STATE OF COLORADO

Department of Higher Education
COLORADO COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Colorado Commission on Higher Education Agenda
March 2, 2006
10:00 a.m.

University of Denver
Community Room of Craig Hall
2148 So. High Street
Denver, Colorado 80210

Welcome by Robert Coombe, Chancellor

I. Opening Business

- A. Attendance
- B. Approval of Minutes for the February 2, 2006 Commission Meeting
- C. Reports by the Chair, Commissioners, Commission Subcommittees and Advisory Committee Members
- D. Public Comment

II. Presentation

- A. Rural Caucus on College Entrance Requirements

III. Action Items

- A. Financial Aid Polices (Lindner)
- B. Repeal of Capital Asset Policies: Parts I, L, O, P (Johnson)

IV. Written Agenda Discussion Items

- A. CCHE Capital Assets Policies – Progress Report (Johnson)
- B. CCHE – Capital Assets Quarterly Reports (Program Plan Waivers, Cash-Funded, SB 92-202, and other Projects and Leases) (Johnson/Gonzales)

V. Consent Item

- A. Teacher Education Authorization – Jones International University (Gianneschi)
- B. Proposed Modification to the Mesa State College Admissions Index (Gianneschi) ***[revised!]***

VI. Written Report – No Discussion

- A. Clarifying Changes to CCHE's Policy Section IV: Extended Studies (Gianneschi/McKeever)

MINUTES OF THE
COLORADO COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION
February 2, 2006

Chairperson Terry Farina called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

Commissioners Terry Farina, Judy Altenberg, Ray Baker, Richard Garcia, Dean Quamme, Richard Ramirez, Edward Robinson, Greg Stevinson, James Stewart and Judy Weaver were present. Commissioner Joel Farkas was excused. Commission Staff members attending were Jenna Langer, Matt Gianneschi, Diane Lindner, and Mary Lou Lawrence. Advisory Council Member Stuart Hilweg was in attendance.

Hank Brown, President of the University of Colorado System, welcomed the Commissioners to the Health Sciences Facility. The medical and research development at the Fitzsimons campus is a model for redevelopment of former military installations. It will provide public and private research opportunities and prospective employment benefiting Colorado's economic growth and citizens. Chancellor Gregory Stiegmann welcomed the Commissioners to the Nighthorse Campbell Native Health Center which provides on-line medical service and treatment to Indian tribes in western states and Alaska

Mr. Baker moved to approve minutes of the January 5, 2006, meeting and Mr. Ramirez seconded the motion. The minutes were unanimously approved.

Chairman Farina reported on his and Executive Director O'Donnell's appearance before the Joint Education Committee on January 26, 2006, and a copy of the presentation was given to each Commissioner. He commended Commissioners for their work on Commission Sub-Committees.

There was no public comment.

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

ATTORNEY GENERAL OPINION REGARDING CCHE TUITION CLASSIFICATION POWERS: Ms. Langer said the issue of in-state tuition for undocumented aliens was of great interest to Commissioners and, because of its complexity and various rulings in other states, a formal Attorney General Opinion was requested, delineating the Commission's powers. Cynthia Coffman, Chief Deputy Attorney General, said informal opinions had been issued and a formal opinion becomes public record. Assistant Attorney General Anthony Dyl authored the opinion and she, Attorney General Suthers and Solicitor General Allison Eid had reviewed and approved the opinion.

Mr. Dyl said the specific question for which the opinion was issued was "Whether CCHE has the statutory authority to, by policy or regulation, grant-in-state tuition status to undocumented aliens". The answer is "No. CCHE lacks statutory authority to establish a policy or regulation granting in-state tuition status to undocumented aliens."

