higher education.

Beginning July 2001, CCHE and the public higher education system will collaborate to develop a framework and criteria for general education courses that will be interchangeable among Colorado institutions.

Transferability. The Commission expects to insure that students will be able to transfer easily between Colorado institutions. To that end, the Commission will work in the coming year to:

- Revise policies and practices as may be necessary to assure the transferability of general education and common course numbering.
- Protect students' rights regarding the transferability of general education courses.

- Provide students on-line information regarding general education course transferability and acceptable courses.

Goal #4: Higher Education Financing

The Governor’s newly established Blue Ribbon Panel on Higher Education for the Twenty-first Century will address the way higher education in Colorado is funded.

The Blue Ribbon Panel and the Commission will focus on participates in Colorado and in this regard will make use of the pricing study outlined under Goal #1.

Graduate/Undergraduate Formula

Currently, Colorado’s declining graduate enrollments reflects the national trend. Growth in specific disciplines – masters programs in business or engineering, for example – is the exception in Colorado, not the rule. Funding for graduate and undergraduate education is commingled in today’s finance formula, resulting in cost shifting by the research institutions from undergraduate programs to graduate programs. Graduate education costs – generally higher cost programs anyway because of the smaller class sizes – are subsidized to an even greater extent as enrollments decline, shifting resources from undergraduate programs to graduate support.

Graduate Enrollment 1990-2000				Percentage Change		
	89-90	94-95	99-00	90-95	95-00	90-00
Research						
University of Colo-Boulder	1,885	2,005	1,912	6.4 %	-4.6 %	1.4 %
University of Colo-Colorado Springs	645	649	678	0.6 %	4.5 %	5.1 %
University of Colo-Denver	1,978	2,018	2,038	2.0 %	1.0 %	3.0 %
University of Colo-Health Sciences	-	-	-			
Colorado State University-E&G	1,330	1,477	1,242	11.1 %	-15.9 %	-6.6 %
Colorado State University-PVM	-	-	-			
Colorado School of Mines	343	353	328	2.8 %	-7.1 %	-4.5 %
Universities and Colleges						
University of Northern Colorado	1,108	1,106	1,088	-0.2 %	-1.6 %	-1.8 %
University of Southern Colorado	43	96	98	121.2 %	2.1 %	125.8 %
Adams State College	326	194	263	-40.5 %	35.6 %	-19.3 %
Mesa State College	-	-	18			
Western State College	80	-	-			
BOARD SUMMARY:						
Regents of the University of Colorado	4,508	4,672	4,628	3.6 %	-0.9 %	2.7 %
State Board of Agriculture	1,373	1,573	1,340	14.6 %	-14.8 %	-2.4 %
Trustees of the Colorado School of Mines	343	353	328	2.8 %	-7.1 %	-4.5 %

Board of Trustees Univ. of No. Colorado	1,108	1,106	1,088	-0.2 %	-1.6 %	-1.8 %
Trustees of State Colleges	406	194	281	-52.2 %	44.8 %	-30.7 %
State System	7,738	7,898	7,665	2.1 %	-3.0 %	-0.9 %
Research	6,181	6,502	6,198	5.2 %	-4.7 %	0.3 %
Universities and Colleges	1,557	1,396	1,467	-10.4 %	5.1 %	-5.8 %
Excludes UCHSC and CSU-PVM						
CCHE, 3/29/01						

Although graduate programs account for only 8.4 percent of full-time students, the health of the state’s graduate institutions is important to industry. Excellence at the graduate level is of concern to the Commission. Funding for graduate and undergraduate education should be distinct and separate; today it is not. The Commission expects to work on funding changes based on recommendations from the Governor’s Blue Ribbon Panel on Higher Education for the 21st Century.

Asset Management: The Commission’s goal is to ensure that the state’s capital assets are maintained and that the state makes sound decisions regarding new capital investments.

A new benchmark for use of classrooms, laboratories, and other educational facilities on the state’s college and university campuses reflect the goal of improved space utilization.

CCHE plans to focus on directing resources to complete long-deferred maintenance on many campuses and intends to set forth a plan for the Legislature that begins to address the growing maintenance backlog. In addition, institutional resources must be set aside annually for the regular upkeep of the existing building inventory.

Other objectives focusing on long-term goals call for CCHE to:

- Prioritize deferred maintenance on campuses and outline a plan for institutions to include regular maintenance funding in their operational budgets once the deferred maintenance deficit is cleared.
- Encourage institutions to share existing buildings with other institutions.
- Expand CCHE’s database to include capital asset information so that CCHE will be able to evaluate and prioritize construction requests and allow facility and academic planning to be integrated.

Maintenance Allocation: Continuing its focus on ensuring the highest utilization of the state’s existing higher education campuses and buildings, the Commission will work with the State Buildings Division to establish policies for long-term allocation of resources to maintain and upgrade the existing building inventory. These policies include examining benchmarks for budget allocations and involving government boards in a discussion of regular allocation of resources.

Building decision tree. The Commission seeks to engage institutions in creating a process for determining how facility decisions are made based on academic goals and institutional mission commitments. As it works with legislators from the Blue Ribbon Panel to re-examine the roles and missions of the state's public institutions, the Commission will seek a way for institutions to incorporate new mission assessments in planning facility requests. Reallocation of resources to upgrade infrastructure, examining long-term uses of existing facilities, seeking ways to maximize use of facilities by working with other institutions—two-year and four-year cooperative efforts--and focusing on technology integration are central to the effort. The Commission seeks a cooperative effort with institutions to re-examine how facility requests are made in this framework.

Fitzsimons and 9th Ave. & Colorado Boulevard. The Commission expects to continue to oversee the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center's relocation to Fitzsimons. The Commission continues to believe that how the 9th Avenue and Colorado Boulevard location is ultimately used is a concern to the state. The Commission continues its support for the Urban Land Institute recommendation that an oversight entity should evaluate the 9th Avenue and Colorado Boulevard proposals and that a master plan needs to be developed. The Commission believes that a large-scale development the size of Fitzsimons UCHSC project requires significant real estate development expertise. The Commission will work to resolve the issue of and overall project manager prior to allocation of further state funds.

Goal #5: Role and Mission Review

1. Admission Standards

The Commission believes that Colorado residents should have broad access to the higher education system. Implicit in this belief is that students' access to an individual institution of higher education depends on their academic preparation. In the coming year, the Commission will study the relationship between admission standards and enrollment.

In compliance with statute, CCHE adopted an admission policy that specifies different admission standards for the four-year colleges, which are tied to an institution's statutory role and mission. In essence, a freshman student must achieve a minimum score calculated from the high school GPA and ACT or SAT test score; each institution has specified its index score. The institution may admit no more than 20 percent of its incoming freshmen who do not achieve the minimum admission standard, commonly referred to as the window. Community colleges are open enrollment institutions and do not have admission standards. The highly selective institutions use the maximum window – 20 percent -- while institutions that are moderately selective or selective use only a portion of the their allowable window.

Colorado has the widest admission window of any other state. Some states do not admit any students below an institution's admission standard; California has a 2.5 percent window, other states have windows that range between 5 – 10 percent.

Because admission standards are the most significant factor that affects enrollment patterns, the Commission raised several questions about the admission standards at its 2000's *Advance*. During the past year, the Commission has returned to this discussion and raised several policy questions, including:

- Are Colorado's admission standards indicative of student academic success?
- Is a 20 percent "window" appropriate for highly selective institutions, particularly those with large freshmen classes? Because one out of five students do not need to meet standards, it may mean as many as 25 to 30 percent attend who are below the academic standards at a large institution.
- How deep do institutions go in admitting students? Ten points below their index? Twenty? Forty?
- With the change in remedial policy, what changes to the transfer admission standards are needed?
- Should there be two windows at each institution – one for transfer and one for freshmen – at each institution?
- What are the effects on the different institutions if the size of the window changed to 10 percent, 5 percent, 2.5 percent, and 0 percent?

The governing boards indicated a similar interest in an admission study to determine if the current admission policy is about access or enrollment growth. Consequently, they requested CCHE to expand the HB1289 chapter on admission, enrollment, and graduation to address several admission issues, including:

What percent of the enrollment growth is attributable to the use of the window?

What is the graduation rate of those admitted into the window compared to the institution's graduation rate of those who meet standards?

What is the average index score of the students who graduate in four-years? Five years?

V. Conclusion

CCHE's mission is to provide the best education at the best price with the best service. This goal can only be achieved through a collaborative partnership involving students and parents, Colorado's higher education institutions and governing boards, the Colorado General Assembly, the Governor, and the business community. Such a partnership will ensure high-quality, affordable, student-centered, and performance-based higher education for all Colorado citizens.

TOPIC: REVISIONS TO THE ADOPTED FY 2002-03 BUDGET REQUEST

PREPARED BY: JAMES JACOBS AND KATHLEEN VON ACHEN

I. SUMMARY

Each year CCHE submits a budget recommendation to the Governor's Office of State Planning and Budgeting. Once reviewed – and modified - by OSPB, it becomes part of the Governor's Budget, which then is submitted to the Joint Budget Committee by OSPB. A budget request for FY 2002-03 also is submitted to the Colorado General Assembly by the Commission on Higher Education by statute and analyzed by the Joint Budget Committee. The JBC presents its budget, known as the Long Bill, to the full legislature for final action a few weeks before the session ends.

At the August 2001 meeting CCHE approved a budget request amounting to a 6.0% increase in general fund support, or \$45.6 million. Components of this request were based on an inflation factor of 3.3%. In late September a revised inflation estimate was released which significantly increased the cost of several CCHE-adopted decision items. In addition, Governor Bill Owens has directed all state agencies to reduce general fund budgets by 1% in the current fiscal year. The net effect of the 1% budget GF reduction and the revised inflationary estimate at 4.9% results in the CCHE-adopted budget request increasing to \$52.6 million, or \$7.0 million over the \$45.1 million 6% general fund cap.

The following tables show the CCHE-adopted FY 2003 budget request and the CCHE staff recommendation to remedy to the impacts resulting from the increase in the inflationary factor from 3.3% to 4.9%. Table 1 outlines the budget in incremental dollars. Table 2 displays the budget in total general fund dollar terms. Table 3 outlines the distribution of financial aid funding among the various categories.

II. BACKGROUND

CCHE is required by a footnote in the Long Bill (SB01-212) to include specific items within its budget request and to limit its general fund request to no more than a 6 percent increase over the prior year appropriated base.

At the August 31 meeting, CCHE approved a 6.0% general fund increase in funds for the governing boards and related elements that totaled \$805.6 million for FY 2002-03. Commission members previously approved \$19.7 million to be distributed under the performance funding system. With the increase in the inflationary estimate from 3.3% to 4.9%, a minimum of \$26.5 million is needed to sustain the general operations of the higher education campuses, funded in the performance funding line. Enrollment funding growth (at 1.0%) costs were calculated at \$5.58 million. Those costs increase slightly to \$5.67 million

due to the change in inflation applied to the incoming new students. The enrollment estimate will be revised when fall and winter enrollment estimates are received.

The adopted request also included \$307,509 for enrollment funding for CU's Health Sciences Center. Last year's General Assembly partially funded enrollment growth at the Health Sciences Center for the first time. CCHE and CU agreed to recommend funding enrollment changes only in the School of Nursing. Last year the funding was \$417,667 or \$12,703 above the general fund per resident student. CU has agreed to subtract the overage from the FY 2003 budget request. The net increase of 27 nursing students totals \$320,212 for FY 2003 and leaves a net general fund request of \$307,509 for enrollment funding at the Health Sciences Center.

Inflation increases for CU's Health Sciences Center, the three CSU agencies, and the Vet Med program at CSU were adopted totaling \$3.8 million. The increase in the inflationary estimate to 4.9% has increased this funding request to \$5.6 million. Allocations to the Health Sciences Center, the three CSU agencies and the CSU Vet Med program are projected to total \$118 million in FY 2003 at 4.9% inflation. Other general fund increases include: \$702,952 for the final year of special funding for the pharmacy program at UCHSC, \$113,000 increase for five slots at the CSU veterinary school resulting from a shift in funding from WICHE cash funding to state-supported general funds. For the occupational and vocational education programs under the community college system funding has increased due to the inflationary estimate from \$373,584 to \$554,716. CCHE adopted a general fund increase of \$394,639 in the programs of excellence. This program is funded primarily from indirect cost recoveries and prior year general fund appropriations retained within the programs of excellence revolving fund.

The request also includes a cash fund increase adopted by CCHE. This includes tuition and instructional fees, as well as auxiliary revenue spending authority. Last year OSPB recommended a tuition differential for non-resident students and the General Assembly set the increases for resident students at 4.0% and for non-resident students at 5.0%. The CCHE adopted request was based upon tuition increases at the rate of inflation of 3.3%, for both residents and non-residents. The increase in inflation to 4.9% has increased this request by \$12 million in tuition cash funds spending authority.

Also, CCHE had adopted a CU-proposed multi-year phasing of various tuition rate adjustments at UCB, UCD and UCCS totaling \$2.9 million in increased cash spending authority. These tuition rate differential requests are not impacted by the inflationary rate estimate increase. Two other tuition proposals from UNC and UCHSC will be discussed in other agenda items but are included in Table 1 for informational purposes.

Also in this table is the cost of tuition increases recommended in agenda items that will subsequently be discussed for informational purposes (i.e., UNC inflation adjustment and the UCHSC tuition increase items.)

The breakdown of financial aid is detailed in Table 3. The overall adopted request sought an additional \$10 million, of which \$2 million is for the Governor's Opportunity Scholarship (GOS) program. This would be the fourth year of a four-year phase-in for the GOS program, which offers the chance at higher education to low-income students who would otherwise not have this opportunity. The request also includes an increase for nursing scholarships and this will address shortages in the nursing profession. Financial aid would total \$95.2 million. Nearly 90% of the financial aid funds go to students attending the Colorado public higher education system.

The CCHE administration operating budget is based upon inflation factors and salary increases set by the Office of State Planning and Budgeting. All departments of state government use these inflation factors. CCHE administration expenses in the request total an estimated \$7.0 million for FY 2003. This total includes CCHE administration, WICHE support programs, the Rural Education Access Program, and advanced technology grants.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

Table 1 outlines the reductions that need to be made in order to bring the higher education general fund budget request under the 6% increase cap. Full funding of projected enrollment, inflationary increases for the operations of the institutions, and financial aid amounts to \$44.1 million.

The financial aid reduction of \$3.6 million to a request of \$6.3 million allows for a 7.4% increase in the financial aid base appropriation, including the \$2.0 million for funding the final cohort of the Governor's Opportunity Scholarship students. This financial aid recommendation meets the statutory requirement to fund financial aid at the same percentage level increase as that year's governing boards operational budget request. Although this financial aid recommendation does not provide additional funds toward addressing identified unmet need in the lower-income quartiles of graduating high schools students, the recommendation sustains a status quo level of financial assistance.

The recommended adjustments to the higher education budget do not allow for the CCHE adopted tuition relief initiative for the community colleges. Tuition relief for the community colleges is a priority for the state's higher education policy, but given the financial constraints placed on the state's general fund budget CCHE staff does not recommend funding this proposal at this time. Discussion of the proposal, however, is an integral part of the financial assessment of the Governor's Blue Ribbon Panel on Higher Education for the 21st Century over the next year.

Along with recommendations in financial aid, this budget seeks greater productivity by universities and colleges, greater access to higher education by Colorado citizens and greater accountability by the institutions and students.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Commission adopt a revised budget recommendation for the governing boards and the CCHE Office totaling \$45.1 million in general fund and approve the cash fund and cash funds exempt spending authority recommended by staff in Table 1. In order to bring the request to \$45.1 million the Commission must decide in what manner it chooses to cut the decision items proposed, which exceed the cap by more than \$1.0 million.

