

COLORADO COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

May 4, 2000
Mesa State College
Grand Junction, Colorado

MINUTES

Commissioners Present: Alexander E. Bracken, Chair; Terrance L. Farina; Robert A. Hessler; Peggy Lamm; Ralph Nagel, Vice Chair; Dean L. Quamme; William B. Vollbracht and James Stewart.

Advisory Committee Present: Jane Duncan; and Sandy Hume.

Commission Staff Present: Timothy E. Foster, Executive Director; Jeanne Adkins; JoAnn Evans; James Jacobs; Raymond Keith; and Sharon Samson.

I. Call to Order

The regular meeting of the Colorado Commission on Higher Education was called to order at 10:15 a.m. in the Brook Café in the College Center at Mesa State College in Grand Junction, Colorado.

Action:

Commissioner Quamme moved approval of the minutes of the April 6, 2000, Commission meeting. Commissioner seconded the motion, and the motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Bracken recognized and thanked President Michael Gallagher for hosting the May 4, 2000, Commi Meeting. President Gallagher welcomed the Commission and the higher education community to Mesa State College. 11:45 a.m. President Michael Gallagher made a presentation about the college and outlined the activities on the campus.

II. Reports

A. Chair's Report

The Chair, Commissioner Alexander E. Bracken, reported that Commissioners Marion Gottesfeld, Ray Baker, an Greenberg were excused absent. Commissioner Bracken introduced James Stewart who was appointed to the Commission to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of Commissioner Lamar Allen. Mr. Stewart served 23 years in the air force was a commander air fighter, and is owner of Technology Vector, Inc., in Colorado Springs. Commissioner Bracke reported that Commissioner Gottesfeld had surgery and the Commissioners' thoughts are with her.

B. Commissioners' Reports

Chair Bracken reported that this was his last Commission meeting. He will resign from the Commission effective June 2000, and will accept the position of Interim President of the University of Colorado. He said that serving on tl Commission has been the highlight of his experience for the past eight years.

The Commission commended Chair Bracken for his tenure on the Commission and extended congratulations to h Executive Director Foster said it was truly a pleasure to serve with Commissioner Bracken and presented him with the gavel he used as chair and a gift from the Commission.

C. Advisory Committee Reports

No reports.

III. Consent Items

None

IV. Action Items

A. Master Plan

Executive Director Foster reported that this item provides the final draft of the master plan for the Colorado Commission on Higher Education. The master plan is an outline of the goals and objectives for Colorado postsecondary education. The first draft of the Master Plan was presented in October and has been discussed with the higher education governing boards. The Commission has taken seriously the directives from the legislature to improve services to students. Mr. Foster reported that the Commission has implemented the Governor's Opportunity Scholarship (GOS), revised financial aid policy to provide access to students, and is in the process of implementing the rural access education program. The Quality Indicator System (QIS) is in process, and capital assets are discussed at every meeting. The Commission will continue to discuss a capital assets pilot plan and efficiency. The Master Plan is a functional action plan that we continually updated.

Advisory Committee Member, Sandy Hume commented that the University of Colorado at Boulder (UCB) has expressed a concern about a potential problem with quality faculty leaving Colorado. Executive Director Foster stated that the overall faculty turnover rate in Colorado is 5.24 percent. Mr. Hume also reported that Dr. Byyny, Chancellor of UCB said that Boulder campus could not survive without the opportunity to recruit more students. Mr. Foster suggested that blending of undergraduate and graduate FTE may help along with the utilization of the window.

Jane Duncan, student representative Advisory Committee member, asked for clarification of the single provider. Mr. Foster explained that CCHE is looking at internet providers using Regis University as an example which used multiple providers. However, from an economic standpoint, it may be more economical and technologically advantageous to use one to two providers.

Staff Recommendation

That the Commission approve the Colorado Commission on Higher Education Master Plan.

Action:

Commissioner Vollbracht moved approval of the staff recommendation. Commissioner Nagel seconded the motion, and the motion carried unanimously.

B. CCHE-Capital Assets Pilot Design Project FY01-02

Jeanne Adkins reported that the Commission Capital Assets Subcommittee, in reviewing capital project proposals last fall, concluded that information developed in the program plans by institutions was sometimes insufficient and outdated and made rendering decisions on project prioritization or approval difficult.

She outlined the proposal for the five pilot projects for the next cycle. The capital subcommittee initiated the proposal based on its review of program plans submitted for the current fiscal year. The process would involve closer integration of academic issues related to the program planning earlier in the concept paper that would be submitted on a project. The second stage of the process would involve much more complete design work than has been completed in the past. The pilot process meets the Commission's objective to integrate more fully the academic and facility master planning process.

