COLORADO COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

November 9, 2001
Colorado History Museum
Denver, Colorado

MINUTES

Commissioners
Present: Raymond T. Baker; Terrance L. Farina; David E. Greenberg; Peggy Lamm, Chair; "Pres" Montoya; Ralph J. Nagel; Dean L. Quamme, Vice Chair; James Stewart; and William B. Vollbracht.

Advisory Committee
Present: Senator Ken Arnold; Wayne Artis; Robert A. Hessler; Kevin Kasel; Representative Nancy Spence; and Larry Strutton.

Commission Staff
Present: Timothy E. Foster, Executive Director; Jeanne Adkins; JoAnn Evans; Jim Jacobs; Gail Hoffman; Ray Kieft; Sharon Samson; and Kathleen Von Achen.

I. Call to Order

Chair Peggy Lamm called the regular meeting of the Colorado Commission on Higher Education to order at 10:15 a.m. in Boettcher Auditorium at the Colorado History Museum in Denver, Colorado.

Action: Commissioner Baker moved approval of the minutes of the October 4, 2001, regular meeting. Commissioner Quamme seconded the motion, and the motion carried unanimously.

II. Reports

A. Chair’s Report

Commissioner Lamm, Chair of the Commission, reported that Commissioner Judith Altenberg was excused absent. The Chair reported that the Commission and the Governor's Blue Ribbon Panel on Higher Education for the 21st Century were in the process of hearing role and mission presentations from the institutions. The Commission and the Panel will make a recommendation to Governor Owens in January 2002.
Chair Lamm also reported that several of the Commissioners attended a luncheon sponsored by the independent universities presidents and toured Regis University. It was a great opportunity to learn more about the work of the independent colleges.

On behalf of the Commission, Chair Lamm thanked Commissioner Hessler for his years of service on the Commission and to the higher education community.

B. Commissioners’ Reports

Commissioner Greenberg made a suggestion that the Commission consider requesting a change in statute to use the Carnegie classifications in the institutions' role and mission statements. The Carnegie classification may allow Colorado institutions to be consistent with other states' classifications. The Commission will consult with governing boards regarding this recommendation.

C. Advisory Committee Reports

No reports

D. Public Comment

Alexander Padilla, a student in the Chancellor Scholars and Leaders Program at the University of Colorado at Denver, made a comment regarding higher education master plan. His concern focused on the non-traditional students who are not able to complete a degree in four years. He also suggested that the Commission consider changing the admission standard for non-traditional students by allowing them to use a portfolio rather than a GPA, SAT and ACT scores.

George Walker made a comment regarding the numerical goals for enrollment of women and disadvantaged groups. He referred to the Leeds family gift to the University of Colorado. President Betsy Hoffman clarified that the Leeds gift agreement does not set a numerical quota.

III. Consent Items

A. One Percent Base Appropriation Reduction

Jim Jacobs reported that 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 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.

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 was provided.

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

**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.

B. **Authorization of Secondary Endorsements in School Library Media Specialist at the University of Denver**

The University of Denver requested approval for 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. 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.

**Staff Recommendation**

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

**Action:** Commissioner Quamme moved approval of the staff recommendations for Consent Items III A and III B. Commissioner Baker seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.
IV. Action Items

A. Auraria Higher Education Center Campus Facility Master Plan 2001

Ms. Gail Hoffman reported that the Auraria Higher Education Center (AHEC) Campus Facility Master Plan 2001 replaces the last master plan approved in 1991. The new master plan projects buildings that will be needed, added onto, or updated if full-time equivalent enrollment grows 2.5% above the current enrollment of 32,500 students. This is Phase I in the plan. Phase II of the plan outlines capital construction that would be needed if full-time equivalent enrollment grows an additional 2.5% beyond Phase I.

Ms. Hoffman outlined the history of the Auraria Higher Education Center. The AHEC master plan incorporates building revitalization that combines controlled maintenance needs with programmatic changes. The institution also anticipates spending about $17.5 million in controlled maintenance funds up through 2007. All buildings on the campus were built at approximately the same time and therefore, need repair at the same time resulting in considerable funding needs for controlled maintenance.

The master plan outlines how the campus will work with the City, and the surrounding area relative to the transportation corridors within the campus pedestrian ways to provide structure for the campus. Ms. Hoffman reported that in the AHEC plan the tie between academic and master planning is weak. The Auraria officials stated that establishing a strong link to its academic planning process was among the most difficult tasks.