The question arises from 1996 Federal legislation limiting state public benefits to undocumented aliens and the 1996 Welfare Act declaring undocumented aliens not eligible for public benefits, including post secondary education benefits, unless a state, by statute, affirmatively provides for them. A portion of the 1996 Immigration Reform Act addresses in-state tuition and states undocumented aliens are not eligible for post-secondary education benefits unless any citizen of the United States would be eligible for the same benefit. Most states offer lower tuition based on residency. The Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) has limited power, either by statute or regulation, to vary the way Colorado determines residency classification based on domicile in the state. CCHE did have authority to make exception to that rule, but that authority was removed from statute in 1996. Currently, it would take a change in the law to render undocumented aliens eligible for in-state tuition status. Quite a few states have enacted enabling legislation that separates in-state tuition from residency requirements, basing eligibility on graduation from a state high school. The one Federal Court case challenging this alternative approach, in Kansas, was dismissed on the grounds Plaintiffs did not have standing to challenge and there has no definitive ruling on the legality of the statute.

Mr. Farina commented that the Commission is not trying aggregate power, but wanted clarification of their responsibility. Ms. Altenberg asked if the enactment of Federal Dream Act would affect the Commission's authority and if a state would have an affirmative action to comply with the Act. Mr. Dyl responded that unless the Dream Act is enacted, it is not possible to speculate if affirmative action would be required. Mr. Quamme asked if state legislatures had authority to act beyond federal law. Mr. Dyl said, since enacted laws basing qualification for in-state tuition premised on location of high school of graduation had not been successfully tested, it is not clear what state legislatures can do to provide undocumented aliens in-state tuition rates. Finding plaintiffs with standing to litigate and who have suffered injury is difficult and there may not be successful challenges to the laws. Mr. Hilweg asked if there was action in the legislature to change classification in Colorado. Mr. Dyl said Representative Vigil has unsuccessfully attempted to pass similar legislation in Colorado. Mr. Garcia asked if Mr. Dyl had reviewed the New Mexico Attorney General Opinion regarding the New Mexico higher education system's authority to make changes. Mr. Dyl had not, noting New Mexico probably has a different system and statutes. Mr. Garcia asked him to review the New Mexico opinion and advise the Commission of his determination.

There was no public comment.

FINANCIAL AID REFORM: PROS/CONS OF VARIOUS OPTIONS: Ms. Linder recapped the reform options presented to the Commission at the January meeting and the purposes of reformation goals. In the interim, staff has met with the Financial Aid Advisory Group, reviewed institutional perspectives of the alternatives and revised fiscal documents, considered viable insight and options presented by institutions and determined more work needs to be done with the institutions. Ms. Lindner reviewed the present funding model that demonstrates parity has been compromised and the state funds institutions instead of students. Minimally, the formula needs review and revision to fund students.

In response to Mr. Farina's question, Ms. Linder stated a change in the model policies are needed to attain parity. Ms. Weaver asked which schools would be most affected and Ms. Linder stated revision would favor schools with growing, need based enrollment and some schools maybe over funded and held harmless. Mr. Farina noted changes in policy based on state wide fairness would not be universally appreciated. Ms. Linder said the Financial Aid Advisory committee is willing to compromise.

Ms. Linder stated that institutions do not favor centralizing financial aid and that work-study programs have to stay with the schools for administrative purposes. Outsourcing is not popular, although some schools are considering outsourcing segments part or all of their of financial aid program, and should be voluntary. Schools felt gradated financial aid encourages achievement but adds complexity beyond their abilities to address and there is not enough money for gradation. Mr. Farina stated gradation could be addressed when additional funds are available. Ms. Weaver asked if gradation equated to front/back loading of student aid. Ms. Lindner said it did not and front/back loading needs further examination because there is no institutional agreement about what works best. Some schools say attract students and, if they are successful, give them aid; others provide financial aid to attract students and provide those who succeed grants to complete their education. Institutions want to keep funding flexibility based on their individual mission, role and student body.

At Ms. Weaver's request, a study of each schools funding pattern and resulting retention and graduation will be conducted and presented at the next Commission meeting. Mr. Hilweg asked if impending reduction in Federal Financial Aid would have an impact Ms. Linder stated federal guidelines are followed for administrative purposes but focus is on the impact of state aid. Ms. Linder said Financial Aid Directors were concerned a "Stipend Plus" option, the College Opportunity Fund (COF) stipend plus a certain need based, transferable and transparent, amount could confuse students and families. Clarification of each stipend would be imperative. Institutions suggested multiple sources of funding and Ms. Linder said there is mutual agreement to target students with the greatest need with the greatest amount of funding.