Appendix A

Table 1: FISCAL YEAR 2002-2003 BUDGET INCREASE ECOMMENDATION

Table 2: GENERAL FUND SUPPORT FOR GOVERNING BOARDS AND RELATED ELEMENTS OF HIGHER EDUCATION, APPROPRIATIONS FOR FY 2001 & 2002 AND THE FY 2003 REQUEST

Table 3: CCHE FINANCIAL AID GENERAL FUND REQUEST, FY 2003

Appendix B

STATUTORY AUTHORITY

23-1-105 (2) The commission shall make annual system-wide funding recommendations, after consultation with the governing boards of institutions, for the state-supported institutions of higher education to the general assembly and the governor. In making its recommendations, the commission shall consider each governing board's and each institution's level of achievement of the statewide expectations and goals specified in section 23-1-104, as measured by data collected through the quality indicator system established in section 23-13-105.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

**TABLE 1
FISCAL YEAR 2002-2003 BUDGET INCREASE RECOMMENDATION**

GENERAL FUND

	FY 2002		FY 2003	
	Decision Item Funded Increases		CCHE Adopted 8/31/01 Budget @ 3.3% CPI and 1% Enrollment	CCHE Staff Recommendation to Revised the FY 2003 Budget Request
Gov. Board - Performance Funding		20,697,239	19,716,374	26,492,835
Enrollment	\$	1,745,884	\$ 5,584,161	\$ 5,670,654
CPI for CUHSC, CSU Agencies, & Vet Med at CSU		4,375,597	3,786,690	5,618,104
Financial Aid, includes GOS		6,697,056	9,969,701	6,332,313
Governing Board - Subtotal	\$	33,515,776	\$ 39,056,926	\$ 44,113,906
Enrollment for CUHSC		417,676	307,509	307,509
Programs of Excellence		-	394,639	394,639
PharmD UCHSC		702,952	702,952	702,952
CSU Vet. Med.		-	113,000	113,000
CC of C Tuition Relief		-	4,635,357	-
Division of Occ.Ed./ Area Vocational Schools		435,413	373,584	554,716
CSU Agencies Increases		565,000	-	-
General CDHE Requests - Subtotal	\$	2,121,041	\$ 6,527,041	\$ 2,072,816
TOTAL GENERAL FUND	\$	35,636,817	\$ 45,583,967	\$ 46,186,722

JBC General Fund Request Cap of 6% Over OSPB Reduced Base --->
Amount Over the 6% Cap --->

\$ 45,127,925
\$ (1,058,797)

CASH FUNDS AND CASH FUNDS EXEMPT

	FY 2002		FY 2003	
	Decision Item Cash Funded Increases		CCHE Adopted 8/31/01 Budget @ 3.3% CPI and 1% Enrollment	CCHE Staff Recommendation to Revised the FY 2003 Budget Request
CASH FUNDS - General Campus Tuition and Instructional Fees Spending Authority	\$	41,019,739	\$ 31,724,128	\$ 43,783,557
CASH FUNDS EXEMPT - General Campus Auxiliary Funds Spending Authority		1,226,298	639,630	949,753
CASH FUNDS - Tuition Rate Increases at UCCS/UCD		1,520,188	1,776,184	1,776,184
CASH FUNDS - Tuition Rate Increases at UCB - Business School		1,081,000	1,097,000	1,097,000
CASH FUNDS - CSU/PVM WICHE Funding Shift		-	(113,000)	(113,000)
CASH FUNDS - UCHSC Tuition Adjustment Decision Item		-	-	401,167
CASH FUNDS - UNC Tuition Adjustment for Inflation Decision Item		-	-	971,213
CASH FUNDS - UCB Quality for Colorado Tuition Decision Item (On Hold)		-	-	On Hold
CASH FUNDS EXEMPT - Tobacco Settlement Funds for Smoking Research at UCHSC		199,073	1,124,625	1,124,625
CASH FUNDS EXEMPT - Private & Occupational Schools / MENTOR		-	-	99,730
TOTAL CASH FUNDS - Tuition and Instructional Fees	\$	43,620,927	\$ 34,484,312	\$ 47,916,121
TOTAL CASH FUNDS EXEMPT - Auxiliary Revenues	\$	1,425,371	\$ 1,764,255	\$ 2,174,108

CCHE Recommended Increase Over 8/31/01 Adopted Level

TOTAL CASH FUNDS - Tuition and Instructional Fees ---> \$ 13,431,809
TOTAL CASH FUNDS EXEMPT - Auxiliary Revenues ---> \$ 409,853

NOTE: Dollar amounts subject to change when new student FTE estimates are finalized.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

TABLE 2
GENERAL FUND SUPPORT FOR GOVERNING BOARDS AND RELATED ELEMENTS
OF HIGHER EDUCATION, APPROPRIATIONS FOR FY 2001 & 2002 AND THE FY 2003 REQUEST

	FY 2001 Appropriation	FY 2002 Appropriation with Cuts	Percent Change	FY 2003 CCHE Adopted Request with FY 03 Cuts	Percent Change	FY 2003 CCHE Revised Recommendation w/ FY03 Cuts	Percent Change
DEPARTMENT GF BASE	\$ 748,134,589	\$ 757,005,450	2.2%	\$ 802,581,149	6.0%	\$ 803,183,904	6.1%
HB 1187 Orphan Agencies	5,319,287	4,865,099	-7.5%	4,865,099	0.0%	4,865,099	0.0%
Governing Board & CCHE	\$ 742,815,302	\$ 752,140,351	1.3%	\$ 797,716,050	6.1%	\$ 798,318,805	6.1%
<u>Decision Item List:</u>				797,716,050			
Governing Boards - operating (a)	544,481,932	560,348,180	2.9%	590,728,479	5.4%	593,287,528	5.9%
UCHSC (b)	71,324,811	74,837,515	4.9%	77,355,169	3.4%	78,426,755	4.8%
PharmD.	1,887,181	2,590,133	37.2%	3,293,085	27.1%	3,293,085	27.1%
VetMed (c)	9,609,861	10,453,547	8.8%	11,450,088	9.5%	11,878,472	13.6%
Occupational/Voc. Ed.(d)	29,263,537	11,835,201	n/a	12,208,794	3.2%	12,389,918	4.7%
CCHE Admin. & Special Purpose (e)	7,040,869	6,684,601	-5.1%	7,059,775	5.6%	7,059,775	5.6%
Programs of Excellence (f)	882,773	134,855	n/a	394,639	n/a	394,639	n/a
Financial Aid	78,324,338	85,256,320	8.9%	95,226,021	11.7%	91,588,633	7.4%

NOTE: Dollar amounts For FY 2002-03 subject to change when new student FTE estimates are finalized. Also, FY 2003 does not reflect base adjustments for salary

(a) Excludes all UCHSC and Vet Med at CSU. Inflation for the CSU Agencies is included in this figure.

(b) Excludes PharmD program at UCHSC; Detailed below.

(c) Includes VetMed base, CPI, and funding for the WICHE funding for 5 additional slots at the program.

(d) \$18.5 million appropriated from Cash Funds Exempt in FY 2002.

(e) Excludes Programs of Excellence funding which is detailed below. FY 2003 cche Revised column also includes base adjustments for departmental salary pots.

(f) Prior year general fund appropriations remain in POE fund, but are rolled-forwarded and counted as cash funds exempt in the subsequent appropriation years.

TABLE 3
CCHE FINANCIAL AID GENERAL FUND REQUEST, FY 2003

	FY 2002 Appropriation	FY 2003 CCHE Adopted	Change \$	FY 2003 CCHE Revised Staff Recommend	Change \$	Change %
Need	\$ 41,598,002	46,711,956	\$ 5,113,954	\$ 43,861,078	\$ 2,263,076	5.4%
GOS	6,000,000	8,000,000	2,000,000	8,000,000	\$ 2,000,000	33.3%
Merit	14,874,498	16,374,498	1,500,000	15,603,348	\$ 728,850	4.9%
Work-study	15,359,754	16,127,741	767,987	16,112,382	\$ 752,628	4.9%
Fed. Match	2,076,350	2,076,350	-	2,076,350	\$ -	0.0%
Law/POW	108,021	108,021	-	108,021	\$ -	0.0%
Native American/Other	4,903,839	5,327,455	423,616	5,327,455	\$ 423,616	8.6%
Nursing Scholarships	335,856	500,000	164,144	500,000	\$ 164,144	48.9%
TOTAL	\$ 85,256,320	\$ 95,226,021	\$ 9,969,701	\$ 91,588,634	\$ 6,332,314	7.4%

TOPIC: UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN COLORADO TUITION / INFLATION PROPOSAL - FISCAL YEAR 2002-2003 CCHE BUDGET REQUEST

PREPARED BY: JAMES JACOBS AND KATHLEEN VON ACHEN

I. SUMMARY

This agenda item is a continuation of the August 31, 2001, discussion on a proposal by UNC to adjust its general fund allocation to reflect inflation changes. However, a new request seeking cash fund spending authority has been submitted in lieu of the original general fund budget decision item.

II. BACKGROUND

The University of Northern Colorado's (UNC) initiative for an adjustment to its tuition cash funds is proposed by UNC to address an erosion of its operating base due to inflation. CCHE staff has had additional time to review the revised the UNC inflation adjustment budget request since the August 31 CCHE meeting.

Historical analysis of UNC's resident tuition schedule indicates that tuition increases have not kept pace with inflation. Data on the rate of inflation for the Denver-Boulder-Greeley area provided by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics indicate the cost of living has increased by approximately 10.5% in the three past fiscal years (1998-99 through 2000-01) compared to the OSPB/JBC planning CPI rate of 8.6%. UNC is requesting authority to adjust resident and nonresident tuition commensurate with the actual rate of inflation for the past three years. The revised request by UNC is to increase its resident and nonresident tuition rates for undergraduate and graduate students by 4%, totaling \$1,294,951 million in FY 2002-03 revenues in order to recover the shortfall in funding.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

Table 1 outlines the CCHE analysis of the University of Northern Colorado Inflation Adjustment Initiative. Funding shortfalls under the estimated general funded enrollment plus estimated inflation mechanism have hampered the institution's ability to deliver services. Given that UNC is a governing board with only one institution, the administration does not have the flexibility to spread variances in the estimates used to develop the budget across multiple campuses. In the past three years actual enrollments at UNC have exceeded the projected budgeted enrollment figures. In addition, estimated inflationary increases for budget purposes fell below actual fiscal year CPI. The net impact of these two factors has adversely impacted the UNC budget.

The CCHE analysis illustrates that over the past three fiscal years UNC has been negatively impacted by the differences between estimated and actual inflation, the cumulative impact over the three fiscal years totals nearly \$1.0 million. The table's figures for the actual costs on a per FTE basis is a blended calculation using the estimated/funded FTE figure for that year. This figure is compared with what that figure would have been had actual CPI been applied rather than the estimated CPI. Dividing the difference between these two per/FTE cost figures and actual enrollment on the campus for that year gives us the shortfall incurred over the past three years that has eroded the institution's operating base.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

CCHE staff recommends a 3% increase in tuition rates at the University of Northern Colorado, amounting to a total cash revenue increase of \$971,213. The requested 4% tuition rate increase proposed by UNC amounting to \$1.3 million exceeds the Table 1 calculated shortfall amount of \$967,518. A three percent increase would adequately fund the shortfall and provide the institutions with additional operating revenues to meet the needs of their growing campus. The rate adjustment still would permit UNC to adjust its tuition by the amount generally authorized to all institutions for the coming academic year as well.

Table 1 – UNC General Fund and Tuition Increases Adjusted for Inflation (FY 1998-99 to FY 2000-01)

Appendix A

STATUTORY AUTHORITY

23-1-105 (2) The commission shall make annual systemwide funding recommendations, after consultation with the governing boards of institutions, for the state-supported institutions of higher education to the general assembly and the governor. In making its recommendations, the commission shall consider each governing board's and each institution's level of achievement of the statewide expectations and goals specified in section 23-1-104, as measured by data collected through the quality indicator system established in section 23-13-105.

Table 1
University of Northern Colorado General Fund and Tuition Increases Adjusted for Inflation
Fiscal Year CPI

	Fiscal Years			
	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01 (est.)	
OSPB Planning CPI (1)	3.30%	2.40%	2.90%	
Consumer Price Index (2)	2.65%	3.45%	4.40%	
Resident Undergraduate FTE Actual	7,541.0	7,901.0	8019.0	
UGrad Per FTE Actual Costs (3)	\$ 6,387	\$ 6,718	\$ 6,962	
UGrad if Adjusted for Inflation	\$ 6,478	\$ 6,702	\$ 6,996	
Difference	\$ (91)	\$ 17	\$ (34)	
Fiscal Impact	\$ (685,673)	\$ 133,156	\$ (273,137)	
Resident Graduate FTE Actual	1,032.0	1,088.0	1022.0	
Graduate Per FTE Actual Costs (3)	\$ 6,747	\$ 7,086	\$ 7,341	
Graduate if Adjusted for Inflation	\$ 6,844	\$ 7,080	\$ 7,391	
Difference	\$ (96)	\$ 7	\$ (50)	
Fiscal Impact	\$ (99,444)	\$ 7,411	\$ (50,831)	
Total Fiscal Impact	\$ (785,117)	\$ 140,566	\$ (323,968)	
Cummulative Fiscal Impact	\$ (785,117)	\$ (644,550)	\$ (968,518)	

Tuition "buy-down" policy indicated by the shaded areas. The increase in resident tuition was capped and additional general funding was appropriated to cover the difference. Non-resident tuition was allowed to increase up to the projected CPI.

(1) Estimated CPI used by the Office of State Planning and Budgeting. Takes the actual Boulder/Denver CPI for the prior calendar year.

(2) Actual Average Denver-Boulder-Greeley Consumer Price Index (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics) for fiscal years. Average actual Boulder/Denver CPI for the two respective calendar years.

(3) OSPB Data Book Format 10, Line 14 Divided by Prior Year Funded Resident FTE figure + Tuition (Format 35R, Lines 2 or 12).

**TOPIC: UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO HEALTH SCIENCES CENTER
TUITION PROPOSAL - FY 2002-2003 CCHE BUDGET REQUEST**

PREPARED BY: JAMES JACOBS AND KATHLEEN VON ACHEN

I. SUMMARY

This agenda item is a continuation of the budget discussion on August 31, 2001.

II. BACKGROUND

Three budget request decision items submitted by the governing boards were tabled until the November agenda, including a tuition increase for the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center for various programs. The request was continued to provide the Board of Regents an opportunity to act on the proposal. The Regents approved the decision items at the September 5, 2001, meeting.

The UCHSC proposal requests an annual increase in resident tuition rates above inflation over the next four fiscal years for selected programs in the School of Dentistry (SOD), the School of Nursing (SON) and the School of Medicine (SOM). The UCHSC non-resident tuition rates in many of the selected programs are the highest among peer institutions; therefore, the UCHSC is not requesting a differential increase in these rates.

The overall revenue increase for the campus in fiscal year 2002-2003 would be \$442,339 for the selected programs if the decision item is approved. The institution advocates the tuition increases to maintain educational and clinic facilities, to recruit and retain faculty members, to increase participation in rural education, to support distance education, and to support the increased use of computer technology in education.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

The Health Sciences Center is requesting increases in its resident tuition rates (see Table 1) representing a 4% increase in five different programs for each of the next four years, or a total of a 16% increase from the current tuition rate. The Doctorate of Dental Surgery program is requesting a 6% increase for each of the next four years, a 24% increase. These requested increases would be in addition to the annually authorized inflationary increases. Non-resident tuition rates are not increased in this proposal because many of the selected programs' tuition rates for non-residents are the highest among peer institutions, according to UCHSC.

The total request over the four-year phase-in amounts to \$1,886,870 in additional tuition cash revenue. Of the total, the nursing programs' tuition increase will realize \$439,091 in additional revenue over the 4-year proposal, the medical school will receive \$1,055,723, physical therapy \$103,618, and the dentistry program will receive \$288,439.