There are approximately 1,700 pooled courses offered by the three institutions. That means that students can take courses at any of the three institutions and receive credit at their home institution. CCHE staff recommend that there still could be more pooled courses on the campus.

Dean Wolf, Executive Vice President for Administration of the Auraria Higher Education Center, outlined the planning process used by AHEC. The master plan processes was put together by a planning council made up of an academic officer and an administrative officer of each of the three institutions. He said the goal of AHEC is to focus its development within the barriers of I-25, Auraria Parkway, Speer Boulevard and Colfax. He pointed out that if student housing becomes a component, it will be done through private developers. AHEC has a significant number of international students at all three institutions that are finding it difficult to find affordable housing in the area adjacent to the campus.

Ms. Adkins stated that the campus is barred by statute from offering any housing on the campus; however, they are considering bringing forward a privatized proposal with a joint partner off site. There is a question as to the scope of the need, therefore, staff request that AHEC readdress the assumptions. Another recommendation is to reevaluate the conference center assumptions in the master
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.

Action: Commissioner Nagel moved approval of the staff recommendation. Commissioner Montoya seconded the motion. Commissioner Nagel moved to amend staff recommendation number one (1) to assure that the analysis of the academic plans include follow-up of the NORED report that there be a study of the low-enrollment programs offered at the three institutions to coordinate programs that could be merged or consolidated given a certain level of overlapping academic programs. Commissioner Nagel's amendment also adds to recommendation number three (3) "especially in light of available external alternatives." Commissioner Lamm seconded the amendment and the amendment carried unanimously.

Action: Commissioner Vollbracht moved approval of the staff recommendation as amended. Commissioner Nagel seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

B. Red Rocks Community College Facility Master Plan 2001

The Red Rocks Community College (RRCC) master plan data collection began in 1998, the base statistical year, and forecasts 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.
Ms. Adkins reported that Red Rocks Community College's service area is both rural and urban. The assumption for the enrollment projections in the master plan is based on the population growth in the area. The goals of the master plan are pretty standard with a focus on continuous improvement. The need for flexible new space is important for this campus as they plan for growth on the Lakewood campus that they do not limit themselves by adding to existing facilities instead of looking at placing new facilities on the site. She pointed out that this plan was in progress before the requirement to tie academic planning to master plans was instituted, and the institution is in the process of developing a strategic plan that incorporates academic planning. Staff believes that the plan needs to come back to CCHE for review. She outlined the staff recommendations.

Senator Ken Arnold raised a concern about the necessity to go forward with this plan considering the current downturn of the economy. His preference would be to lease space rather than build with bricks and mortar.

Eric Reno, President of Red Rocks Community College, explained that there is a critical safety issue in the construction trades program due to overcrowding. The construction trades program is the largest and best program in the western United States. He said they understand the reality of the fiscal constraints right now, but feel it is prudent to continue the process to be prepared when funding is available.

There was discussion about including a timetable in the staff recommendation. Dr. Reno pointed out that a timetable was originally included in the plan and can be inserted easily.

**Staff Recommendation**

The staff recommends a conditional 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 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 weaknesses 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 effective. 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 for 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.

**Action:** Commissioner Nagel moved approval of the staff recommendation. Commissioner Farina seconded the motion. Commissioner Baker moved to amend the staff recommendation to attach a timetable of one year to the first three recommendations and a two-year timetable for recommendation four (4). Commissioner Farina seconded the amendment and the amended motion carried unanimously.

**C. CCHE 2001-2002 Master Plan**

Executive Director Foster stated that the purpose of the master plan is to establish an outline of the goals and objectives of the Commission through 2002. The primary theme of the master plan is access, both economic and geographic. He reported that all governing boards have been involved in drafting the master plan. The following editorial changes as requested by the Commission were made:

- Section IV, B, Goal 1, change from "cut tuition at some community colleges" to "cut tuition at all community colleges."
- In the paragraph regarding Marketing, there was a suggestion to add a real numerical goal. The last sentence was revised to show a participation rate of "38 percent to 55 percent in the next five years."
- Under Goal 4, Asset Management other objectives in the first bullet delete "once the deferred maintenance deficit is cleared."

The Commission discussed the participation rate. It was suggested that the goal for the participation rate should be 38 percent to 45 percent rather than 55 percent.