Ms. Linder told Mr. Quamme there was no consensus but institutions were agreeable to further study and compromise. She told Mr. Stevension institutions agreed with combining multiple sources.

Ms. Linder said cost of living is a major educational expense. Pell Grants are not meeting all of this need and there is no material cost fluctuation between students residing at home or elsewhere. The University of Colorado System, (CU) offers additional institutional aid. She said schools are making policy strides to increase access. It is necessary to meet the needs of part-time, employed students who's earning disqualify them for some aid and this will be discussed with the financial aid community.

Staff recommends additional study of aid as a percent of cost of attendance, guaranteed tuition and fees at access schools and stipend plus awards. Guaranteed aid could preclude students from attending schools other than access schools. Determining a viable COF Stipend Plus award, its portability and transparency need to be reviewed. Some conclusions and policy parameters will be presented at the next Commission meeting. Ms. Linder asked the Commissioners to add their thoughts and ideas to the study.

Mr. Hilweg stated it maybe necessary to redefine what constitutes full time attendance. Ms. Lindner agreed stating that, increasingly, students do not adhere to the traditional definition of a student and corresponding adjustments have not been addressed. Mr. Quamme wanted assurance that students with the greatest potential for success and need received aid. Ms. Lindner stated that had been discussed with Financial Aid officers and noted the most qualified usually are fully funded by scholarships, grants, etc. The greatest need is the next tier and institutional funding flexibility maybe the best way to meet their need.

Mr. Garcia asked if out-of-state tuition money subsidize resident students education and the effect of minimal out-of-state enrollment at Community Colleges. Ms. Lindner stated out-of-state tuition money assists educating resident students and Community Colleges are disadvantaged by low out-of-state student enrollment. The guaranteed tuition and fees option could benefit students attending access institutions. Ms. Weaver asked if participation in work study programs was required to receive state or federal aid and Ms. Lindner said it was not. However, income received from work study employment is not considered part of income and, therefore, does not impact financial aid eligibility. Mr. Garcia wanted to know the best way to inform prospective students and families of the necessity of applying for financial aid. College in Colorado, along with a collaborative efforts by the entire educational community, are informing all affected of this necessity.
Ms. Weaver asked if linking financial aid to study of community need profession was considered. Ms. Lindner stated it had been done to encourage nursing students. It is difficult, however, as students change courses of study and financial aid adjustments must be made accordingly. She told Mr. Baker and Ms. Weaver educating for high need professions is addressed in Fee for Services contracts. She told Mr. Quamme there is no information if medical schools provide incentives for students to become faculty members.

Ms. Lindner said staff would collaborate with the institutions on various options and return with recommendations on how to move forward at the next Commissionmeeting.

There was no public comment.

2006 TEACHER EDUCATION REPORT: Mr. Gianneschi thanked Kimberly Thompson for her hard work preparing the report. He stated all teacher preparation programs are meeting statutorily based standards and 11,000 students are enrolled in undergraduate and post-graduate teacher education programs. All graduates passed state licensure assessments, a requirement to graduate. Teacher candidates are 87% Caucasian or classified as race unknown and the majority are female. Colorado requires science teachers to have degree in any science discipline, not the specific discipline they teach. Currently, there are five prospective teachers majoring in physics. Over one-half of the students are non-traditional students and a greater number are attending proprietary schools such as University of Phoenix.

Mr. Quamme wanted to know the teacher turnover rate and Mr. Gianneschi said it was about 25%. He said 1/3 of Colorado teachers were not trained in Colorado. Ms. Weaver asked if there had been further discussions with CDE in the past 3 years to make the teacher licensure exams more rigorous. Mr. Gianneshi said CCHE relies on CDE to establish the licensure assessment criteria. Ms. Weaver asked to re-institute conversations with CDE to increase exam rigor. Mr. Stevinson said more rigorous exams may result in less need for college student remediation.