Nursing Program Tuition Increase

UCHSC is concerned about the nursing shortage in Colorado. It believes the additional resources will address three program areas:

- 1) Provide resources to increase access to nursing education for Colorado residents to support technology advances for on-line courses that make gaining advanced degrees in nursing possible for nurses in rural areas of Colorado where shortages are more pronounced.
- 2) Increase nursing faculty salaries to recruit more nurses to teaching and to maintain the faculty-student ratios required by accreditation standards.
- 3) Because currently only 13% of nurses are members of ethnic and racial minority groups, compared to 22% of Colorado's population, one-fifth of the additional revenues are being dedicated for scholarships to address these diversity issues.

The institution contends income potential of nursing graduates is rising due to the shortages and that any additional student debt incurred could be met by the income these graduates would earn upon graduation. The tuition increases, UCHSC contends, would not negatively impact the graduates.

Although the UCHSC justification for the funds implies that enrollment increases will occur, the financial model as proposed by UCHSC does not outline additional revenues realized as a result of estimated increases in nursing student enrollment. Projections of how successful the proposal will be in increasing nursing education, and thus decreasing the nursing shortages in Colorado, were not submitted with the proposal.

Below are two tables outlining how the two nursing programs' tuition rates rank with peer institutions.

University of Colorado School of Nursing
2001-2002 Peer Institution Annual Resident Tuition Rates for Undergraduate Program

University of Michigan	\$11,884
University of Colorado	\$5,474
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee	\$5,404
Wayne State University	\$4,770
University of Maryland	\$4,767
University of Nebraska	\$4,369
University of Indiana-Purdue	\$3,839
University of Washington	\$3,762
University of Illinois - Chicago	\$3,232
University of Florida	\$2,822
University of Utah	\$2,531
University of Arizona	\$2,490

Note: Nursing Undergraduate tuition calculation assumes 34-credit hours per academic year. Institutions with semester rates were converted assuming 2 semesters per academic year and institutions with quarter rates were converted assuming 3 quarters per academic year.

University of Colorado School of Nursing
2001-2002 Peer Institution Annual Resident Tuition Rates for Graduate Programs

University of Michigan	\$15,092
University of Illinois - Chicago	\$13,728
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee	\$9,352
University of Washington	\$7,500
University of Maryland	\$5,058
University of Utah	\$4,986
University of Arizona	\$4,824
University of Colorado	\$3,816
Wayne State University	\$3,406
University of Indiana-Purdue	\$3,083
University of Florida	\$2,974
University of Nebraska	\$2,624

Note: Nursing Graduate tuition calculation assumes 18-credit hours per academic year. Institutions with semester rates were converted assuming 3 semesters per academic year and institutions with quarter rates were converted assuming 4 quarters per academic year. Graduate peer data includes PhD and MS programs only. None of these peers have a Nursing Doctorate program.

Medical School Tuition Increase Proposal

The proposal states that medical school curriculum has become increasingly compressed as basic science information has exploded over the past decade. Additional resources are needed in the school to invest in technology enhancements to provide the increasing level of knowledge efficiently to students. Medical students are expected to support the tuition increase because of the benefits the new resources will provide and because their incomes upon graduation will support the increased student loan burden, according to the UCHSC. Comparatively, the UCHSC medical school tuition rate ranks 5th of 11 peer institutions.

**University of Colorado Health Sciences Center Medical School
2001-2002 Annual Resident Tuition Rates at Colorado and Peer Institutions**

School	Tuition (1)
Percentile	(5/11) 45%
University of Wisconsin	\$18,969
Oregon Health Sciences Center	\$16,040
University of Indiana	\$14,603
University of Florida	\$12,373
University of Colorado	\$11,966
University of Iowa	\$11,290
University of California-SF*	\$10,714
University of Utah	\$10,695
University of Washington	\$10,142
University of Arizona	\$9,671
University of North Carolina	\$3,381

* California schools have no tuition; therefore, fees are used in lieu of tuition for comparison purposes only.
(1) 5% increase is used in lieu of actual when data is unavailable for comparison purposes.

The additional tuition cash revenue is proposed to go for the following program areas and needs.

Proposed Uses of Additional Revenue for the School of Medicine

Proposed Uses	FY 2002-03	FY 2003-04	FY 2004-05	FY 2005-06	Total
Web-based/Computer Assisted Education	\$166,563	\$134,132	\$112,914	\$86,720	\$500,329
Faculty Development	\$32,318	\$25,793	\$37,638	\$64,340	\$160,089
Career Development	\$32,318	\$49,009	\$56,457	\$67,138	\$204,922
Rural Medical Education	\$17,402	\$49,009	\$61,833	\$61,543	\$189,787
Total	\$248,601	\$257,943	\$268,842	\$279,741	\$1,055,127

Physical Therapy Program Tuition Increase Proposal

Part of the UCHSC School of Medicine, the two-year Master of Science Physical Therapy Program has also been included in the tuition increase proposal. Additional resources are needed in the program to invest in technology enhancements to provide the increasing level of knowledge needed more efficiently to students. The funds are also being sought to address diversity issues. Physical therapy students are expected to support the tuition increase because of the benefits the resources will provide and because their incomes upon graduation will support the increased educational costs, according to the UCHSC. Comparatively, the UCHSC physical therapy graduate program tuition rate ranks 4th of nine peer institutions from other states.

**University of Colorado, Master of Science, Physical Therapy Program
2001-2002 Annual resident Tuition Rates at Colorado and Peer Institutions
CCHE Funding Formula**

Program	Tuition (1)
Percentile	(4/9) 44%
University of Utah	\$8,219
University of Washington	\$7,864
University of Indiana/Purdue University	\$7,810
University of Colorado	\$7,600
University of Wisconsin - Madison	\$7,072
University of Iowa	\$6,316
University of Florida - Gainesville	\$6,166
University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill	\$5,058
California-UCSF/SFSU *	\$4,982
University of Arizona	No PT program
University of Oregon	No PT program

(1) 5% increase is used in lieu of actual when data is unavailable for comparison purposes.

* California schools have no tuition; therefore, fees are used in lieu of tuition for comparison purposes only.

Proposed Uses of Additional Revenue for the Master of Science, Physical Therapy Program

Proposed Uses	FY 2002-03	FY 2003-04	FY 2004-05	FY 2005-06	Total
Web-based/Computer Assisted Education	\$12,200	\$12,680	\$13,160	\$13,720	\$51,760
Faculty Development	\$4,880	\$5,072	\$5,264	\$5,488	\$20,704
Scholarships	\$4,880	\$5,072	\$5,264	\$5,488	\$20,704
Rural Clinical Education	\$2,440	\$2,536	\$2,632	\$2,744	\$10,352
Total	\$24,400	\$25,360	\$26,320	\$27,440	\$103,520

Dentistry Tuition Increase Proposal

The proposal states that the dentistry program has significant needs in two major areas, and as a result, it is requesting a 6% increase for each of the next 4 years as opposed to the 4% for the other programs in the UCHSC tuition proposal. The need is to update technology at the school and in rural clinics, and maintaining the educational and patient care facilities and laboratories. Additional resources are needed to invest in technology enhancements. The second identified need is to retain and recruit faculty. A recent AAD task force found that dental education was facing a crisis in recruiting faculty. The average salary of the UCHSC dentistry faculty, with the exception of eight full professors very close to retirement, is substantially below the national averages and 50% below what a typical experienced dentist earns in private practice. Dentistry students are expected to support the tuition increase because of the benefits the resources will provide by retaining qualified faculty and because their incomes upon graduation will support the increased educational costs, according to the UCHSC. The proposed 6% per year tuition rate increase in each of the next 4 years would bring the FY 2006 tuition rate (\$9,919) to a level that is still significantly below the current average of its peer institutions (\$12,117).

**University of Colorado School of Dentistry 2000-2001
Faculty Salaries and National Averages**

	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Professor	Department Chair
National Average	\$70,247	\$83,591	\$107,190	\$128,860
UCSD Average	\$63,451	\$74,795	\$116,069	\$110,520
\$ Difference	(\$6,796)	(\$8,796)	\$8,879	(\$11,493)
% Difference	(9.67%)	(10.52%)	8.28%	(9.42%)

Note: The 2000-2001 national averages for dental school faculty salaries are the most recent available.

2001-2002 Annual Resident Tuition Rates at Colorado and Peer Institutions

School	Tuition (1)
University of Minnesota	\$14,963
University of Missouri at Kansas City	\$14,221
University of Nebraska	\$11,950
University of Iowa	\$10,772
University of Oregon	\$10,653
University of Washington	\$10,142
University of Colorado	\$7,857
Average of Peer Group	\$12,117

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Commission approve the UCHSC tuition increase proposals for five of six

programs as requested. Staff does not recommend an increase in the tuition rate for the University of Colorado, School of Nursing undergraduate program for two reasons: 1) the current undergraduate tuition rate is high among their peer institutions; and 2) increasing the tuition rate may not encourage higher nursing enrollment level and adversely impact the goal of providing more nurses for the state.

Table 1 – UCHSC Tuition Increase Proposal

Appendix A

STATUTORY AUTHORITY

23-1-105 (2) The commission shall make annual systemwide funding recommendations, after consultation with the governing boards of institutions, for the state-supported institutions of higher education to the general assembly and the governor. In making its recommendations, the commission shall consider each governing board's and each institution's level of achievement of the statewide expectations and goals specified in section 23-1-104, as measured by data collected through the quality indicator system established in section 23-13-105.

TABLE 1: UCHSC TUITION RATE INCREASE PROPOSAL

Program	FY 02 Rate	FY 2003 Proposed Rate	% Increase	Additional Tuition Increase in 1st Year	FY 2004 Proposed Rate	FY 2005 Proposed Rate	FY 2006 Proposed Rate	Student Headcount	New Cash Revenue - 1st Year	New Cash Revenue - 2nd Year	New Cash Revenue - 3rd Year	New Cash Revenue - 4th Year	
UCHSC REQUESTED PROPOSAL													
Nursing Undergraduate (1)	5,474	5,693	4.0%	\$ 219	\$ 5,921	\$ 6,158	\$ 6,404	188	\$ 41,172	\$ 42,819	\$ 44,532	\$ 46,314	
Nursing Graduate (2)	3,816	3,969	4.0%	\$ 153	\$ 4,128	\$ 4,294	\$ 4,466	194	\$ 29,682	\$ 30,872	\$ 32,110	\$ 33,397	
Nursing Doctorate (3)	8,480	8,819	4.0%	\$ 339	\$ 9,172	\$ 9,538	\$ 9,920	96	\$ 32,544	\$ 33,845	\$ 35,198	\$ 36,605	
Medicine Doctorate	11,966	12,445	4.0%	\$ 479	\$ 12,943	\$ 13,461	\$ 14,000	519	\$ 248,601	\$ 258,553	\$ 268,902	\$ 279,667	
Physical Therapy	7,620	7,925	4.0%	\$ 305	\$ 8,242	\$ 8,572	\$ 8,915	80	\$ 24,400	\$ 25,377	\$ 26,392	\$ 27,449	
Doctorate of Dental Surgery	7,857	8,328	6.0%	\$ 471	\$ 8,827	\$ 9,356	\$ 9,917	140	\$ 65,940	\$ 69,893	\$ 74,083	\$ 78,524	
									1,217	\$ 442,339	\$ 461,358	\$ 481,218	\$ 501,955
TOTAL Tuition Revenue Raised in 4-Year Phase --->												\$ 1,886,870	
CCHE STAFF RECOMMENDATION													
Nursing Graduate (2)	3,816	3,969	4.0%	\$ 153	\$ 4,128	\$ 4,294	\$ 4,466	194	\$ 29,682	\$ 30,872	\$ 32,110	\$ 33,397	
Nursing Doctorate (3)	8,480	8,819	4.0%	\$ 339	\$ 9,172	\$ 9,538	\$ 9,920	96	\$ 32,544	\$ 33,845	\$ 35,198	\$ 36,605	
Medicine Doctorate	11,966	12,445	4.0%	\$ 479	\$ 12,943	\$ 13,461	\$ 14,000	519	\$ 248,601	\$ 258,553	\$ 268,902	\$ 279,667	
Physical Therapy	7,620	7,925	4.0%	\$ 305	\$ 8,242	\$ 8,572	\$ 8,915	80	\$ 24,400	\$ 25,377	\$ 26,392	\$ 27,449	
Doctorate of Dental Surgery	7,857	8,328	6.0%	\$ 471	\$ 8,827	\$ 9,356	\$ 9,917	140	\$ 65,940	\$ 69,893	\$ 74,083	\$ 78,524	
									1,029	\$ 401,167	\$ 418,539	\$ 436,685	\$ 455,641
TOTAL Tuition Revenue Raised in 4-Year Phase --->												\$ 1,712,033	
<i>(1) Nursing Undergraduate tuition calculated using 34-credit hours per academic year.</i>													
<i>(2) Nursing Graduate tuition calculated using 18-credit hours per academic year.</i>													
<i>(3) Nursing Doctorate tuition calculated using 40-credit hours per academic year.</i>													

TOPIC: POLICY INTERPRETATION DISCUSSION FTE FUNDING FOR DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS INMATES

PREPARED BY: JEANNE ADKINS AND ROBERT HADDOCK

I. SUMMARY

In 1990 the General Assembly adopted a comprehensive statute affecting the policy for providing high school, basic skills/remedial, job training vocational and post-secondary education to inmates within the Department of Corrections (DOC). Several community colleges have worked since the adoption of the statute as contractors with DOC delivering various secondary educational programs not provided by DOC staff.

These institutions also have provided post-secondary courses to inmates outside the contractual programs and have reported the student credit hours earned for state General Fund support. Recently, some of the institutions informed DOC they could no longer provide these educational services unless CCHE grants them waivers to the student FTE policy and authorizes continued FTE funding for the inmates served.

After several meetings with the colleges, staff believes there are legitimate issues concerning costs of delivering these programs for institutions. However, an interim solution allowing institutions to phase-out claiming these FTE is an alternative to altering FTE policy or giving permanent exemptions. CCHE will work with the impacted institutions to ensure that these contract issues are addressed with the DOC. Staff is working to schedule a meeting with the DOC and institutional representatives to begin renegotiating the contracts with institutions. Staff, however, does not recommend altering the FTE policy to accommodate the waiver requests.

II. BACKGROUND

CCHE has received requests from Pueblo Community College (PCC), Colorado Mountain College (CMC) and Otero Junior College to permit waivers of the FTE policy, which currently denies funding for student FTE in courses closed to the general public. These colleges are concerned this provision prohibits them from claiming FTE related to inmate post-secondary education courses they offer in the state's correctional facilities. CMC further asserts that its prison education program in Buena Vista is such a large portion of its enrollment that failure to cover its costs could impact services to the general public in Chaffee County. Northeastern Junior College (NJC) also provides significant numbers of educational and vocational programs at correctional facilities but has not requested a waiver from the policy. NJC is not claiming FTE currently and has not done so in the past.

These institutions are affected because major state prisons are located in Sterling and Limon (served by NJC), Canon City, (served by PCC), Buena Vista and Rifle (served by CMC) and Arkansas Valley in Ordway (served by OJC). In addition, OJC has plans to contract with a private correctional facility in Bent County to provide courses in FY2001-02 that would generate an additional 60 SFTE. OJC has invested significant capital outlay resources in equipment to serve the Bent County private facility. This program is further impacted because the contract for services between the DOC and Corrections Corporation of America (CCA), which is the private operator of Bent, apparently does not allocate resources to CCA for educational services in a similar manner.