**Staff Recommendation**


**Action:** Commissioner Greenberg moved approval of the staff recommendation. Commissioner Nagel seconded the motion. Commissioner Montoya moved to amend the staff recommendation to set the participation rate at 38 percent to 45 percent measured annually in the next five years. Commissioner Nagel seconded the amendment and the amendment and the amended motion carried unanimously.

**D. Revision to the Adopted FY 2002-03 Budget Request**

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

Mr. Jacobs reported that the national economy rate of inflation went from 3.3 to 4.9 percent, a 50 percent increase. He outlined the CCHE budget recommendations. The budget request adopted by the Commission was based upon tuition increases at the rate of inflation of 3.3 percent, for residents and non-residents. The increase in inflation to 4.9 percent has increased this budget 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 at this meeting. Mr. Jacobs reported that due to the one percent reductions, the budget request does not exceed the six percent limit. Thus, the original staff recommendation concerning the cap is no longer applicable.

**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 the agenda.

**Action:** Commissioner Baker moved to approve the staff recommendation. Commissioner Farina seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

E. **University of Northern Colorado Tuition/Inflation Proposal - Fiscal Year 2002-2003 CCHE Budget Request**

Jim Jacobs reported that this item was 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.

Historical analysis of UNC’s resident tuition schedule indicates that tuition increases have not kept pace with inflation. The revised request by UNC is to increase its resident and nonresident tuition rates for undergraduate and graduate students by 4 percent, totaling $1,294,951 million in FY 2002-03 revenues in order to recover the shortfall in funding.

Hank Brown, President of the University of Northern Colorado, stated that in August UNC had requested an increase to bring the institution up to the cost of living. Had that request been approved, UNC would still be significantly below all other doctoral-granting institutions in the state in terms of general fund.
Instead, the institution came back with a request to increase tuition to bring it up to cost-of-living at 3 percent. He reported that UNC has restructured its faculty compensation allowing the intuition to pay more money to nursing faculty and other faculty that are higher market demand areas. He suggested that providing tuition increases on a dollar basis instead of a percentage basis would help the institutions.

Betsy Hoffman, President of the University of Colorado, spoke in support of UNC's request.

The Commission discussed the possibility of a macro solution rather than piece meal, essentially robbing Peter to pay Paul. There is no easy solution and college presidents have to make tough choices daily. The discussion included conversations about lowering community college tuition to provide more access to students. Mr. Foster said there has been virtually no enrollment growth in higher education in the past ten years. Under TABOR if tuition is increased, it increases revenue which results in higher education having to return money to the general fund.

There was a lengthy discussion about restrictions imposed on higher education by TABOR. Senator Windels would be willing to explore legislation to de-Bruce higher education. There was no further discussion of that offer.

Many of the Commissioners support a macro solution that would not penalize the institutions.

**Staff Recommendation**

CCHE staff recommends a 3 percent increase in tuition rates at the University of Northern Colorado, amounting to a total cash revenue increase of $971,213. The requested 4 percent tuition rate increase proposed by UNC amounts 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.

**Action:** Commissioner Baker moved approval of the staff recommendations for IV, E and IV, F. Commissioner Farina seconded the motion. The motion carried with a vote of six in favor and three opposed (Commissioners Baker, Lamm and Vollbracht). (Both agenda items were combined into one motion. See IV, F.)

**F. University of Colorado Health Sciences Center Tuition Proposal**

Jim Jacobs reported that this item was also a continuation of the August 31, 2001, budget discussion. 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 Board of Regents approved the decision items at its 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 discussion of this agenda item and item IV, E (UNC) were combined. President Hoffman and President Brown addressed the Commission simultaneously. [Please see section IV, E.] President Hoffman supports a macro solution and that was why she withdrew the Quality for Colorado proposal. This Health Science issue is a very modest proposal.

**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.

**Action:** Commissioner Baker moved approval of the staff recommendations for items IV, E and IV, F. Commissioner Farina seconded the motion. The motion carried with a vote of six in favor and three opposed (Commissioners Baker, Lamm and Vollbracht). (Both agenda items were combined into one motion. See IV, E.)

**G. Capital Project Prioritization**

This item was a handout item and was added as a last minute item to the agenda.

Jeanne Adkins reported that as a result of the state's revenue projections being significantly less than originally forecast for the current budget year and for FY 02-03 budget year, the General Assembly and the Governor have rescinded the appropriations for numerous capital construction projects for higher education. The Commission has been asked to send its prioritization of new and previous projects to the Capital Development Committee for review by December 1, 2002.