Mr. Ramirez stated as important to educator academic and professional preparation are the intangible and unquantifiable qualities that teachers bring to a classroom to motivate students. He cautioned against placing undue emphasis on rigor when the unquantifiable qualities are extremely important. Mr. Farina thanked him for his comments and thinks Ms. Weaver would agree after her experience on the school board. Mr. Ramirez said his teachers are dedicated and focused on being the best teachers and mentor new teachers despite the societal negative comments about teachers. Mr. Stevinson agrees many factors constitute a good teacher but the extraordinary costs of college remediation demonstrates there are problems that need to be addressed. Mr. Hilweg wondered if dual majors, in education and in content area should be considered. He supports Mr. Ramirez' assertion that there are un-quantifiable elements that make good teachers.

There was no public comment.

ACTION ITEMS

STUDENT BUDGET PARAMETERS: Ms. Lindner said the Commission is required to set parameters every February. Staff researches the costs of relevant items in Denver, Grand Junction and Boulder and averages the research results to ascertain the costs. The data is analyzed by three categories: students living on campus, students living off campus and students living with parents. The research is shared with the institutions and they may request modifications. Schools can petition CCHE to make parameter changes if they believe their situation is unique. These parameters determine part of the basic cost of attendance, affecting financial aid. The costs of books and supplies increased this year. The average cost of monthly childcare and an allowance for computers are included. If students do not live near the school, round trip travel costs maybe included.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Stewart made a motion to approve the staff recommendation and Ms. Weaver and Mr. Quamme seconded the Motion which was unanimously approved.

CONSENT ITEMS

- **DEGREE AUTHORIZATION ACT – PROVIDENCE THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE**
- **DEGREE AUTHORIZATION ACT – WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT UNIVERSITY**
- **GE-25 INTERIM REVIEW (GIANNESCHI/LEAL)**
- **VACANT BUILDINGS REPORT (JOHNSON)**

There was no public or Commissioner discussion on the Consent Items.

Mr. Stewart moved to approve all Consent Items as presented and Mr. Quamme and Ms. Weaver seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

WRITTEN REPORTS – NO DISCUSSION

2005-06 NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND GRANT REPORT

There was no discussion and no action was taken

The meeting was adjourned.

TOPIC: FINANCIAL AID REFORM INTIATIVES

PREPARED BY: DIANE LINDNER

I. SUMMARY

This agenda item presents the 2007-2008 Student Financial Aid Reform initiatives discussed in previous Commission meetings with the staff recommendation on the preferred option for further analysis and writing of final policy after collaboration with the higher education governing boards. The option staff recommends for further work is to provide a "Stipend Plus Aid" model that creates a financial aid voucher that may be easily understood, transferable, and ensures all of Colorado's lowest income students benefit from state financial aid.

II. BACKGROUND

The Commission kicked off its study of Financial Aid Reform with a retreat in September by examining the effectiveness of financial aid in Colorado and discussing how to best leverage aid to improve student access. The Governor's Blue Ribbon Panel that examined funding mechanisms for higher education and ultimately recommended student educational savings accounts (now implemented as student stipends) reviewed concepts of financial aid but given the complexity of their work in the student stipend area did not complete its work on financial aid.

The Commission accepted the challenge of reforming financial aid and spent the last several months identifying problems and potential solutions. Some of the problems that exist with the current method of allocating state-funded financial aid include:

- A large number of the lowest income students in Colorado do not receive a state-funded need-based grant.
- Student confusion about the financial aid program – state funded grants are not automatically reviewed even if eligibility criteria is met – students and parents have difficulty planning financially for two or four years of college.
- Aid is not transferable and varies from year-year.
- Student packaging policies are most often the purview of administrative staff with almost no input from the governing board and some input from the President or Chancellor's office depending on the institution.
- Even the lowest-income students who apply late almost certainly do not receive state-funded aid; one reason for this is the lack of adequate funding and another is the policy of awarding students first who meet the institutional priority deadline.
- The current formula as implemented by the Commission has not been maintained and needs recalibrating if the original intent of the formula is to be honored; the original intent of the formula was to pay a uniform percent of "unmet need" at each institution.

- High cost schools are rewarded in the formula.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

Institutions have provided substantial comment on the three models presented at the February commission meeting. All CEO's, CFO's and Financial Aid Directors have received Attachments A and B to this agenda item. Attachment A summarizes the rationale behind the models and the data used for these calculations. Attachment B shows the allocation amounts by institution for each model. Comments submitted to the Commission can be generally categorized as follows:

a) Status Quo:

Some institutions that support status quo are most interested in the dollar allocation going to their institution and will support the model that provides most funding to that institution or governing board.