This issue affects CCD, however, it has not submitted a written waiver request to CCHE. Until recently, CCD provided courses to the Denver Women's Facility and the Denver Regional Diagnostic Center that houses inmates for initial processing prior to their being assigned to other DOC facilities. With the exceptions noted, all institutions have claimed or are claiming state general fund student FTE support to provide college courses to inmates. In addition, Morgan (MCC) and Red Rocks Community Colleges had smaller contracts with DOC in FY01. Morgan had expenditures of \$11,800, according to the Department of Corrections. MCC reports that it claimed less than one student FTE for state support. Red Rocks had expenditures of \$2,575 related to correctional education programs in FY01, according to DOC and community college system records.

After reviewing the statutes relating to corrections and the authorized education program staff conclude that legislative intent prohibits the community colleges from including these FTE in their general fund higher education reports. From the Commission's perspective the issue involves the waiver requests to exempt the prison-generated FTE from the CCHE policy. However, it also involves potential violation of the statute and its accompanying statement of legislative intent. From a broader policy perspective the issue of offering prisoners educational opportunities not similarly available to law-abiding citizens of the state is troubling.

The statute primarily governing this program is C.R.S. 17-32-101 through 17-32-107. It was designed to supplant a myriad of programs at each separate correctional facility and create one statewide corrections education program that aggregated all funding for the elements of the program – basic literacy and GED/high school diploma, life management skills, health, drug and alcohol education – in a single line item within the DOC budget.

The General Assembly was not equivocal in stipulating within the statute that its intent is to provide basic literacy levels for all inmates who are within two to five years of potential release. Furthermore, the program is to provide “marketable entry-level vocational skills” that enable inmates on release to work.

The program is to function in conjunction with DOC's work program and a related statute requires all inmates – unless there is a security or behavioral risk – to participate in work programs. If an inmate fails basic skills literacy diagnostic testing, basic skills education with the potential for receiving a GED or high school diploma is to be offered. C.R.S. 17-

32-106(1)(b) allows DOC to enter into agreements and contracts with school districts, community colleges and colleges and universities to provide DOC's educational services. However, the legislature was unequivocal in its intent NOT to provide free two-year or four-year education degrees to inmates. C.R.S. 17-32-105 (g) states that it is the intent of the General Assembly "to provide every person in a correctional facility who demonstrates college-level aptitudes with the opportunity to participate in college-level academic programs which may be offered within the correctional facility. **Costs associated with the college-level academic programs shall be borne entirely by the person participating in the program.**" (Emphasis added). In this case, the individual is the inmate. Similar language defining non-resident student cost assessments is found elsewhere in statutes.

Staff believes this statute clearly bars financial aid participation, institutional scholarships (tuition waivers) that might come from general fund or other state resources and FTE funding. **In fact, a strong case could be made that actual cost – calculated in much the same manner as non-resident actual tuition costs – must be used and that the inmate must be assessed that figure in taking the course. Non-residents are not counted in FTE funding.**

The participation in basic skills coursework is anticipated for anyone not meeting general literacy testing standards. Again, however, the General Assembly anticipated the costs for the program would be delineated within the DOC budget, not higher education. C.R.S. 17-32-106 (c) directs DOC to submit a "budget request for the correctional education program for inclusion in the budget request for the department as a separate line item. **Such line item shall be the department's total budget request for correctional education funding from the general fund** and shall replace or include any previous request for instructional or educational funding. Such budget request shall itemize the amount of the budget to be funded from the general fund of the state and the amount to be funded from moneys in the correctional education program fund created in section C.R.S. 17-32-107. **No other funds from the general assembly shall be allocated to the department for any educational program.**" (Emphasis added)

A waiver of the FTE policy would entail adding non-DOC funding to the total education line for prison education services – an additional general fund allocation for this service from the higher education budget. Additionally, the waiver would directly contradict the intent of the Commission's FTE policy to prohibit funding for courses not open to anyone wishing to enroll. Clearly DOC will not permit citizens to enroll in courses within the prisons for security purposes, nor is it likely non-prisoners would wish to enroll. The service then becomes strictly one provided for DOC inmates and higher education dollars should not be added to the funding mix.

The question also arises as to whether the General Assembly anticipated that other general funds from other departments – human services or higher education, as examples – would be allocated for supporting this program. Staff would argue from historical notes

that the General Assembly intended all costs for the program to the general fund would be reflected within DOC's budget line for this purpose.

Clearly in C.R.S. 17-32-106 (1) (b), (e) and (h) the legislature anticipated DOC would contract with other agencies – in particular higher education and human services – to provide services in this area, but the costs of those contracts would be borne by DOC, not the other departments and would be reflected within the line item referenced above. From a technical standpoint, the contracts from a budgetary perspective are intra-agency cash-fund transactions.

Community colleges clearly are one of the intended entities identified by statute to deliver remedial, basic skills learning and vocational programs and to contract with DOC to provide such courses and programs. However, staff believes those contracts should cover total institutional costs to deliver the courses and programs at the correctional facility. Since the goal is to ensure that inmates complete high school and leave prison with these skills, a case could be made from a policy perspective to fund the excess using adult literacy or K-12 funding as well.

Attachment A shows the distribution of current correctional education program student FTE among vocational, remedial and college-level course work being provided to inmates by the five community colleges.

Attachment B shows the DOC contract amounts for each community college for the fiscal year, compared to the actual expenditures for the services billed by the community colleges under the DOC contracts. DOC has stated that it reverted funds from the correctional education program line to the General Fund. Information from DOC shows that the five community colleges under-expended against their contract by about \$977K in FY01. This indicates that DOC could have increased its credit-hour payment rate and accommodated almost all of the increased costs claimed by the institutions without the colleges' having to resort to SFTE funding to make up the difference.

Attachment C shows the revenues and expenditures for each community college that provides basic skills and post-secondary education at correctional facilities. As the chart also shows, the institutions claim some of the inmate credit hours (SFTE) generated from correctional education programs (both academic and vocational courses) for state general fund support. Practices vary among the five community colleges.

As Attachment C shows, the five community colleges provided educational programs to DOC and received reimbursement through three primary sources. The first source of funds for the community colleges was from contracts that are part of the DOC Correctional Education line item in the Long Bill. Four of the five community colleges reported funding for contract faculty teaching correctional educational programs. These were primarily remedial and vocational courses and related programs. NJC had the largest contract with DOC in FY01 at \$1,341,041. For FY 01-02, NJC reports that its contract with DOC will be for almost \$2.4 million and will employ 38 full-time and 29

part-time faculty. In FY01 CMC Rifle had the smallest contract with DOC at \$60,062. Combined, the four community colleges reported revenues of about \$2.5 million as a result of these DOC educational contracts. It is clear from Attachment B, however, that DOC under-spent the line item. DOC contracts with the community colleges were for about \$3.5 million. As stated above, the five colleges under-spent against these contracts by about \$977K.

The second source of funds that the community colleges use to fund educational programs at correctional facilities comes from the Colorado Youth Offender Tuition Program (CYOTP). These are federal funds obtained by DOC and then passed on to the community colleges. The CYOTP funds are not a part of DOC's correctional education program line item. The funds are used by the community colleges to pay young offenders' tuition primarily for post-secondary courses. The community colleges make up the difference between revenues from CYOTP and their actual costs of educating these inmates by reporting the student FTE generated for state support. In FY01, three community colleges — PCC, CMC (Rifle and Buena Vista campuses) and NJC — reported receiving cumulatively about \$205K in CYOTP funds. DOC maintains the federal eligibility definition applies to any inmate under the age of 25 (not the Colorado youthful offender definition, which applies only to those actually sentenced to a youthful offender program) and that the maximum payment allowed per student is \$1,500. Thus, DOC maintains it cannot pay the full cost of youthful offenders beyond \$1,500 per student. The state general fund pays the difference between the actual cost of each inmate and the \$1,500 that the federal government allows to be charged for each inmate under CYOTP. Staff also would point out that with the supplemental costs and FTE funding, the federal grant itself may cost the state more than the total federal dollars gained for the program.

The third source of money the community colleges use to fund correctional education programs is state student FTE general fund support. The claims for SFTE support include youth offender courses discussed above and other secondary (i.e., remedial) and post-secondary courses (vocational, academic and remedial) offered at the five community colleges. Total general fund support reported by the five community colleges for correctional inmate SFTE was slightly more than \$1 million in FY01. See Attachment A for a complete breakout of SFTE by these categories.

There are significant differences in how the five community colleges report correctional inmates for state general fund support. Further, there are significant differences in the types of courses and programs the institutions provide. For example, CMC Buena Vista reported over 200 SFTE for general fund support in FY00-01. Of these, 164 SFTE were in Adult Basic Education (ABE), English as a Second Language (ESL) and GED (alternative high school diploma) courses at DOC correctional facilities. CMC Buena Vista reported an additional 37 SFTE for state general fund support in two programs — Learning Unlimited and Job Seeking Skills and Career Orientation — that were offered to inmates. On the other hand, while NJC had the biggest contract with DOC for its correctional education program, NJC did not report or request any SFTE support even

though it offers the same types of programs as CMC does. The 23 SFTE that NJC reported for state support were a part of its youth offender program attending computer and art courses. The tuition for these inmates was paid from CYOTP funds.

OJC, as can be seen in Attachment A, delivers vocational courses – computer and welding – to DOC inmates. To help pay for these courses, OJC requests state general fund SFTE support. OJC also is preparing to provide similar courses to the private correctional facility in Bent County. OJC estimates it will generate an additional 60 SFTE for state reporting from the Bent Facility. At the time the legislature adopted the current Correctional Education statute, there were no contracts for state inmates with private entities. It is not clear whether the DOC is involved in the OJC/Bent County contract discussions. However, the inmates – whether housed at a private or state prison – are in DOC's custody and, thus, funding educational programs for those inmates should be incorporated as part of the overall DOC contract with the private prison.

Both PCC and CCD have had contracts with DOC to provide courses as a part of the correctional education program. Both apparently have offered a number of post-secondary courses. Based on information supplied by PCC, its courses offered at DOC facilities range from core general education subjects to secondary and post-secondary remedial and vocational programs. PCC reported 77.98 student FTE generated from these courses for general fund support in FY01. CCD generated 12.37 SFTE from various academic courses at Denver Women's Correctional Facility. CCD also has a contract with the Adams County Detention Center and reported an additional 11.30 SFTE from inmates taking courses there. These FTE also would not be reportable under the existing policy, since the courses are offered at the county detention facility and not on CCD campuses and are closed to the public. CCD received \$105,000 for the Adams County inmates in addition to the state general fund support it received.

While NJC appears to be covering the costs of its correctional education program without requesting SFTE support, PCC and CMC are not. Therefore without either a higher reimbursement rate from DOC or FTE Funding, both indicate they would not be able to continue to offer all of the courses they currently offer.

Negotiating a contract with DOC for the 27.6 FTE that CMC reported at the Buena Vista Boot Camp is imperative from staff's perspective. CMC only received the higher education general fund support. It did not receive DOC support for Boot Camp programs. According to CMC, inmates at Boot Camp were not charged tuition but, rather, this cost was picked up through CMC's Developmental Studies program scholarships that could also have incorporated other operational state funds. (Institutions sometimes commingle state operating revenue, cash revenue and foundation revenue to provide internal scholarship support.) Given the issues previously outlined in this agenda item, this circumstance involves the higher education budget picking up all or part of the costs of the Boot Camp correctional education program.

Staff also believes there are issues involving the administration of the program from the perspective of statutory intent. While clearly general basic/remedial skills to complete a high school diploma or GED are to be offered through these programs, the value of other courses is clearly marginal.

Anthropology, principles of macroeconomics, physical geology, introduction to fine arts, college algebra, statistics, Indians of North America and psychology courses are more appropriate to college coursework and have questionable vocational value from the job-skill perspective contemplated in statute.

Data supplied from DOC show that PCC significantly under-expended against the DOC contract. DOC's FY01 contract with PCC was for \$1,013,939. DOC states that the contract is supposed to cover travel, health benefits and administrative overhead costs. In its report to CCHE, PCC reported \$541,022 in actual billings against the DOC contract. Thus, PCC under-expended by about \$473K. PCC made up the difference between its actual costs and its expenditures against the DOC contract by claiming SFTE support for the inmates in its correctional education programs. PCC maintains that DOC contract dollars do not cover total administrative costs hence PCC requires state general fund support for its programs offered in correctional facilities. Attachment C shows, that without student FTE funding, PCC would not have covered its costs (faculty and administrative costs). With the SFTE support, however, PCC made a "profit" of about \$219K. The data provided by CMC and DOC, similarly, show that CMC does not cover its costs with DOC funds alone. However, when state student FTE support is included, CMC Buena Vista covers its costs and, in FY01 reaped an additional \$242K above its actual costs to delivery the program.

The central policy question here is whether the legislature anticipated this in its stated intent that an inmate would not be rewarded for breaking the law with a free college education – regardless of the intent to offer the courses – at taxpayer expense.

All statutory construction argues the opposite view. In fact, reading the statute in its entirety reinforces the bar on FTE support. DOC is to provide for all costs of basic skills course delivery. The inmate is to bear the costs of any additional college-level courses. It argues against FTE funding or any general funding from the higher education lines that involves state funding (financial aid, or governing board allocations) and indicates these students (inmates) for college purposes would be treated similarly to out-of-state or non-resident students paying the full cost of their college-level courses.

Since most institutions' out-of-state tuition rates actually cover between 130% and 140% of costs, the institutions could negotiate a contract rate with DOC and the private prisons that simply covers the costs at 100%.

With reference to vocational programs and authorizing FTE for inmates receiving vocational certificate courses through a community college/prison agreement, the statute does charge DOC with providing work-ready skills to inmates. Again, DOC contracts

with institutions should cover these costs. Cost-shifting to higher education through the FTE line potentially dilutes the FTE per-student allocation across the board unless new dollars are added. It raises the same issue of whether the subsidy per FTE exceeds actual delivery costs. Staff have made the case in the past that these courses fall more under the Colorado Vocational Act and that funding should come from that source of general funds if funds other than DOC dollars are to be used for this purpose. Clearly, the statute mandates that DOC ensure inmates within a reasonable date of parole should have work skills. If the certificate courses or vocational skills were at a post-secondary or college-level, then the statutory bar against the state providing these services free to inmates would apply.

DOC also has raised the issue that inmates should receive credit for completion of these courses under the contract toward vocational certificate programs and should not be required by institutions to retake the courses as non-inmates to receive credit. Staff would concur that if the institutions are providing the coursework for the certification to inmates via the DOC contracts, inmates who successfully complete the programs should receive the appropriate certifications.

A secondary policy issue, however, involves monitoring which inmates are provided educational and vocational opportunities. In some cases, information provided to CCHE staff indicates that inmates serving life terms and significant (15-year to 25-year) sentences are being served. This clearly is not contemplated in statute. Should the Commission choose to make a case to the General Assembly that some statutory accommodation for FTE funding would be appropriate, the issue of tighter eligibility controls would need to be addressed.

The current FTE policy does not allow FTE to be claimed for certificate vocational programs by Area Vocational Schools (AVS), for example, while a number of community colleges are claiming this type of FTE. DOC reports and the Delta/Montrose Area Vocational School confirms that it also has a contract for \$253,102 to provide contract faculty to teach correctional education programs. Delta/Montrose AVS does not claim SFTE support for these programs.

From a policy perspective, CMC and PCC argue the benefits of a college education to inmates, indicating the benefits to the inmate are significant and that society is less likely to see inmate recidivism if they are completing college while incarcerated. While the argument has some validity, neither national nor Colorado studies are available to show that correlation. DOC maintains courses provided by the community colleges as a part of the correctional education program are a vital part of its inmate management strategy.

Even if that is true and the correlation that statistically direct, the policy decision to subsidize the costs from the general fund higher education budget for inmates remains. Based on existing statute, it is clear the General Assembly anticipated inmates would pay the costs. Free college educations are not available to the general populace in Colorado and there has been significant policy debate over whether such an education should be

provided to those who have broken state laws. The Commission in a related discussion affirmed staff interpretation of the FTE policy and Post-Secondary Education Options statutes at its Aug. 31 meeting declining to endorse allowing high school students to delay graduation to obtain 2-year degrees through a 5th-year program at community colleges.