Given the circumstances facing the state with revenue declines, the expected revenue available for capital construction is less than $100 million over the next two years. She reported that the Capital Assets Subcommittee has not met to discuss the new projects proposed and evaluate the scope of those projects. She suggested that the Commission delegate authority to the Capital Assets Subcommittee to meet the December 1, 2001, deadline.
Staff Recommendation

That the Commission delegate, as it has in previous years, to the Capital Assets Subcommittee the ability to prioritize projects and submit the requested prioritized list to the Capital Development Committee on the December 1, 2001, date;

That the subcommittee meets with institutions to hear their concerns and address specific issues on projects prior to submission of the prioritization list;

That the subcommittee reports back to the full Commission its actions in a written report for the January 2002 meeting.

Action: Commissioner Quamme moved approval of the staff recommendation. Commissioner Nagel seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

V. Items for Discussion and Possible Action

A. Policy Interpretation Discussion FTE Funding for Department of Corrections Inmates

Jeanne Adkins reported that 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). Since the adoption of the statute several community colleges have worked 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. Upon reevaluation of the audit guidelines for FTE, staff does not believe this is authorized by statute.

Staff have met with the institutions and have agreed to accomplish several things over the next twelve-month period. By November the affected institutions will provide half-year budgets to the Department of Corrections based on definitions developed by the working committee, so that all institutions are presenting the same definitions to the Department of Corrections for administrative costs or overhead.

The half-year budgets will accommodate the change for each institution as the FTE claim is phased out. Beginning in January the institutions will rely on the Department of Corrections budget to pay the cost of delivering this program. One of the issues that needs to be resolved by the legislature is the salary for DOC instructors.
There is another policy issue that the Commission may need to discuss. A foundation has offered to pay institutions tuition on behalf of inmates. If the institutions get the full tuition from a foundation or federal grant, they would like to have the state FTE subsidy for those inmates.

**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.

**Action:** Commissioner Stewart moved approval of the staff recommendation. Commissioner Greenberg seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

**B. Colorado State University Residence Hall Program Plan**

Jeanne Adkins reported that Colorado State University (CSU) has submitted a proposal, which has been reviewed by staff, to complete using its auxiliary funds and bonding a new 700-unit housing facility on the Fort. 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.

Ms. Adkins stated that staff brought this issue forward because of the Commission's specific direction on other residential hall projects. CSU’s conclusion is that privatization was not an option for this project and has forwarded it as an institutional auxiliary funded project.

Dr. Reginald Washington, chairman of the State Board of Agriculture, and Gerry Bomotti, Vice President for Administrative Services at CSU, testified that this particular project was developed in close cooperation with the city of Fort. Collins and would not be best served by a public/private partnership.

The Commissioners expressed their concerns that the institution did not seek an RFP for public/private partnership on the project. Institutions may need to think about looking at bringing new sources of money into higher education capital budgets. It was recommended that the institution seek an RFP with a tight deadline, perhaps to a nonprofit, with the same tax-exempt status, and do a land
lease. There may be no risk of enrollment declines in the next four or five years, but in later years there may be a risk of fewer students.

**Staff Recommendation**

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.

**Action:** Commissioner Nagel made a motion that requires Colorado State University to develop an RFP that is in agreement with the staff recommendation and submit the RFP to the marketplace. Commissioner Stewart seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

**VI. Written Reports for Possible Discussion**

**A. FY 2002 Tuition and Fee Survey**

The Commission accepted the FY 2002 Tuition and Fee Survey. The 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 included 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.

**B. Concept Paper:**

1. **Bachelor of Science (B.S.) Degree in Biomedical Sciences at Colorado State University**

   The State Board of Agriculture submitted a concept paper for a Bachelor of Science (B.S.) degree in biomedical sciences at Colorado State University. The Commission accepted the concept paper submitted by the State Board of Agriculture.

2. **Bachelor of Science (B.S.) in Biomedical Engineering at Colorado State University**

   The State Board of Agriculture submitted a concept paper for a Bachelor of Science (B.S.) degree in biomedical engineering at Colorado State University. The Commission accepted the concept paper submitted by the State Board of Agriculture.
C. Report on Out-of-State Instruction

The Commission accepted the report on out-of-state instruction as follows:

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.


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.

**Action:** Commissioner Greenberg moved to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Vollbracht seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 1:16 p.m.