The pilot projects are actually combining what would be phase one and two of a proposed way of evaluating high education projects. Because some programmatic information is lacking, some pilot projects will be addressing Phase questions as they begin the conceptual design stage.

Questions raised by institutions in writing to the proposal included whether this was an effort to set architectural fees. Responding, Ms. Adkins said the fees suggested followed a format based on total project costs and would vary from project to project as do the ultimate construction costs. The proposal establishes a parameter for fees for an expected level of architectural work. Total fee is based on the project cost.

Another question asked was whether CCHE believes this is the best way to accomplish its goals. Ms. Adkins indicated that the pilot responses will provide CCHE with information on which to judge whether these changes should be permanent or other options should be tried.

Asked whether the process would extend the length of the capital project review process, she replied the goal was to shorten the process. Several concerns were raised about the post-construction review phase, suggested by Conn Vollbracht, and Ms. Adkins responded that such a review was actually contemplated in current CCHE policy and has simply been dropped by practice, not policy change.

Institutions were concerned that all issues in the concept paper would need to be addressed in the institutional master plan and whether the process was a way to limit campus growth. The answer to both questions is "no," she said, explaining that the Commission has emphasized several times that it wants to review system-wide planning goals and integrate academic and facility planning. The pilot project is designed to further those goals.

CSU raised the concern that CCHE would be unable to accomplish its goals, particularly the post-construction review without adding staff. However, Ms. Adkins responded that the legislature and the Commission had both expressed a desire to know how to plan for regular repair and maintenance and system replacements over time for the higher education system. The post-construction review has been in policy since 1987. Reinstating it as practice will allow a database to be generated to provide information on mechanical systems and other maintenance elements that will address the maintenance needs long-term.

Without the data, any assessment of long-term maintenance needs for the system lacks the integrity of a good database.

Commissioner Hessler asked whether staff had determined the best way to allocate funding for long-term maintenance on an annual basis. Ms. Adkins replied that staff was still exploring formulas developed in other states and private industry models, but had not yet concluded what approach might work best for Colorado. She said that would involve a staff discussion including legislative staff, the Office of State Planning and Budgeting and the director of the State Buildings Division.

Chair Bracken asked if the new master plans coming forward are in tune with the proposed planning process. She responded that staff and capital subcommittee met with the CU representatives and reiterated a need for a system-wide academic growth plan and assessment of facility needs system-wide. She added, however, that some institutions would consider master plans of institutions independently. Staff is requesting the system-wide approach in response to the Commission's direction.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends the Commission approve the guidelines for the pilot projects and that any changes recommended following review by a professional committee that includes architects and the State Buildings Division director be reviewed by the Capital Assets Subcommittee for inclusion in the project guidelines this year.

Evaluation of the pilot project should occur as staff and the subcommittee review the project submittals and a report will be made to the Commission in November.

Action:

Commissioner Hessler moved approval of the staff recommendation. Commissioner Farina seconded the motion, and the motion carried unanimously.

C. Low Enrollment Program Policy and Action

Dr. Sharon Samson introduced the Low Enrollment Policy discussion by recapping the events leading to April appeals from several governing boards for short-term extensions and policy exemptions. During this process, the Commission clarified several points, including that (1) the baccalaureate exemption privilege is limited to five degree programs; (2) it is open to appeals for short-term extension as long as the degree program is showing evidence of the effect of prior governing board intervention; and (3) if a governing board chooses not to make the final exemption selection, the Commission will re-assume its responsibility and make the final decision. Following the Commission discussion, clarifications were incorporated into proposed policy revisions that were presented as part of the agenda item.

Dr. Samson described a new policy section that was proposed at the Commission's suggestion to differentiate between small and large institutions. Under the proposed language in section 4.03.02, large institutions – those enrolling more than

small and large institutions. Under the proposed language in section 1002(2), large institutions – those enrolling more than 5,000 FTE – may exempt three degree programs. She explained that the change does not affect smaller institutions that are still able to exempt five undergraduate degree programs. Dr. Samson explained that in researching this issue, accrediting agencies supported the range because it allows institutions to dedicate resources to new program development rather than maintain low demand degree programs, acknowledging that larger institutions propose more new degrees than smaller institutions. She concluded by stating that the Academic Council discussed the issue in general but had not come to consensus on the change from three to five exemptions.

The Commission asked staff and academic council to look at the underlying intent of the policy, and to allow governing boards to continue to work on the policy. Academic Council reviewed the policy but did not get to delve into the policy as deeply.

In response to Commissioner Vollbracht's question why institutions want to maintain low enrollment programs, Dr. Samson responded that there are political ramifications for discontinuing a program, including the difficulty for faculty who have invested time in developing a program to let go. Commissioner Vollbracht said that if a degree program does not graduate sufficient numbers, the state should have a policy to support discontinuing these degree programs.