CCHE's additional policy concern is the potential cost shifting that is likely to occur and the inability to track – both from an executive branch and a legislative perspective – the true cost of inmate education. It is the very reason the initial legislation was proposed and adopted in 1990. Multiple programs funded by multiple state sources housed in several agencies masked the true cost of inmate education.

Finally, several of the community colleges have stated that they cannot provide post-secondary programs to DOC unless they receive state general fund support. The institutions involved have an obligation to negotiate contracts with DOC that reflect the true costs of services to inmates on basic education/remedial skills or GED/diploma coursework. PCC and CMC indicate that their calculations do not include contract management, academic oversight, sick leave expenses, instructional materials and operating expenses. If the costs exceed what is paid, the institutions need to work with DOC and CCHE to advocate an increase in the DOC education line for these programs with the legislature. NJC has done this by negotiating a contract with DOC that appears to cover all costs of that institution's offering courses to correctional inmates.

An institution offering inmates college-level coursework should, using its out-of-state student costs, calculate the coursework cost per credit hour for inmates accordingly and assess the inmate those costs. If the institutions choose not to calculate the cost (and the statute contemplates they will) the general fund subsidy via the FTE funding should not be a backfill option. The institution in making the choice to not seek full cost from the inmate should absorb those costs.

III. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

- 1. That the Commission approve the policy clarification to deny all future FTE funding requests for inmate education programs;**
- 2. That the Commission uphold the director's denial of requested policy waivers for inmate education FTE funding as outlined above;**
- 3. That the Commission approve a six-month phase-out for claiming FTE by the affected institutions, resulting in payment for the FTE claimed through the end of the current calendar year;**
- 4. That the director notify institutions and the Department of Corrections of the decision and that staff aid institutions in renegotiating the rates for institutions, as well as clarifying the types of courses that would be considered basic and vocational skill courses.**

Attachment A					
Community College DOC Correctional Education Program					
SFTE Reported for State Funding 2000-01					
College	Total SFTE Claimed	Total State Funds From SFTE (b)	Breakout of Total SFTE Claimed By Type of Course or Program		
			ABE/GED/ESL Remedial Life Skills	Vocational FTE	Academic FTE
PCC	77.98FTE	\$270.1K	50.78FTE	19.4FTE	7.8FTE
OJC	33.0FTE	\$145.6K	0	33.0FTE	0
CMC Rifle	22.61FTE	\$52.6K	22.61FTE	0	0
CMC Buena Vista	200.4FTE	\$465.3K	191.1FTE	0	9.3FTE
CCD	12.37FTE (a)	\$38.3K	0	0	12.37FTE
NJC	23.37FTE	\$110.8K	0	0	23.37FTE
TOTALS	369.73FTE	\$1,082.7K	264.49FTE	52.4FTE	52.84FTE

Notes: (a) CCD also had a contract with the Adams County Detention Center that generated an additional 11.30 SFTE that were reported for student FTE support. (b) SFTE times reimbursement amount identified in Budget Data Books FY2000-01 estimate.

Attachment B			
DOC Contract Amounts and Expenditures for Correctional Education Program FY01			
College	Contract Amount (a)	12 month Expenditures	Not Expended
CCD	\$128,410	\$78,578	\$49,832
OJC	\$74,808	\$53,985	\$20,823
PCC	\$1,013,939	\$541,022	\$472,917
NJC	\$1,734,582	\$1,341,041	\$393,541
CMC	\$545,704	\$505,964(b)	\$39,740
TOTALS	\$3,497,443	\$2,520,590	\$976,853

Colorado Department of Corrections Contract FY01 Reports, Sept. 19, 2001. Note: (a) Contract amounts include 2 months (July and August 2000) when DOC contracted with CCCOES for the community colleges and 10 months for contracts between DOC and the individual institutions. (b) CMC includes both Rifle and Buena Vista sites.

Attachment C										
Community College Revenues, Expenditures And Student FTE										
From Department of Correction's Educational Programs 2000-01										
College	REVENUES					EXPENDITURES				
	(1) Total Billings To DOC Ed Program	(2) CYOTP Revenues (b)	(3) SFTE Claimed	(4) General Fund Revenues From SFTE (c)	(5) Total Revenues (Total Columns 1+2+4)	(6) Faculty Costs From DOC Contracts	(7) Faculty Costs CYOTP & Academic	(8) College Admin Costs All DOC (e)	(9) Total Costs All DOC Programs (Total Columns 6+7+8)	(10) Diff Revenues & Expends (5-9)
PCC	\$541,022	\$122,833	77.98	\$270,123	\$933,978	\$543,058	\$53,648	\$118,507	\$715,213	\$218,765
QJC	\$53,985	0	33.0	\$145,596	\$199,581	0	\$72,861	\$60,500	\$133,361	\$66,220
CMC Rifle	\$60,062	\$9,040	22.6	\$52,568	\$121,670	\$73,767	0	\$12,919	\$86,686	\$34,984
CMC Buena Vista	\$445,902	\$25,070	200.4	\$465,342	\$936,314	\$507,420	\$58,256	\$127,908	\$693,584	\$242,730
CCD	\$78,578	0	12.37(a)	\$38,298	\$116,876	\$96,219	0	\$37,124	\$133,343	(\$16,467)
NJC	\$1,341,041	\$48,270	23.37(f)	\$110,794	\$1,500,105	\$1,098,039	0	\$149,358	\$1,247,397	\$252,708
TOTALS	\$2,520,590	\$205,213	356.64	\$1,082,721	\$3,808,524	\$2,318,503	\$184,765	\$506,316	\$3,009,584	\$798,940

Notes: (a) CCD also generated 11.3 SFTE from program with Adams County Detention Center. (b) CYOTP = Federal funds not included in DOC Correctional Education Program. CYOTP funds are in addition to revenues from Correctional Education Program. (c) To calculate general funds, CCHE used FY2001 Budget Data Book estimate for each school times SFTE reported. (d) Contract faculty are employed by colleges as part of DOC correctional educational program. (e) Includes Institutional support and equipment. (f) NJC SFTE only from CYOTP not from DOC Contract.

**TOPIC: COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY RESIDENCE HALL
PROGRAM PLAN**

PREPARED BY: JEANNE ADKINS

I. SUMMARY

Over the past two years, the Commission has consistently stated its belief that wherever possible, institutions should not allocate resources – institutional or state – to capital projects where alternative funding sources or partnerships could accomplish the same goal.

In particular, in reviews of master plans, the Commission has addressed the issue of privatizing the construction of new residential housing on the state's campuses and focusing institutional attention on education issues rather than on developing enterprises, such as large-scale multi-unit housing projects. This is particularly an issue with projects that involve apartment-style living units, as many of today's projects do.

Colorado State University (CSU) has sent forward a proposal, which has been reviewed by staff, to complete using its auxiliary funds and bonding a new 700-unit housing facility on the Ft. Collins Campus. Staff has met with CSU facilities and residential representatives and raised the issue of privatization of the project. Staff has cited the Commission's direction to the University of Colorado-Boulder and its support of the University of Northern Colorado project, both of which will be developed in public-private partnerships. The State Board of Agriculture also has approved privatization of residential projects previously and is successfully operating such a facility on the University of Southern Colorado campus in Pueblo.

II. BACKGROUND

The Commission has delegated authority to the Executive Director or his delegated representative to review all cash-funded and SB92-202 auxiliary-funded projects. The policy requires Commission agreement when staff determines a project should not proceed.

The Director of Policy and Planning has reviewed staff evaluations and budgets on these projects for three years. Where approval has not been granted, an agenda item has been forwarded to the Commission. Appeals of the director's decisions – the UC-Boulder Grandview building demolitions, for example – are reviewed by the Commission.

Policy also requires that a denial of a project by the director must be brought before the Commission for review.

CSU representatives indicate that privatization was not considered by the administration because the administration does not support the concept. In its submission, the institution

states that housing is more than “a place to live.” It contends it would be unable to offer added amenities to students in privatized residence halls.

Staff disagrees. The project as submitted can be completed either by the institution, as CSU proposes, by a public-private partnership, or privately with RFP requirements for institutional design elements to ensure quality educational programming options. The fact that the institution desires specific programming opportunities is irrelevant to the discussion of whether construction or construction and operation, a public-private cooperative lease or other agreements can be accommodated.

The institution also raises objections that a private builder and/or operator would not maintain the facility in the manner in which the institution would and that lease agreements are inappropriate in this circumstance.

However, the institution has submitted – and the Director of Policy and Planning has approved – four phases of a project for the Natural Resources Research Center that are being built using federal funds by a private developer and which will ultimately at the end of the agreements become the responsibility of CSU for maintenance.

It has negotiated direct involvement in the planning and programming of these facilities upfront.

The fact that CSU has accommodated similar circumstances in other areas leads to the conclusion that it could appropriately address its concerns about programming and maintenance of a residential facility in an RFP negotiation.

Attachment B is the program plan assessment for the CSU residence hall project. Staff has reviewed the proposed program plan and believes it is an appropriate proposal given the institution’s objections to privatization.

However, given the recent actions by the Commission with reference to privatizing these types of facilities, staff believes the project should not be approved without Commission discussion of the policy issue – whether the State Board of Agriculture should be asked to resubmit the plan privatizing the construction and/or construction and operation.

III. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Commission determine whether the State Board of Agriculture should reconsider and resubmit the request for a CSU-built and operated residential facility or direct that the project be allowed to proceed as submitted.

STATUTORY AUTHORITY:

23-1-106. Duties and powers of the commission with respect to capital construction and long-range planning. (1) It is declared to be the policy of the general assembly not to authorize or to acquire sites or initiate any program or activity requiring capital construction for state-supported institutions of higher education unless approved by the commission.

(2) The commission shall, after consultation with the appropriate governing boards of the state-supported institutions of higher education and the appropriate state administrative agencies, have authority to prescribe uniform policies, procedures, and standards of space utilization for the development and approval of capital construction programs by institutions.

(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.

SB 202 PROGRAM PLAN EVALUATION FY 2002- 03
Colorado Commission on Higher Education

Project: New South Residence Hall	Institution: Colorado State University
Original Submittal Date: October 3, 2001	Revision Date:
Total Project Cost: \$16,580,740 Total CCFE Cost: Total CF Cost: \$16,580,740 Total CFE Cost: Total FF Cost: Phased Funding 2002: \$16,580,740 2003: 2004: New Construction Cost: \$13,060,000 Renovated Construction Cost: Purpose Code: F5	Total Square Footage New Square Footage: 102,600 gsf Renovated Square Footage: New Construction Cost per Square Foot: \$161.60 Renovated Cost per Square Foot: <i>Comments:</i>

Evaluation:

Project Description: Colorado State University wants to build a 102,600-gross-square-foot student housing complex of three to four stories on Pitkin Street in the southwest corner of Main Campus and next to the existing South Residence Halls on the site of the Ropes Course. The complex would provide 700 beds for undergraduate students adjacent to the South Residence Halls. This housing would create space necessary to accommodate student housing needed as the University demolishes two 1950s-era dorms and renovates two 1960s-era dorms. It would also provide additional beds long-term to address the current overcrowding of University housing. In keeping with national trends away from traditional dorms, the new housing complex would consist of four-bedroom, four-desk residential units, each sharing a common bathroom. The complex would not have its own dining facility nor would kitchen units be available. Instead, students would eat in any of the eating facilities on campus, including those in the nearby residence halls. Although gathering areas may be provided on each floor, the lower level would have laundry, vending, common gathering areas, and administrative spaces. Some units for the handicapped and others also would be provided on the lower level. The basement level would have a seminar or classroom-type space. The 2.5-acre site would allow for outdoor picnic spaces, a volleyball area, and other gathering spaces.

The Plant Environmental Research Center directly adjacent on the east could be a site for quiet contemplation. Residents would have access to general student parking in the south residence hall area. A separate project would build 150 new parking spaces between Ingersoll and Edwards residence halls. Before the new units are ready for occupancy, 200 parking spaces

would be built close to the residence hall, giving the complex 350 parking spaces. The University figures one parking space is needed for every two beds. Because the project would be an auxiliary enterprise that would be funded, operated and maintained with revenues from residence hall room rental and food sales. It therefore qualifies as an SB 202 project eligible for expedited review and approval.

CCHE Recommendations:

This project should move forward in order to allow Colorado State University to begin either demolishing or renovating existing student housing and addressing the on-campus housing shortage.

However, if the Commission desires to have the State Board of Agriculture re-address the issue of bidding this project privately, it may authorize the demolition involved and instruct the institution to bid the project in the manner that UC-Boulder, UNC and USC have done.

If the commission chooses not to require the project to go to public bidding, the approval motion would authorize the institution to proceed to develop the project itself as an auxiliary-funded project using university cash resources (it intends to bond for the project) within the housing enterprise fund to complete the project.

CCHE Comments:

Student Housing Long Range Plan: The Student Housing Long Range Plan, completed in spring 2001, was submitted with the program plan. It recommends a three-phased approach, with construction of the New South Residence Hall as the first phase. The second phase would involve construction of additional housing, for graduate students and possibly faculty members, on the South Campus. In the third phase, Newsome and Ellis halls—the outdated 1950s-era residence halls slated for demolition—would be replaced after 2004 with suite-style housing.

Financing: The University decided to bond for this project because:

- Financing is less expensive in cost of issuance and in the interest rate;
- It is earlier to maintain control over design, materials, construction, and facility operations;
- The University has debt capacity; and
- The additional revenue that will flow to the auxiliary revenue system due to the housing rate set at 1.25 debt coverage can be used for any housing facility or auxiliary facility.

The project is financially feasible as long as at least 50 percent of the rooms are double occupancy.

Community Involvement: The City of Fort Collins developed the West Central Neighborhoods Plan, a plan for the area immediately around the Main Campus, in partnership with the University. The plan points to the need for more student housing. In addition, Fort Collins expects the University to provide its share of housing as well as work with the private sector to provide additional housing.

Background: Over the past 20 years, the University has focused on improving or providing housing for its graduate, married, and non-traditional students. Completion of the long-range housing plan in late spring was the first attempt in many years to examine undergraduate housing needs.

Requirements:

Because many students have grown up in small families with larger rooms, the typical dorm room is becoming less desirable. For this reason, the University and other higher education institutions are moving to apartment style student housing.

A market analysis and demand study performed in the spring of 2001 for the Colorado State University Long Range Housing Plan indicated a demand for 3,377 additional beds on campus for the 23,000 undergraduate and graduate students. According to the study, the University needs 1,715 suites and 2,134 apartments, but has a surplus of 472 beds in traditional dorms. This is an illustration of the fading popularity of traditional dorm rooms.

About 414 square feet is necessary for each two-room unit, or 104 square feet per student. Total space needs are:

Space Needs for South Residence Hall

Space Type	# of People	@ x per space	Gross Square Feet
Room Suites	700	106	74,520
Entry Lobby			1,000
Administrative			1,500
Public Restrooms			500
Meeting Space	25	40	1,000
Study Area	30	40	1,200
Laundry/Cleaning	20	60	1,200
Lounge	20	40	800
Vending			800
Mechanical			4,000
Storage			5,500
Other/Circulation			10,600
TOTAL			102,600

Other than the features already discussed in the project description, the project should have storage space in the basement to allow students to store materials over the summer. This will be necessary because Conference Services would most likely use the complex in the summer.

Placing student housing on Main Campus reduces air pollution, as students are able to walk, bike, or use roller blades to get around campus. The Pitkin Street site is within walking distance

of the Student Recreation Center, the most popular facility on campus, and to Campus West, a retail and commercial area developed primarily around college student needs. It is also two blocks north of Prospect Avenue, the main arterial connecting to Interstate 25.

Each unit will be equipped for access to the Internet and various software applications.