Financial aid officers may prefer the status quo because it would maintain institutional flexibility when deciding whom the "neediest" students are instead of being tied to a federal model taking assets and liabilities into account.

One institution supporting maintaining the status quo based their arguments on a recent study by the American Council of Education, Center for Policy Analysis. The research focuses on the large number of low income students who do not apply for most types of financial aid noting that the number has declined since 2000; research concludes that if more students file a FAFSA, it could result in further "rationing of already tight resources". The conclusion did end by saying, "…no student should miss the opportunity for vital assistance because he or she lacks necessary information, is misinformed about the nature of student aid programs, or is unable to navigate the financial aid application process." This last statement is precisely the driving factor behind the Commission's intensive work on financial aid reform.

Another factor supporting status quo is the ability of institutions to use aid to promote their role and mission; they dismiss the fact that the state aid is not being used to fund the neediest students by presuming that these students are receiving institutional aid to make up the difference. While that may be true at large institutions, it is not true at the access institutions.

Institutions that are not supporting status quo indicate it is possible to have higher awards but less Pell students than another school because the model is based upon cost; this model is seen to reward high cost institutions. One proposal to equalize the model is to subtract the 20% revenue generated by tuition increases from the base of the allocation for that school.

b) Stipend Plus/Flat Grant:

Stipend Plus with no Variation on Type of Institution
Institutions supporting this model see it as a mechanism to assist students in making a market-driven decision on their institution of choice. All low-income students would be assured of a grant regardless of when they applied and it would increase the number of students receiving a grant at the institutions with the most Pell eligible students. It is also seen as rewarding the cost-effective institutions. It is important to note that the average student is receiving a higher state amount than the proposed Stipend Plus Aid models. This argues for a phased-in approach to change.

This model, regardless of variation on amounts by type of school, according to schools that have reviewed it, may also make more students believe they can afford a 4-year school. Research supports that there is a higher rate of achieving a 4-year degree if students enter at 4-year school.

Stipend Plus with Variation on Type of Institution
Support for this model comes from institutions that argue that students should not be pushed to a lower cost institution by virtue of state financial aid policy. They argue that poor students have a right to attend higher cost institutions and the state should assist in supporting that decision. Lower cost institutions argue that providing a lower stipend amount to the institutions with low tuition creates a two-tiered system and is treating its students less than fairly.

c) First Sixty Credit Hours of Tuition:

Institutions see this as a way to make any institution an equal choice for students. While it takes the competitiveness out of the equation, it does not drive more low-income students to lower cost institutions. It is seen as having the potential of keeping the lowest income students from building excessive loan debt for the first two years of school and encouraging a higher number of low-income students to enroll in college. Since research shows that the majority of low-income students who are going to drop out do so by the end of their sophomore year, front-loading grants may enable students to try college without having to assume the risk of large student loan debt. Several national research reports support front-loading grants.

Students will know that they can go to school for two years with tuition paid by the state and can use that time to become successful and plan financially for their last two years – or, if they are at a community college, they will graduate with the benefit of having state-paid their tuition.

On the other hand, it only provides two years of aid and leaves students with loan debt at the end of their educational career. This model is seen as having a potential for a “bait and switch” perception. The Commission would, clearly, under this model undertake a massive marketing/educational campaign.

This model may cost more than the other models if tuition differentials for high cost programs are included. The model also does nothing to discourage price hikes and cost increases at institutions, as the aid budget would automatically go up to cover those increases. Institutions are also concerned that state funding may prohibit use of the model.

d) Other governing boards/institutions were hesitant to support or detract from these models, indicating that they would like more research into the likely outcomes, either intended or unintended.

Aside from institutional comment on the models, there are issues that are important and remain to be addressed as reform progresses collaboratively with governing boards. These issues include:

- Providing retention and graduation incentives (although it could be argued that research shows that aid heavily impacts retention)
- Allowing additional incentives for training that occurs in high-need career areas
- How work study, which is an important piece of financial aid, is incorporated into the detailed implementation plan
- If incentives for pre-collegiate course work should be included.