Commissioner Hessler supported the change, but recommended allowing more time for academic council to discuss the three exemption rule. Commissioner Quamme supported Hessler's recommendation to postpone action on the item until the next meeting since there are several Commissioners not present who may want to comment on the policy.

Commissioner Bracken asked for further explanation why larger institutions should have fewer numbers. Dr. Samson stated that the Commission's overall goal is to promote an entrepreneurial approach to degree program offering. Maintaining duplicative programs with low student enrollment is a strategy counter to this intent. She added that institutions expressed intent to move most if not all degree programs off the low demand list. The proposed change provides larger institutions a policy tool to address this goal.

In response to Commissioner Farina's question regarding when the policy should be implemented to allow sufficient time for institutions to act on the policy, Dr. Samson said the Commission's June or October agenda. Commissioner Farina stated if there is no rush; he supported allowing additional time to allow the governing boards a full voice to discuss policy changes.

The Commission chair proposed delaying action on the proposed policy changes for further discussion at the next Commission meeting. The consensus decision was to take no action at this time; the item was tabled without objection.

D. Coordinated Degree Policy

Dr. Samson presented revisions to CCHE's Coordinated Degree Policy. Adopted in 1986 and revised in 1995, the policy promotes inter-institutional cooperation in the delivery of degree programs. The current policy, however, limits collaboration to institutions within a governing board. The proposed revision eliminates this restriction and encourages inter-governing board collaboration. The governing boards unilaterally support the proposed revision.

Commissioner Hessler asked if there would be an additional cost to students enrolled in a coordinated degree program. Dr. Samson explained that the memorandum of understanding would specify the tuition rates, but historically the student pays the tuition fee at the student's home institution.

Dr. Dave Clark, Associate Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs, stated that the CSU system supports the Coordinated Degree Policy. Because few institutions have been able to participate in the coordinated degree programs under the former policy, the concept of a coordinated degree is somewhat experimental.

Dr. Lee Halgren, Vice President of Academic and Student Affairs, commented that this policy has had significant input from the institutions and systems. Western State College and Adams State College are considering offering a Physics degree as a coordinated degree program if the Commission approves the proposed policy. The Trustees of The State Colleges are looking at the coordinated degree program. The State Colleges are very supportive.

Dr. Michel Dahlin, Associate Vice-President of the University of Colorado, endorsed the proposed revisions to Coordinated Degree Program Policy. CU is the only system currently engaged in offering coordinated degree programs and is supportive of coordinated degree programs. She concluded that Commission adoption of the policy revisions

and is supportive of coordinated degree programs. She concluded that Commission adoption of the policy revisions is a positive step in promoting greater collaboration.

Staff Recommendation

That the Commission approve the proposed revisions to the Coordinated Degree Policy.

Action:

Commissioner Hessler moved approval of the Coordinated Degree Policy. Commissioner Quamme seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

V. Items for Discussion and Possible Action

A. CCHE-Capital Assets Schedule FY01-02

The Commission Capital Assets staff has reviewed the submission deadlines and process for program plan review for the FY01-02 funding cycle. Although four projects will go through the pilot project procedures outlined in the previous agenda item, and a fifth project potentially will be included in this process, the remainder will follow the traditional program plan prioritization review process in the past.

In reviewing timeframes, it was decided to start earlier in order to meet legislative deadlines. The new schedule in the agenda was outlined for the Commission and Ms. Adkins requested that the Commission approve the schedule allowing staff to set the budget form deadlines after consultation with OSPB.

She clarified that while 202 projects can be submitted anytime during the year, the suggested date would ensure expeditious review. The review time for projects not submitted in this window may be lengthened.

After the vote, Commissioner Nagel said that it seems important that CCHE know what each system's growth projections are and that the traditional institutional projection view must be refocused. He reiterated that getting system numbers is important. She responded that it is complicated by the second year reports due for HB99-1289. However, overall projections, plus historical data provide some base information. The contractor for the governance study can make recommendations for changes that might impact the current alignment of institutions. To avoid potential duplication of effort, staff is incorporating system requirements in the master plan reviews, but not for program planning in the current cycle. Staff intends to follow the Commission's direction to develop a more comprehensive approach to evaluating the master plans and projects. Commissioner Nagel added that it is important to have a context of what the systems project their percentage of the statewide growth in enrollment will be.

Ms. Adkins replied that systems have not done system-wide facility planning in the past and that these documents need to be built. Community colleges, for example, don't have a system-wide plan. Each institution has its own.

Executive Director Foster said the Commission staff will be able to put the projections in historical context as they reviewed and present that to the Commission as the plans are brought forward. We can compare where they have been, and where they think they are going.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommended that the Commission adopt the Capital Assets project review schedule as outlined.