Building Functional Uses:

The residence hall would be used for undergraduate student housing and support space.

Building Efficiency Factor/Space Utilization:

CCHE has a building efficiency factor of 65% for dormitories. The suite-type layout envisioned in this program plan, however, cannot be considered as a traditional dorm complex. Space utilization would be 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

Facilities Alternatives:

The University discarded the possibility of a private developer building, operating, and maintaining the new undergraduate student housing complex. Better integration of student life programs and academic programs would occur if the University owns and operates the facility. The University wants to provide new undergraduate student housing that is more than a place to sleep. The University also expects that its maintenance of the facility will be better than a private developer, who would turn the complex over to the university after two or three decades, giving the developer little incentive to maintain the complex sufficiently toward the end of the contract. The private sector option, however, may be considered for graduate student apartments on the South Campus.

Consistency with the Institutional Master Plan:

The CSU facilities master plan, *Foundation for a New Century (1997)*, notes that first-year students will continue to be required to live in University residence halls (unless they are living at home within commuting distance of campus), that the campus will begin moving away from traditional dormitory units, that residential halls should be clustered together, and potential building sites should be adjacent to Main Campus. In all these particulars, this program plan is consistent with the master plan and with the Long Range Housing Plan for the campus.

Consistency with Institutional 5-Year Capital Improvements Program Schedule:

This project is in the 5-Year Capital Improvements Program Schedule for FY02-03.

Approved by Governing Board:

The State Board of Agriculture approved the program plan for this project on August 29, 2001. In its assurances and certifications, the State Board noted the educational program benefits include ready access to technologically rich campus connections, food services, and close proximity to academic and recreational areas, all aspects expected to improve the educational experience of students.

Appropriateness of Financing:

Cash Funds Exempt from a bond issue will be used for this project, with the bonds paid off through revenue generated from rents and food service charges.

Attachment 1: CC-C Support Information
CC-C Project Request

TOPIC: FY 2002 TUITION AND FEE SURVEY

PREPARED BY: BRIDGET MULLEN

I. SUMMARY

The enclosed report presents the FY 2002 survey on tuition and fees for the Colorado public institutions of higher education. The analysis of the FY 2002 tuition and fees include: summary tables of FY 2002 tuition and fees for all Colorado public institutions of higher education; room and board expenses; and a national comparison of resident tuition and fees at public institutions showing tuition and fees at universities, state colleges and community colleges.

II. BACKGROUND

CCHE staff annually collects information concerning the tuition and fee rates for the public institutions of higher education in Colorado.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

See enclosed report.

Appendix A

STATUTORY AUTHORITY

23-1-108 (12) “The commission shall establish tuition and fee policies based on institutional role and mission, and the governing boards shall set tuition and fees consistent with such policies. The commission shall follow the requirements of section 23-1-123 in establishing fee policies pursuant to this subsection (12).

COLORADO COMMISSION ON
 **HIGHER
EDUCATION**

ACCESS TO HIGH-QUALITY, AFFORDABLE EDUCATION FOR ALL COLORADANS

FY 2002 TUITION AND FEE REPORT
FOR COLORADO'S PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION
OCTOBER 2001

1380 Lawrence Street, Suite 1200 • Denver, Colorado 80204 • (303) 866-2723
TIMOTHY E. FOSTER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

FY 2002 Tuition and Fee Report

This annual report provides the latest information on tuition, mandatory student fees and room and board expenses associated with attending a public postsecondary institution in Colorado. For Colorado public institutions of higher education, annual maximum tuition rate increases are set by the legislature. Governing boards establish tuition rates based on these legislatively set limits. In FY 2002, the maximum resident tuition rate increase was 4.0 percent and non-resident tuition rates were capped at 5.0 percent. Student fees and room and board charges are established by the institution and approved by their respective governing boards. In addition, governing boards must comply with the Colorado Commission on Higher Education's tuition policy, which states that resident tuition rates should cover between 25 and 35 percent of total education costs for the academic program while non-resident tuition rates should cover at least 100 percent. The following tuition and fee report summarizes current information and historical trends on resident and non-resident tuition and mandatory student fees charged by Colorado public two-year and four-year institutions.

Tuition

Tuition for full-time undergraduates at Colorado's public institutions of higher education are lowest at the two-year, community colleges, and highest at the research institutions and at the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center. FY 2002 resident tuition for full-time students increased, on average, by 4 percent, the largest increase since FY 1995. In FY 2002, resident undergraduate tuition ranged from \$1,441 at the thirteen community colleges to \$4,940 at the Colorado School of Mines. Resident graduate tuition rates varied depending on the academic program. Resident tuition for graduate programs ranged from a low of \$1,746 at the University of Southern Colorado and \$1,976 and Adams State College to a high of \$4,940 at the Colorado School of Mines. Resident tuition for professional graduate programs (Medicine, Law & MBA) ranged from \$4,418 at the University of Colorado at Boulder MBA program to \$8,690 at Colorado State University – Veterinary Medicine and \$11,966 at the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center Medical Program.

In FY 2002, full-time tuition rates for non-resident students increased by 5 percent. Non-resident undergraduate full-time tuition ranged from \$5,593 at the rural community colleges and \$6,991 at the urban community colleges to \$16,624 at the University of Colorado at Boulder and \$16,860 at the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center. Non-resident graduate tuition was lowest at Adams State College and the University of Southern Colorado at \$7,518 and \$8,298 respectively and highest at the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center. For professional graduate programs tuition ranged from \$17,750 for the MBA program at the University of Colorado at Boulder to \$30,390 for the Veterinary Medicine program at Colorado State University and \$59,597 for the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center Medical School.

Tables 1 through 4 provide a summary of the tuition rates for FY 2002, including percentage increases over the FY 2001 rates. Table 1 and Table 2 in the attached Appendix report undergraduate resident and non-resident full-time tuition rates and Table 3 and Table 4 present full-time graduate tuition rates. All tuition differentials for the various academic programs for the University of Colorado campuses are included in the tables. It is important to note that in FY 2002, the University of Colorado at Boulder, the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs and the University of Colorado at Denver were given legislative approval to increase resident and non-resident tuition for various academic programs beyond the 4 and 5 percent limits. In addition, since the number of credit hours considered for full-time varies from campus to campus, a 15-credit hour comparison of tuition rates for undergraduates is provided in Table 5.

Historical Undergraduate Tuition Trends

During the past five years, average resident undergraduate tuition increases have been fairly uniform, rising between 10 and 11 percent, from FY 1998 to FY 2002, with the exception of the University of Colorado at Denver which experienced a 28 percent increase and the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs, a 16 percent gain. This uniformity is due to legislative actions taken to reduce resident tuition growth and the voter approved Taxpayers Bill of Rights (TABOR). The ten-year increases reflect a greater range of increases. For example, the two-year colleges across the state saw an average tuition increase of nearly 40 percent between FY 1992 and FY 2002. The lowest increase in the ten-year period was at the University of Colorado at Boulder (most common rate) at 33 percent and the highest increase at the University of Colorado at Denver (Freshman and Sophomore rate) at 54 percent.

In the last decade, resident undergraduate full-time tuition at Colorado's public institutions of higher education rose between 32 and 54 percent. Average resident undergraduate tuition at the state's research institutions grew by 33 percent followed by a 40 percent increase in average tuition at both the four-year and two-year public institutions. Table 6 outlines a history of resident full-time undergraduate tuition from FY 1992 to FY 2002.

Tuition as a Percentage of Education Costs

In addition to legislative guidelines for tuition increases, institutions must also comply with the Colorado Commission on Higher Education's tuition guidelines. The CCHE guidelines state that the average tuition rates for full-time, undergraduate resident students – on a governing board basis – should cover between 25 percent and 35 percent of the cost of the academic program. Average tuition rates for full-time non-resident students should cover at least 100 percent of the costs. These guidelines do not apply to

the Colorado School of Mines. Table 7 and Table 8 report tuition as a percentage of cost at each institution over the past ten fiscal years.

Student Fees

Fees reported in this report are mandatory for all students. Resident and non-resident students pay the same amount in mandatory student fees. The governing board must approve any increase or decrease to a student fee. New student fees must be first approved by students through a referendum and then by the governing board. Examples of mandatory student fees are technology fees, RTD bus pass fee, physical recreation fee, student government/organization fees and health services fees.

In FY 2002, twenty-four institutions had an increase in their mandatory student fees ranging from less than 1 percent increase to more than 20 percent. Student fees decreased by almost 4 percent at the University of Northern Colorado and remained unchanged at the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center. Table 9 compares the FY 2001 and FY 2002 mandatory student fee totals. In FY 2002, student fees ranged from \$20 at the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center to \$801 at Western State College. In general, the community colleges have lower fees as compared to the four-year institutions.

Fees at the two-year institutions were highest at Northeastern Junior College (\$557) and lowest at the Community College of Aurora (\$85). At the four-year institutions, fees were highest at Colorado State University (\$750), the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs (\$767), and at Western State College (\$801) and lowest at the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center (\$20). The average increase in mandatory student fees from FY 2001 to FY 2002 at the two-year institutions was \$4.26, a 2 percent increase over the FY 2001 fees. Mandatory student fees at the four-year institutions averaged an 8 percent increase over the previous year's totals, up \$45.

A history of mandatory student fees by institution is reported on Table 10. Over the past decade, FY 1992 to FY 2002, fees have more than doubled at eight institutions. Fees have decreased at Colorado Northwestern Community College and at Northeastern Junior College. On average, from FY 1992 to FY 2002, student fees have increased by 32 percent at the public two-year institutions, by 65 percent at the research institutions, and have more than doubled at the public four-year institutions. During the past five years the average growth rate in student fees at community colleges was 9 percent, followed by the research institutions at 20 percent. The four-year public institutions have had the largest percentage increase in mandatory student fees increasing by an average of 35 percent from FY 1998 to FY 2002.

Resident Undergraduate Tuition and Mandatory Student Fees

A more accurate picture of higher education costs to resident students at Colorado's public institutions of higher education combines both tuition and mandatory student fees. Table 11 summarizes FY 2001 and FY 2002 tuition and mandatory student fees for resident undergraduate full-time students. Resident tuition and fees at the four-year institutions ranged from highs of \$5,621 for the Colorado School of Mines and \$4,115 for the University of Colorado at Boulder Business School to lows of \$2,278 at Adams State College and \$2,288 at Mesa State College. Full-time resident tuition and fees were lowest at the community colleges, which ranged from lows of \$1,528 at the Community College of Aurora and \$1,588 at Arapahoe Community College to highs of \$1,753 at Trinidad State Junior College and \$1,998 at Northeastern Junior College, both residential two-year institutions.

A year-to-year picture of resident full-time tuition and mandatory student fees, including the five-year and ten-year averages for each institution is shown on Table 12. Over the past decade, undergraduate resident full-time tuition and fees have increased between 26 and 73 percent. Community colleges had the lowest increase over the decade (26.1%) followed by Colorado State University at almost 30 percent. Metropolitan State College of Denver experienced the largest increase in tuition and mandatory student fees (72.8%) along with the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs at 53 percent.

Tuition and fee increases during the past five years were more restrained than the first five years. From FY 1998 to FY 2002, average resident full-time undergraduate tuition and fees at the public two-year institutions increased by 10 percent followed by an average increase of almost 12 percent for the research institutions and 18 percent at the four-year institutions. Looking at the changes from FY 1992 to FY 1997, average tuition and fee increases were highest at the two-year institutions at 27 percent and lowest at the research institutions at 20 percent. Average resident undergraduate tuition and fees increased by 25 percent at the four-year institutions over the same five-year period.

Tuition and Fees as a Percent of Median Household Income

Resident undergraduate full-time tuition and mandatory student fees have declined as a share of the state's median household income during the past decade. Tuition and fees at the state's public research institutions fell from 8.8 percent of median household income in 1991 to 8.7 percent in 1996. It shows a more significant decrease over the next five years falling to 7.3 percent in 2002. For Colorado public 4-year institutions, tuition and fees actually rose from 4.9 percent of income in 1991 to 5.1 percent in 1996. They declined, however, over the next five years, dropping to 4.6 percent in 2002. In terms of

public 2-year institutions, tuition and fees as a percent of median household income was less dramatic. While increases rose from 3.3 percent of median income in 1991 to 3.5 percent in 1996, they fell to 2.9 percent by 2002. Chart 1 shows tuition and fees as a share of Colorado median household income between 1991 and 2002.

Growth in Colorado's median household income has outpaced growth in resident tuition and fees over the past decade. From 1991 to 2002, Colorado's median household income increased by more than 69 percent. Over the same period, resident full-time undergraduate tuition and mandatory student fees at Colorado's public 4-year institutions rose by 52 percent, as compared to tuition and fee growth of 41 percent at public research institutions and 38 percent at community colleges. Median household income grew at a faster pace from 1996 to 2002 than from 1991 to 1996, whereas resident tuition and fees increased faster from 1991 to 1996 as compared to the last five years.

Room & Board Rates

In addition to tuition and mandatory student fee rate changes, the Colorado Commission on Higher Education annually reports room and board rate costs. The FY 2002 room and board charges are between 2 and 12 percent higher than the previous year. Fifteen of the twenty-six public institutions of higher education in Colorado offer institutional housing options to their students and, although, freshmen are generally encouraged to live on campus, it is not mandatory. Table 13 outlines room and board rates for FY 2002. Room and board expenses averaged \$5,568 at the public four-year institutions and \$4,321 at the residential two-year institutions. The lowest room and board rates were at Otero Junior College at \$3,756 and \$4,288 at Lamar Community College. The highest rates were at the University of Colorado at Boulder at \$6,085 and the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs at \$5,900. The average room and board rate grew to \$5,152 from \$4,895 in FY 2001, an increase of more than 5 percent.

A National Comparison

A national comparison of resident tuition and fees at public institutions of higher education is provided in Table 14. The most recent data compiled by the State of Washington Higher Education Coordinating Board is for FY 2001 tuition and mandatory student fees. Full-time tuition is defined as 30 semester credit hours or 45-quarter credit hours. The resident undergraduate tuition and fee rate reported for the "Flagship University" classification in the report is the University of Colorado at Boulder. The average tuition and fee calculated for Colorado's "Comprehensive Colleges and Universities" classification is Adams State College, Fort Lewis College, Metropolitan State College of Denver, the University of Northern Colorado and Western State College.

Resident tuition and fees at Colorado's public four-year universities and colleges, on average, is less than the national average. However, resident tuition and fees at

Colorado's community colleges exceed the national average. The national average for tuition and fees at a flagship university was \$4,000 compared to Colorado at \$3,188. Resident tuition and mandatory student fees at Colorado's flagship university, as defined by the State of Washington Survey, was 25 percent less than the national average. Resident tuition at Colorado's comprehensive colleges and state universities was 35 percent less than the national average. However, Colorado's average resident community college tuition and mandatory student fee, at \$1,920, was higher than the national average of \$1,729 by 10 percent.

Appendix

TOPIC: CONCEPT PAPERS

PREPARED BY: JOANN EVANS

I. SUMMARY

This agenda item presents the concept papers submitted to the Commission during the past month, including:

B.S. in Biomedical Sciences at Colorado State University
B.S. in Biomedical Engineering at Colorado State University

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

II. BACKGROUND

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

Stage 1: Concept Paper

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

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

Stage 2: Full Degree Proposal

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

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

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

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

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

TOPIC: CONCEPT PAPER: BACHELOR OF SCIENCE (B.S.) IN BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES AT COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY

PREPARED BY: JOANN EVANS

I. BACKGROUND

The State Board of Agriculture has submitted a concept paper for a Bachelor of Science (B.S.) degree program in Biomedical Sciences at Colorado State University (CSU). The proposed degree program will offer preparation programs for students seeking admission into medicine or veterinary medicine. It is designed for students who intend to continue their education in health professional programs, enroll in a graduate program, or directly enter a career in biomedical sciences. The concept paper was developed by the School of Veterinary Medicine.