.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. That the Commission finds that the Stipend Plus Aid model (a financial aid voucher) achieves the majority of the goals the Commission established as priorities in reforming Colorado's financial aid system. The goals the Stipend Plus Aid model achieves are:

- **Is easily understood and marketable, especially in connection with the College Opportunity Fund stipend, and thus helps to demystify college financing and encourage more low-income students and their families to see that paying for college is possible.**
- **It is transferable.**
- **It ensures that no low-income Colorado student misses the opportunity to receive state financial aid dollars because it is not dependent upon when a student applies for aid (avoids first-in, first-out).**
- **It eliminates bait-and-switch whereby a student loses financial aid by providing constant aid during the entire course of a student's college tenure.**
- **It does not reward tuition and cost increases with automatic increases in financial aid.**
- **It allows institutions to use their own aid budgets to further package students.**

2. That the Commission acknowledge that additional staff work must be done in collaboration with institutions to explore the intended and unintended consequences

under a Stipend Plus Aid model as final policies are developed. That the Commission direct the staff to prepare in collaboration with the institutions by June 2006 a recommendation on if the Stipend Plus Aid model should provide the same financial aid voucher amount for all students, should be differentiated for four-year and two-years institutions (or some other differentiation) and what income-level should qualify (i.e., Pell eligible or some rate above Pell eligible).

3. That the Commission direct staff to prepare final financial aid policies for Commission approval by October 2006 in order for a Stipend Plus Aid program to be operational for the 2007-08 academic year.

STATUTORY AUTHORITY

C.R.S. 23-3.3-102 Assistance program authorized-procedure-audits. (3) The commission shall administer the program with the assistance of institutions according to policies and procedures established by the commission.

Financial Aid Models

At the February Commission meeting, the staff recommended that three policy models be considered for reform purposes for Fiscal Year 2007-2008. Staff then discussed these models with the Financial Aid Advisory Committee Monday, February 13th. The discussion was on policy implications for each model, i.e., how each model affects particular groups of students at specific types of institutions.

For modeling purposes, need-based aid is assumed to increase by $23.9 M assuming that GOS would be partially rolled into need based aid for 07-08 while the balance would be maintained for current participants who have not graduated. No new GOS scholarships would be awarded in 06-07.

The Commission's Five-Year Funding Plan adds $55 M to Financial Aid to boost access to students who are least likely to attend college – generally, under represented, low income students. As financial aid policy models are analyzed for use in Colorado, these additions to the appropriation level should be noted. The total financial aid appropriation for 2005-2006 is $76.7 million – the three largest components of need-based aid include $15.0 M in work study, $50.6 million in Need grants (including GOS) and $2.1 M in federal/state partnership programs.

The existing formula allocates proportionate funding to each institution (based on statewide need), holding institutions harmless if their proportion of the statewide need has decreased over time. A cap of 35% growth over the prior year's allocation is placed upon institutions whose proportion of statewide need has increased. The spreadsheet shows models that were discussed by the Commission during the February meeting.

A recalibrated 2007-2008 model shows what schools would receive under the existing formula if there were no "hold harmless" provision and growth was not capped. That provides a starting point for discussion.

Model 1: Equal Share of Need: Guarantee[1] state funding for 8.00%[2] of every Pell eligible students' federally calculated Need. Uses institutional need based upon Cost of Attendance less the Expected Family Contribution (EFC) but funds each institution at the same percent. I.e., this is another method to get each institution to their "fair share" of need; this model funds an Across The Board percent of student need at each institution. Any Pell eligible undergraduate student at any institution would be assured of having that percent of need met by the state.