Action:

Commissioner Lamm moved approval of the Capital Assets Schedule FY 01-02. Commissioner Farina seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

B. Annual Admission Standards Report

The Commission annually reviews the admission data of the public higher education system. The dual purpose of CCHE's Admission Standard Policy is to maintain a differentiated system of admission standards and assure individual students of entry into institutions for which they are best prepared and at which they will be most successful. Consequently, the two aspects of admission data that the Commission is particularly interested in monitoring in

Consequently, one of the aspects of admission data that the Commission is particularly interested in monitoring is institutional compliance with the prescribed admission standards and the academic success of students who meet admission standards. To address the compliance responsibility, the staff analysis section of this agenda item provides a summary of the admission standards data for fiscal year 1998-99 -- the last full year reported to the Commission as of this date -- and the fall data of the current year. The statewide data indicates that:

- All institutions were in compliance in 1998-99 with CCHE's Admission Standards, with the individual window size ranging from 4 to 20 percent of admitted applicants who did not meet admission standards.
- In 1998-99, the public four-year institutions admitted approximately 41,000 freshman students. Of the admitted students, 17 percent did not meet the admission standards for the institutions to which they applied.
- Of the 6,938 students in the "window," 26% of the students offered admission were minority students.
- In 1998-99, 16,901 new freshmen enrolled in Colorado public institutions -- approximately one-third of the applicant pool.
- In addition, 9,608 transfer students enrolled at a public institution in 1998-99.

Dr. Samson reported that the admission standards policy was implemented in 1985. She outlined the enrollment pattern over the past 15 years. Noting that two-year institutions and high school concurrent students are exempt, she reported that 17% of student applicants are denied admission, but this number may over-report non-admits because a significant number of students submit multiple applications.

She clarified that the admission standards create a second window for transfer students. The current transfer standard is loosely defined and a student who completes a basic skills course may apply to transfer and be counted in the transfer window even though they may not meet the freshman standards. She illustrated the use of the window at the highly selective admission institutions. While 50 percent of freshman "window" students are within five points of the index score, the index scores range from a low of 63 for admitted students -- approximately 40 points below the specified index scores for these institutions.

Commissioner Quamme asked staff to examine the percent of new enrollment growth and what portion can be attributed to window students. Commissioner Hessler requested including graduation rates in the study. Commissioner Brack seconded the Commission's interest in seeing the long-term academic success record of students who meet the standard and those that do not.

Mr. Sandy Hume, member of CCHE advisory committee, said the admission policy was the antidote of enrollment caps. He supports using admission standards to manage enrollment. He is interested in knowing about the entrepreneurial student practices to circumvent admission standards.

VI. Written Reports for Possible Discussion

A. Report on Out-of-State Instruction

The Commission accepted the report of instruction offered out-of-state beyond the seven contiguous states approved by the Executive Director:

The Trustees of The State Colleges has submitted a request for approval of courses to be delivered by Adams State College:

ED 589, *Time to Teach* to be delivered in Washington June 9, 2000;

ED 589, *Dysfunctional Behavior Intervention Skills* to be delivered in Montana March 6-8, 2000 and in North Carolina March 29-31, 2000;

ED 589, *Learning Styles: You and Your Students* to be delivered in Hawaii June 28-July 9, 2000;

ED 589, *Costa Rican Journey* to be delivered in Costa Rica June 26-July 7, 2000;

ED 589, *Teaching for the 21st Century* to be delivered in Belize June 19-23, 2000;

ED 559, *Excellence in Teaching* to be delivered in New York April 6-9, 2000.

The Trustees of The State Colleges has submitted a request for approval of a course to be delivered by Metropolitan College of Denver:

ENG 3900, *London Literature* to be delivered in England July 10-July 22, 2000.

The Trustees of The State Colleges has submitted a request for approval of a course to be delivered by Western State College:

EDUC 497, *Teaching for the 21st Century* to be taught in Placencia, Belize June 19-23, 2000.

The Board of Regents of the University of Colorado has submitted a request for approval of a course to be delivered by the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center, School of Medicine:

Prostate Cancer: Current Strategies and Advancements in Hormonal Treatments to be delivered in Georgia April 28, 2000.

B. 2000-2001 Commission Meeting Schedule

The Commission accepted the 2000-2001 meeting schedule.

Chair Bracken reported that the Commission is working through statute on the official appointment of Jim Stewart. Stewart previously served on the Colorado Community College and Occupational Education Board for two months. Chair Bracken thanked Dr. Gallagher for hosting the May Commission meeting.

Action: Commissioner Hessler moved adjournment of the meeting. Commissioner Nagel seconded the motion, and motion carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.