The Biomedical Science concept paper highlighted several points supporting CSU's claim that Biomedical Sciences is appropriate to CSU's role and mission, does not unnecessarily duplicate other degree programs, and meets bona fide demand in Colorado.

The program is specifically designed for students who intend to: 1) continue their education in health professional programs, 2) enroll in a graduate program, or 3) directly pursue a career in an industry where an academic background (and associated technical skills) in biomedical sciences is deemed important. The overall goal is to provide a comprehensive program that will provide students with a marketable degree that provides opportunities to pursue a variety of career options. The institution anticipates enrolling up to 100 freshmen for the first two years and a total program enrollment of 600 to 700 students.

The proposed B.S. Degree in Biomedical Sciences program will complement existing B.S. degree programs in Microbiology and in Environmental Health currently offered by the College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences.

The market demand for biomedical scientists is substantiated by the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, report that indicates that the demand for health/biomedical professionals (a list of 10 occupations) will grow between 5 and 80 percent from 1994 to 2005 in the U.S., and between 1 and 6 percent for the same occupations in Colorado. According to the *2000-01 Occupational Outlook Handbook*, there should be many opportunities for bachelor's degree graduates in science-related jobs in sales, marketing, and research management, as well as in laboratory research positions through the year 2008. The concept paper states that in Colorado, biotechnology and biomedical companies employ over 20,000 people (Colorado Venture Center report). Currently there are 174 biotechnology and medical device companies and 143 medical supplier firms in Colorado. Larimer County is second only to Boulder County in employing people in the biomedical sciences field.

II. STAFF ANALYSIS

The proposed degree program is aligned with CSU's role and mission of "offering a comprehensive array of undergraduate programs consistent with the tradition of land grant universities." (C.R.S. 23-31-101)

Duplication: The proposed B.S. degree in Biomedical Sciences is not offered at any four-year institution in Colorado. There are approximately fifty such programs offered nationwide.

The concept paper provided evidence of general demand by industry. It is unclear how the proposed Biomedical Science undergraduate degree ties to industry demand. The case is more compelling for students who are seeking an undergraduate degree to prepare them for graduate work.

III. ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED IN PROPOSAL

The Commission staff and representative of the governing board discussed the following issues and agree that it is appropriate for CSU to respond to these questions during the proposal development and address in the full proposal.

- Elaborate how the proposed degree program responds to a bona fide statewide demand for the program by the industry.
- The concept paper indicates the degree program is designed for pre-veterinary students. What will this program provide to students that they do not receive in an undergraduate science program or in Environmental Health?
- Clarify the distinctions between this degree proposal and the concept paper for a proposed B. S. in Biomedical Engineering. These two programs appear to compete for the same student population and are housed under two different schools. Biomedical Engineering is proposed to be offered by the School of Engineering and Biomedical Science by the School of Veterinary Medicine. What is the basis for the projected enrollment?
- What is the link between this new program and the elimination of the non-degree pre-professional veterinary medicine program?

CONCEPT PAPER
B.S. Degree in Biomedical Sciences
COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY

Lance Perryman, Dean, College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences
Al Dyer, Interim Provost/Academic Vice President
October 22, 2001

A. Goal

The College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences proposes **to create a premier B.S. degree program in Biomedical Sciences**. This will be accomplished by utilizing existing undergraduate courses in the college, developing new courses as needed to conform to the All University Core Curriculum, and developing or drawing upon supporting courses from other colleges and the newly implemented interdisciplinary Life Sciences Core. In addition to **offering a coherent, focused curriculum in biomedical sciences**, the program will provide **academic and career advising services**. The program is specifically designed for students who intend to: 1) continue their education in health professional programs, 2) enroll in a graduate program, or 3) directly pursue a career in an industry where an academic background (and associated technical skills) in biomedical sciences is deemed important. Accordingly, the overall goal is to provide a comprehensive program that will provide students with a marketable degree that provides opportunities to pursue **a variety of career options**.

The new degree program envisioned will complement existing B.S. degree programs in Microbiology and in Environmental Health currently offered by the College, and will permit the College to further increase its role in undergraduate education. Moreover, it will also complement existing or planned programs in Life Sciences including: biochemistry; cell and molecular biology; integrative organismal biology; evolution; genetics and systematics; behavioral biology; health and exercise science; and food science and human nutrition.

B. Basic Design

Administration: As a result of the recent reorganization of departments in the College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences, the Department of Physiology and the Department of Anatomy and Neurobiology were combined to form a new department – the “Department of Biomedical Sciences”. The proposed degree program will be administered by the newly formed Department of Biomedical Sciences, which currently teaches the majority of the biomedical science courses (e.g. Anatomy and Physiology, Human Development, Human Health and Disease, Histology, Endocrinology, Pharmacology, Cardiopulmonary Physiology, Theory and Practice of Biotechnology, Physiological Responses to the Environment, etc.). The faculty embraces the Core Curriculum and is prepared to develop students’ communication, critical thinking, and problem solving skills, in addition to developing a solid knowledge base and biomedical scientific skills. Additional responsibilities will include recruiting students, academic and career advising, ensuring student retention in the program, keeping records for each student, conducting degree checks, curricular development, determining teaching assignments, etc. The faculty in this department is

eager to provide mentorship and research opportunities to the students enrolled in the B.S. degree program, just as many of them do currently for undergraduates enrolled in other majors at Colorado State University. Academic and career advising can be accessed by students in at least three ways: 1) Each student in the program will have a faculty advisor assigned through a staff member in the department office with responsibility for academic programs; 2) Students who are interested in preparing for professional programs will receive specific information from professional advisors at the Center for Life Sciences; and 3) The College Career Liaison is a professional advisor jointly appointed in the University Career Center and the College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences who provides information to all students in the College.

Projected enrollment and additional resources: We anticipate an initial enrollment of up to 150 freshmen, 100 internal transfers, and 25 external transfers distributed among the first three classes of students. If freshmen enrollment continues at ~150 students, and the number of incoming transfers declines somewhat after the first two years, then we anticipate a total program enrollment of ~600-700 students (conservative estimate). To meet this demand we anticipate a need for at least 2 additional faculty FTE and 1 administrative-professional FTE. To ensure optimal and cost-effective use of faculty resources and physical facilities, the use of web-based educational technology will be routinely evaluated and utilized when appropriate.

Curriculum: Graduation requirements: minimum of 120 credits, 42 of which are upper division courses. Core Curriculum (93-97 credits) requirements are:

- All University Core: 23-26 credits. Students will select courses to fill AUCC requirements (designated by category numbers and letters) from the lists in the General Catalog.
- Life Sciences Core: 46-50 credits to include base biological and physical sciences courses.
- Biomedical Sciences Core: 24-28 credits to include: First-Year Seminar (2-3 credits, discipline-based), and Capstone seminar (2 credits) and skills development (3 credits), and approved biomedical sciences electives (12-14 credits).
- Electives: 14-16 credits of general electives.

Academic support services: RADAR program - The College's **R**ecruitment, **A**dvising, **D**iversity, **A**nd **R**etention committee, which has representatives from each undergraduate program, provides a link between University academic, advising, and retention programs, college faculty members, and undergraduate students enrolled in B.S. degree programs. Career Liaison - This staff member provides career advice, internship opportunities, resume and interview workshops, and links to potential employers. Advising Coordinator - this staff position (1 FTE administrative-professional) will be established to coordinate and participate in the academic advising of BMS students. Program Support - this state-classified staff position (1 FTE) will be re-allocated from current staffing.

C. Market

Pre-entry market: The primary recruitment market includes undergraduate students with post-

baccalaureate interests in: 1) human medicine, veterinary medicine, physician assistant, nurse practitioner, medical technology, pharmacy, occupational therapy and physical therapy programs, 2) graduate programs in physiology, neurobiology, pharmacology, cell and molecular biology, human biology, and pathobiology, and 3) careers where a background in biomedical sciences is needed or deemed desirable (e.g., biotechnology and pharmaceutical companies, research and service laboratories in universities, research institutes, and government agencies). At present a degree program that specifically focuses on education, training, and preparation in biomedical sciences is not available.

Post-graduation market: Graduates of the degree program in Biomedical Sciences would emerge with the knowledge base and technical skills that would permit them to immediately pursue a variety of post-baccalaureate interests. According to the *2000-01 Occupational Outlook Handbook*, there should be many opportunities for bachelor's degree graduates in science-related jobs in sales, marketing, and research management, as well as in laboratory research positions through the year 2008. Continued growth is expected in biotechnology and pharmaceutical companies, and more biomedical scientists will be needed to determine the environmental impact of industry and government actions and to prevent or correct environmental problems. Expected expansion in research related to health issues, such as, heart disease and stroke, cancer, infectious diseases (e.g. anthrax or other agents used for bioterrorism), and chronic neurological diseases, should also result in growth. Continued growth of the health care industry will require trained medical personnel from technical laboratory staff to physicians. In Colorado alone, biotechnology and biomedical companies employ over 20,000 people and sell products throughout the world as well as domestically (Colorado Venture Center report). There are currently 174 biotechnology and medical device companies and 143 medical supplier firms in Colorado. Larimer County is second only to Boulder County in employing people in the biomedical sciences field. Many graduates will also enroll in health-care professional schools (e.g. occupational therapy, physical therapy, physician assistant, etc.) and in schools of human and veterinary medicine. The majority of potential employers state that prospective employees must have good communication, critical thinking, problem solving, and teamwork skills. The proposed program will prepare students to be competitive in the "biomedical sciences" market.

D. Justification

Colorado State University is in a unique position to develop, promote, and implement a B.S. degree program in Biomedical Sciences based on its mission as a Land Grant institution. The University is to provide access to "a comprehensive array of undergraduate programs consistent with the tradition of a land grant university. To accomplish this task, new programs, particularly multidisciplinary and cross-disciplinary programs, that address the needs of enrolled students and employers within the State of Colorado are to be supported." The proposed B.S. degree program meets these goals.

- According to a recent survey, a B.S. degree in Biomedical Sciences is not offered at any 4-year institution in Colorado. Approximately 50 such programs are offered nationwide.
- The U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, indicates that the demand for health/biomedical professionals (a list of 10 occupations) will grow between 5 and 80% from

1994 to 2005 in the U.S., and between 1 and 62% for the same occupations in Colorado.

- In Fall 2000, over 1500 pre-health professional students were enrolled at Colorado State University.
- A 1998 survey of undergraduate students enrolled in “health science” courses at Colorado State University indicated that 61% (490 of 801 surveyed) would have been interested in enrolling in a B.S. degree program in Biomedical Sciences if it were available; 74% responded that such a degree would meet the needs of undergraduate students at Colorado State University that are not adequately met by our current majors; and 74% responded that such a degree would help recruit more health career oriented students to Colorado State University.
- A 2000 survey of undergraduate students enrolled in “Anatomy and Physiology” courses at Colorado State University indicated that 49% would have been interested in a Biomedical Sciences program; 67% responded that such a degree would meet the needs of undergraduate students at Colorado State University; and 77% responded that such a degree would help recruit more health career oriented students to Colorado State University.
- A recent survey indicated that there are over 350 potential Colorado industrial employers (biotechnology, pharmaceutical, medical devices, analytical services, etc.) of graduates with a B.S. degree in Biomedical Sciences.

E. Summary

1. Colorado State University is well positioned to offer a B.S. degree in Biomedical Sciences that is not offered elsewhere in the State.
2. Academic and career needs of students in career tracks involving the Biomedical Sciences will be met more efficiently and effectively.
3. General and specific course work is currently available; only a few specific “areas of emphasis” need to be developed. A new degree program in Biomedical Sciences will complement the integrated Life Sciences curriculum that is being implemented at Colorado State University.
4. Undergraduate research opportunities will be increased by providing students better access to world-class biomedical scientists who will be advisors/mentors in the new degree program.
5. There continues to be a strong market for graduates with education and training in the biomedical sciences.
6. We can better prepare our graduates who wish to pursue professional and/or graduate education in the health-care fields and the life sciences, as well as those who seek employment in industries where an academic background and training in biomedical sciences is needed or considered desirable

**TOPIC: CONCEPT PAPER: BACHELOR OF SCIENCE (B.S.) IN
 BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING AT COLORADO STATE
 UNIVERSITY**

PREPARED BY: JOANN EVANS

I. BACKGROUND

The State Board of Agriculture has submitted a concept paper for a Bachelor of Science (B.S.) in Biomedical Engineering based in the College of Engineering at Colorado State University (CSU). Biomedical engineering is an engineering degree that has a strong chemistry, physics, and the life sciences component as part of the degree requirements.

The proposal presents the following points to support CSU's intent to develop a full proposal for this degree program. The full concept paper is attached.

The College of Engineering at CSU currently offers an undergraduate interdisciplinary studies certificate (commonly referred to as a minor) in Biomedical Engineering. The Bachelor of Science program, if approved, will replace the certificate program. There are approximately 70 students enrolled in the biomedical engineering minor and 12 students have graduated to date.

The demand for biomedical engineers in industry is growing. According to the U.S. Department of Labor's predictions for 1998 to 2008, while the employment of engineers by all industries will increase by 19.9%, the employment of engineers by the medical instruments/supplies and health services industries is expected to grow by 33.4% and 21.2%, respectively. The biomedical engineering industry is rapidly expanding in Colorado, the U.S., and the world. According to a January 1997 article in Colorado Business Magazine, the biomedical industry "comprises one of the largest and fastest-growing segments of the Colorado economy . . . the industry already accounts for almost 10% of the State's manufacturing base. Its \$4.3 billion in annual gross revenues in Colorado matches agriculture's."

Students are attracted to the proposed biomedical engineering degree program not only because of the strong job market, but also as an alternative to pre-health profession courses of study. CSU recently conducted a survey of the students enrolled in the minor. Fifty four percent (38 students) completed the survey. Thirty-two respondents indicated they would be interested in a biomedical engineering degree if it were offered at CSU. Since it is increasingly difficult to be admitted into first professional health profession programs (e.g., Medicine, Dentistry), students are seeking bachelor degree programs that are recognized as excellent preparation for advanced medical programs but also provide background for alternate careers in the medical field. In addition to meeting the needs of Colorado residents, the proposed B.S. degree would help CSU recruit out-of-state students seeking a B.S. degree

in biomedical engineering.

The Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology, Inc. (ABET) accredits biomedical engineering bachelor degree programs. There are currently 17 biomedical engineering (or bioengineering) undergraduate degree programs accredited by ABET. The proposed BSBE program will seek ABET accreditation.

II. STAFF ANALYSIS

The proposed degree program is strongly aligned with CSU's role and mission of "offering a comprehensive array of undergraduate programs consistent with the tradition of land grant universities." (C.R.S. 23-31-101)

At the present time, no undergraduate degree is offered at any institution in Colorado or the surrounding states in the biomedical engineering. Colorado residents currently must enroll at universities in other states to pursue a bachelor's degree in biomedical engineering.

The concept paper provided evidence of the demand by industry for graduates with a degree in Biomedical Engineering. It is unclear if the industry demand is for undergraduates or engineering students with advanced degrees in biomedicine.

III. ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED IN PROPOSAL

The Commission staff and representative of the governing board discussed the following issues and agree that it is appropriate for CSU to respond to these questions during the proposal development and address in the full proposal.

- Provide a market study of the biomedical engineering industry in Colorado. Given the market information, why is the current certificate program insufficient?
- Elaborate on how the proposed degree program responds to industry demands, especially regarding entry-level positions in this field. Would a more appropriate degree design be a 3 plus 2 baccalaureate/master's degree? What are the advantages and disadvantages of each program design?
- What are the competencies a graduate of this program will have that would make the individual a prime candidate for medical school? Are they the same competencies that the biomedical industry is seeking?
- The proposed curriculum appears to be technically specifically designed in the biomedical field with three concentrations. Is this overspecialized at the bachelor level? The curriculum presented in the concept paper did not effectively describe the

curriculum design. However, CCHE's approval process states that the concept paper is an early stage of the proposal development process and the curriculum will be refined and developed to meet market need and ensure the competencies.