Advantages:

- Allocations go to institutions and allows institutional flexibility for award of funds
- Creates a uniform allocation model, taking into consideration differences in institutional costs of attendance

[1] "Guarantee" is used under the assumption of continued state funding at the expected level
[2] 8.00% is calculated under the assumption that the GOS program is partially rolled into need aid and the need aid is funded at the level requested

Disadvantages:

- A student would not know how much to expect the state to contribute toward his or her education until they are fully packaged by the institution
- Is not a student-driven model
- Does not provide clarity since few citizens outside higher education think of a grant award as a percent of statewide need
- Since the model is based upon cost, it provides no incentive for cost effectiveness

Model 2: Stipend Plus Aid: Guarantee state funding for every Pell and /or Level 1 eligible student (Part time students would receive prorated grants). If Level 1 students are awarded under this model according to the current assumptions (eligibility = 150% of Pell), the amount available would be spread across more students and obviously be lower than if funding were limited to Pell eligible students.

Staff has calculated two variations of Model 2 after hearing concerns regarding the first calculation methodology.

Model 2: Stipend Plus Aid with ***no*** Variation among Type of School
This model awards $1,470 each academic year to Pell Eligible students or $1,100 to Level 1 students per academic year. The award would provide a flat amount regardless of the amount of tuition charged by the institution they chose to attend.

Model 2: Stipend Plus Aid with Variation among Type of School
This model awards a flat grant to Pell eligible and/or Level 1 students; the award varies depending upon the type of institution attended. This model takes into account the fact that some institutions and programs – e.g., Mines or engineering at CSU – are higher cost programs and have higher tuition charges to the student. The model awards the grant based upon whether the institution is a two year or four year institution. The model averages tuition at each institution type and provides a grant amount that is an equal percent of that average tuition. The average tuition at two-year institutions is $1,746 and $3,830 at four year institutions. If awards are made to Pell eligible students only, the a stipend could pay approximately 50% of that average:

The Four Year institutional student stipend	$1,890
The Two Year institutional student stipend	$ 865

If Level 1 students are included, the average tuition paid is approximately 37%:

The Four Year institutional student stipend	$1,420
The Two Year institutional student stipend	$ 650

Advantages:

- Gives students/families clarity in financial planning for college; research on financial aid shows the aid is the most influential on college entry decisions of lower-income students
- Assures that all lowest income students receive state funding
- Grant is “portable” (transferable) among COF eligible institutions
- Increases the “buying power” of Pell grants by as much as 45%

Disadvantages:

- One version of the model does not account for differences in costs, thereby disadvantaging students attending higher cost institutions
- The amount may change during a student's educational career
- The two tiered system may be viewed as a way of treating the lower cost institutional students inequitably

Model 3: Tuition Awards for the first sixty credits of college to Pell Eligible Students Attending COF – eligible institutions: Under this scenario, all Pell eligible students attending public/COF-eligible institutions would receive state grant support equal to total tuition for their first sixty credit hours. Provide institutional flexibility for packaging advantageously to students (provides for the lowest loan amount) – i.e., if a student is packaged with other sources of funds to cover a proportionately larger share of the Cost of Attendance without state funds, it allows institutions to disclose this to the student and use that money to package a Level 1 student.

Advantages:

- Provides enhanced ability for student/family financial planning for college
- Provides maximum financial assistance to the lowest income students enrolling in eligible institutions
- Creates a clear, unambiguous message to students and parents about the state's investment in their education
- Could likely increase the number of students—especially underserved students—attending college in Colorado, reversing the Colorado Paradox
- Provides all Pell eligible students with the knowledge that they can afford tuition at any institution
- Allows students two years to become successful and learn the financial aid process
- May allow the institution to utilize institutional funds more effectively

Disadvantages:

- Students currently receiving higher state grants may have their grants decrease
- If a student received the full Pell award, their state dollars may go for living expenses allowed in the Cost of Attendance
- May be seen as a "bait and switch"