- Given biomedical engineering's strong alignment with a land grant college's mission, what would make this one of the top ten undergraduate programs in the nation?

CONCEPT PAPER

B.S. Degree in Biomedical Engineering COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY

**Neal Gallagher, Dean, College of Engineering
Al Dyer, Interim Provost/Academic Vice President
October 22, 2001**

The College of Engineering at Colorado State University (CSU) requests permission to establish a new academic degree program entitled Bachelor of Science in Biomedical Engineering (BSBE). This degree represents an extension of the present interdisciplinary studies program in biomedical engineering at CSU. Biomedical engineering is a relatively new discipline which, through the application of engineering, chemistry, physics, and the life sciences, seeks to improve human health.

The rationale and desire for this new degree rests on the following eight points. A brief description of the BSBE degree curriculum and administrative structure follows these eight points.

1) The biomedical engineering industry is rapidly expanding in Colorado, the U.S., and the world.

According to a January 19, 1997 article in Colorado Business Magazine, the biomedical industry "comprises one of the largest and fastest-growing segments of the Colorado economy . . . the industry already accounts for almost 10% of the State's manufacturing base. Its \$4.3 billion in annual gross revenues in Colorado matches agriculture's." A Battelle Memorial Institute report, commissioned by the Fitzsimons Redevelopment Authority, confirms these statements for the growing biosciences industry, which includes biomedical engineering. Nearly 2300 establishments employing over 28,000 workers comprise Colorado's bioscience industry in 1996. The industry paid out \$1.3 billion in payroll and paid an average wage of \$44,145 (compared to a private sector average of \$28,182). Bioscience jobs in the state expanded by 36 percent between 1989 and 1996, five percentage points faster than the state's private sector average and 25 percentage points faster than the U.S. private sector average. Real wages expanded by 210% compared to a 3% state private sector average. Bioscience accounts for 1.8% of the state's private sector employment and 2.8% of private sector payroll. The bioscience industry in Colorado is concentrated more heavily in biomedical engineering, than it is in the U.S. as a whole, as evidenced by the large number of medical device companies along the front range ("Biotechnology and Information Technology in Colorado's Front Range", Edward J. Feser, and Sara Hinkley.).

"The medical technology sector-the industry with the highest demand for biomedical engineers- is already one of the fastest growing commercial sectors in the world. The medical device industry is a \$146 billion enterprise world-wide. The United States accounts for \$62.3 billion, almost half of the total. In 1999 the Nasdaq Biotech Index rose 102 percent, outperforming the Nasdaq Composite Index, which climbed 86 percent during the same period." (The Whitaker Foundation, 1999 Annual Report). The Whitaker Foundation is a nonprofit, private foundation that supports biomedical engineering education and research. The Whitaker Foundation is the major nonprofit organization responsible for developing new biomedical engineering degree programs in the U.S. over the last decade, and for conducting studies and workshops related to biomedical engineering. In the last three years there has been a dramatic shift in the focus of the Whitaker Foundation from graduate to undergraduate degree programs in biomedical engineering.

2) A BSBE degree will strengthen the relationship between CSU, the Fitzsimons Bioscience

Park, and the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center (UCHSC) campus.

Accelerating Colorado's biotechnology boom is the \$3.5 billion redevelopment of the former Fitzsimons Army Medical Center into one square mile dedicated to life science research, education, and patient care. The new 217-acre campus of the UCHSC, and the 160-acre Colorado Bioscience Park Aurora anchor the project. The 160-acre Bioscience Park has been master planned for up to 3 million square feet and a workforce of 4,000. The park can accommodate research-oriented biomedical, biotechnology and pharmaceutical operations in multi-tenant buildings as well as in single-tenant build-to-suit buildings. A 60,000-square-foot multi-tenant Bioscience Park Center opened on the site in 2000. Planned in consultation with academic researchers and biotech entrepreneurs, the building contains facilities, equipment, and services to support startup and early stage bioscience companies. The first eight biotech tenants recently moved in. A 93,000 square foot Bioscience Two Building is already in design to house expansion-stage bioscience companies.

There already is a good relationship between the current CSU Biomedical Engineering Program (BEP) and UCHSC. CSU BEP students have worked in research labs at UCHSC, and the faculty from the two campuses collaborate on research proposals and exchange seminars and lectures. The proposed CSU BSBE curriculum requires students to obtain a summer internship in the field. The companies in the Bioscience Park will benefit from the placement of CSU BSBE summer interns and the ability to recruit students with the BSBE degree. Furthermore, the biomedical researchers on the UCHSC faculty will also benefit from ties with the CSU BSBE program and access to the students and graduates of this program.

3) The demand for biomedical engineers in industry is also growing rapidly.

In the past, medical device and biomedical companies have hired graduates of traditional engineering disciplines with the hope that they could absorb enough of the life sciences to be productive. However, with the continuing revolutions in the biological sciences and the rapid growth of engineering technology, companies have come to recognize the importance of interdisciplinary training specifically in biomedical engineering.

Companies are now becoming aware of the talents and training biomedical engineering graduates possess. While five years ago there appeared to be some bias against hiring baccalaureates in biomedical engineering, the attitudes are now changing. "For one thing, companies are building a history of experience with people who have biomedical engineering degrees, a history of positive experience. Also this bias is more prevalent among people who had their educational training quite a number of years ago, before there were many biomedical engineering programs" -- Robert Morff, manager of technology development for Sentron Medical Ventures (Whitaker Foundation 1999 Annual Report).

According to the U.S. Department of Labor's predictions for 1998 to 2008, while the employment of engineers by all industries will increase by 19.9%, the employment of engineers by the medical instruments/supplies and health services industries is expected to grow by a staggering 33.4% and 21.2%, respectively.

Measurements of the U.S. bioengineering industry show its rapid growth. An Ernst & Young report issued in May of 2000 by the Biotechnology Industry Organization (BIO) showed that the nation's biotech/bioengineering industry had doubled in size between 1993 and 1999. It is predicted to double again within the next five to eight years.

The bio-industry in Colorado has emerged predominantly over the last 15 years. Though, not yet in the top tier of biotech states, Colorado has seen a steady stream of biotech/bioengineering start-ups and a few relocations into the state. At last count, there were more than 60 bioengineering companies in Colorado. Some of the start-ups have attracted the resources needed to grow rapidly into larger enterprises. Relocations of companies or divisions of companies into the state have fueled growth. The best examples are: Amgen, the world's largest biotech company; Ribozyme Pharmaceuticals, which relocated to Colorado from Cleveland, Ohio early in its development; and California-headquartered FeRx, which recently moved its entire research and development (R&D)

operations into the new Colorado Bioscience Park at the former Fitzsimons Army Base (see #2 above).

Colorado biomedical companies have responded very favorably to a proposed undergraduate program in biomedical engineering at CSU. Warren Mauter, Director of the Laboratories Group for GAMBRO BCT in Lakewood states "Biomedical technology is a significant and growing industry in Colorado and beyond. This growth creates a real need for trained technical staff with a fundamental understanding of biomedical technologies and the regulatory requirements that drive our industry". According to Mauter, students would be better prepared to enter a highly regulated industry like biomedical technology with the training that a biomedical engineering bachelors degree program would offer. Mauter states that additional training in the life sciences and regulatory requirements, which this proposed degree program would provide, would help companies decrease the amount of training time by 50%.

In October 2001, CSU submitted a proposal to NASA to create an institute for bioengineering and science technology. Over 25 Colorado companies signed a statement in support of biomedical engineering baccalaureate education in the State. In addition, the Colorado Institute of Technology (CIT) and Governor Bill Owens provided letters supporting bioengineering initiatives in the State to complement the growing biomedical industry in Colorado. Finally, discussions with the Colorado Medical Device Association members indicate a good job market for biomedical engineering baccalaureates.

4) There has been significant growth in the number of students electing to pursue biomedical engineering undergraduate degrees, and in the number of universities offering these degrees.

Given the growth in the biomedical engineering job market and heightened publicity achieved by the field in recent years, it is not surprising that student demand for bachelor degrees in this area is increasing. The Whitaker Foundation is a private, nonprofit foundation that primarily supports research and education in biomedical engineering. The foundation's goal is to help establish biomedical engineering as a mainstream academic discipline at most major research university. According to the Whitaker Foundation 1999 Annual report, universities are responding to the increased demand with the creation of new degree programs. "At the close of 1999, there were biomedical engineering departments and programs at 80 colleges and universities throughout the United States (compared to approximately 50 in 1992). Another 44 institutions plan to create departments and programs in the next year.

CSU currently has a Biomedical Engineering Program (BEP) that offers interdisciplinary studies certificates (similar to a minor) to undergraduates. There are approximately 70 students enrolled in the program, and 12 students have graduated to date. The average GPA of these students is 3.0; 52% are female and 48% are male (see #8 below). BEP receives numerous requests each week from students inside and outside of Colorado seeking an undergraduate degree program in biomedical engineering.

A survey of CSU BEP students was recently conducted. Fifty four percent of BEP students completed the survey. The majority of respondents (84%) indicated they would be interested in a biomedical engineering degree if it were offered at CSU. The high average GPA (3.1) of all BEP students, and the fact that 68% of the respondents indicated that they intend to pursue graduate or professional school indicate the excellent quality of the BEP students.

BEP also recently conducted a small mail survey of regional Colorado high school students. Thirty students from four different high schools responded. Of these, 43% expressed an interest in an undergraduate major in biomedical engineering at CSU. Those high school students were considering biomedical engineering programs that offer a BSBE at ten out-of-state schools, and had discounted CSU due its lack of a degree-granting biomedical engineering program.

Students are attracted to BSBE programs not only by the strong job market, but also as an alternative to pre-health profession (i.e., medical, veterinary, physical therapy, etc.) courses of study. As it becomes increasingly difficult to gain entrance to these health profession programs, students

are seeking bachelor degree programs that are recognized as excellent preparation for applying to the programs, but that also offer a B.S. degree that is extremely useful in and of itself. National trends indicate that approximately 1/3 of BSBE graduates work in industry, approximately 1/3 go to graduate school, and approximately 1/3 go on to professional school (e.g., medical school).

The Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology, Inc. (ABET) does accredit biomedical engineering bachelor degree programs. There are currently 22 biomedical engineering (or bioengineering) undergraduate degree programs accredited by ABET. Most of these programs have been established for decades. The proposed BSBE program would plan to achieve ABET accreditation.

5) The mission of CSU as a Land Grant University is in part to provide educational programs that respond to the needs of the people of Colorado.

In light of the increasing demands from students and industry for education in this area it is incumbent upon us to provide such a degree. Furthermore, the field of biomedical engineering promises to improve the health care technology available to all. Indeed, the growing importance of biomedical engineering has inspired departments across campus to hire new faculty with expertise in this area.

6) No such degree is presently offered at any institution in Colorado or the surrounding states.

No universities in Colorado, Wyoming, Nebraska, or New Mexico currently offer a B.S. degree in biomedical engineering. The University of Utah recently began a bachelor's degree in biomedical engineering in 1999. Colorado residents currently must leave the state to pursue a bachelor's degree in biomedical engineering. In addition to meeting the needs of Colorado residents, the proposed B.S. degree would help CSU recruit out-of-state students seeking a B.S. degree in biomedical engineering.

7) CSU is the best institution in the State to provide this degree.

CSU has all the components required to offer a B.S. degree in biomedical engineering on one campus: strong engineering and life sciences departments and a professional veterinary medicine program complete with a full scale clinical hospital. While close ties to the UCHSC medical school (see point 2 above) will help strengthen the proposed CSU degree, CSU does have all the required components on its own campus. Veterinary medicine is an integral part of biomedical engineering training because animals are often used as models in biomedical research.

The proposed degree will help CSU meet its strategic goals in the life sciences and educating for citizenship, and provide a model for conducting interdisciplinary undergraduate degree programs as the demand for interdisciplinary education continues to expand.

8) Enhance the diversity of the engineering faculty and students.

Women are traditionally underrepresented in engineering fields. The percentage of biomedical engineering bachelor degrees awarded to women is higher than that percentage for almost all other engineering fields. For example, in 1998-99, 32% of biomedical engineering bachelor degrees went to women, while only 15% of mechanical engineering bachelor degrees went to women (Profiles of Engineering and Engineering Technology Colleges, ASEE 1999 edition). Indeed, 3 of the 7 (42.8%) tenured or tenure-track female professors in the College of Engineering work in the biomedical field. The current BEP enrollment (>50% female -- see #4 above) supports this as well.

BSBE Curriculum and Administrative Structure

The curriculum for the proposed degree represents an extension of the existing interdisciplinary studies certificate curriculum. The curriculum is truly interdisciplinary involving significant coursework from four colleges (Engineering, Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences, Natural Sciences, and Applied Human Sciences) and select courses from two other colleges (Business and Liberal Arts). The delicate balance between the breadth required for interdisciplinary biomedical studies, and the depth required to achieve the rigorous analytical and practical design skills associated with traditional engineering degrees, is achieved by having students specialize in one aspect of biomedical engineering through the choice of concentrations. The four-year curriculum contains 3 different concentrations: 1) Biomechanical and Biomaterials Engineering, 2) Cellular, Molecular and Bioprocess Engineering, and 3) Bioelectrical Engineering. In addition to enabling a balance of breadth and depth, these concentrations make it possible to update the curriculum with new/different concentrations as the field advances and as CSU faculty interests change. These concentrations also ensure these students will have in-depth engineering knowledge, similar to traditionally trained engineers, in addition to their specialized biomedical skills. As a result, more traditional engineering job markets will also be open to these graduates.

The first two years of coursework are similar for all three concentrations and much of this coursework (math, chemistry, physics, and biology) could be completed at regional community colleges. The curriculum features significant experiential learning through a two-course capstone sequence and a required internship experience.

The program will be based in the College of Engineering under the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies, and will be phased in over a five-year period, with the first students enrolling in 2003. A full time program director will administer the program with the help of administrative support staff, professional advisors, and a variety of faculty members from Engineering and the other Colleges involved. Each BSBE student will also be assigned a faculty advisor from one of the Engineering Departments depending on which concentration they choose (e.g., concentration 3 students will be advised by faculty from Electrical and Computer Engineering).

TOPIC: REPORT ON OUT-OF-STATE INSTRUCTION

PREPARED BY: ANDREW BRECKEL III

I. SUMMARY

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

II. BACKGROUND

Prior to 1983, instruction out-of-state was offered at will by Colorado institutions, primarily through the Extended Studies Program, but an Attorney General opinion of July 3, 1980, concluded that there was no authorizing legislation and out-of-state programs were discontinued. In 1983, the General Assembly enacted legislation that authorized non-state-funded out-of-state instruction but also required governing board approval. When the instruction is beyond the contiguous states, Commission approval is required as well.

At its meeting of May 2, 1986, the Commission delegated authority to the Executive Director to determine when out-of-state instruction beyond the contiguous states complies with statutory requirements. In June 1986, the Commission received the first notification of out-of-state instruction certified by the Executive Director. Additional approved out-of-state instruction is reported to the Commission as it is received and reviewed.

III. ACTION

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

The Board of Regents of the University of Colorado has submitted a request for an out-of-state instructional program, which was delivered by the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center.

T-Cell Dynamics in HIV Infection: Implications for Immune Based Therapies an out-of-state program to be presented in Chicago, Illinois on September 21, 2001.

The Board of Trustees of the State Colleges in Colorado has submitted a request for the approval of an out-of-state course to be delivered by Adams State College.

ED 589: Brain Based Learning to be offered in New York State from October 18 through October 21, 2001.

STATUTORY AUTHORITY

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