Attachment B

			FY 07-08 Model 1	FY 07-08 Model 2		FY 07-08 Model 2 Variation		FY 07-08 Model 3
Institutions	2005-06 Allocated Amount	FY 07-08 Current Model Recalibrated	8% of Need	$1470 Pell Eligible Only	$1100 Level 1 Eligible	Pell Eligible Only	Level 1 Eligible	05-06 Tuition Pell Eligible
ASC	791,842	1,139,966	1,140,642	1,358,577	1,613,880	1,749,195	1,574,780	868,230
CSM	634,036	1,252,710	1,254,386	665,710	676,588	859,950	851,290	1,464,096
CSU	3,461,214	4,885,567	4,880,976	4,906,585	5,063,408	6,317,325	6,370,830	3,481,048
FORT LEWIS	564,000	889,424	889,686	1,067,925	1,096,987	1,374,975	1,380,240	652,430
MESA	1,662,276	2,342,567	2,341,947	2,915,327	2,839,526	3,753,540	3,572,720	2,153,730
METRO	3,772,741	6,551,671	6,547,114	7,653,099	7,618,531	9,853,515	9,585,710	4,887,472
UCB	3,182,832	5,987,952	5,985,960	4,800,160	4,638,495	6,180,300	5,836,200	4,917,276
UCCS	1,413,657	2,286,195	2,284,506	2,246,681	2,089,016	2,892,645	2,628,420	2,320,110
UCD	2,127,335	3,927,245	3,926,312	2,496,964	2,664,595	3,214,890	3,352,620	2,437,344
UCHSC	966,278	1,647,313	1,645,211	105,692	252,804	136,080	318,080	HSC included in UCD
UNC	1,909,279	3,845,818	3,843,318	2,814,773	3,145,373	3,624,075	3,957,540	2,505,720
CSU-P	1,463,200	2,211,032	2,206,344	2,475,679	2,342,947	3,187,485	2,947,920	1,890,729
WSC	420,398	501,084	502,136	701,675	678,281	903,420	853,420	490,392
Total	22,369,088	37,468,544	37,448,536	34,208,847	34,720,431	44,047,395	43,229,770	28,068,577
ACC	785,311	1,334,136	1,332,785	1,627,944	1,630,245	962,199	975,829	1,931,076
CCA	767,230	1,133,702	1,134,217	1,596,384	1,613,880	943,613	966,403	1,884,807
CCD	1,810,678	2,662,008	2,658,732	3,272,035	3,062,423	1,930,999	1,800,679	3,852,549
CNCC	165,726	137,798	139,144	268,633	251,675	161,209	181,854	319,518
FRCC	1,969,745	3,319,680	3,315,373	4,011,143	4,074,201	2,366,527	2,383,404	4,710,708
LCC	241,277	244,278	245,642	450,658	415,885	268,469	276,429	516,816
MCC	285,353	444,712	446,537	573,964	524,794	341,129	339,154	679,194
NJC	354,639	382,076	382,786	650,297	652,324	386,109	412,604	771,732
OJC	484,932	513,611	516,201	1,034,163	907,384	612,307	559,504	1,161,090
PCC	1,873,754	3,012,767	3,010,587	4,055,915	3,552,794	2,392,909	2,083,104	4,779,675
PPCC	1,817,733	3,062,875	3,058,357	3,877,560	3,800,518	2,287,812	2,225,779	4,604,202
RRCC	715,176	1,177,547	1,176,883	1,474,544	1,456,442	871,807	875,729	1,710,207
TSJC	732,040	789,207	785,688	1,385,734	1,247,653	819,474	755,479	1,641,240
AIMS	723,141	1,860,274	1,857,384	1,570,694	1,799,532	928,464	1,073,329	1,605,000
CMC	291,744	488,557	486,560	577,633	582,351	743,715	732,720	812,184
Total	13,018,479	20,563,228	20,546,875	26,427,301	25,572,101	16,016,740	15,642,000	30,979,998
COLORADO C	285,516	306,914	308,651	197,438	271,989	254,205	392,630	314,545
REGIS	1,307,161	2,311,249	2,310,063	973,243	1,251,603	1,253,070	2,209,520	886,875
UNIV OF DEN	1,836,418	1,973,018	1,970,626	826,450	1,142,131	1,064,070	1,161,560	1,193,472
Total	3,429,095	4,591,181	4,589,341	1,997,131	2,665,723	2,571,345	3,763,710	2,394,892
Grand Total	**38,816,662**	**62,622,953**	**62,584,752**	**62,633,279**	**62,633,279**	**62,635,480**	**62,635,480**	**61,443,467**

TOPIC: **REPEAL OF CAPITAL ASSET POLICIES: PARTS I, L, O, P**

PREPARED BY: **JOAN JOHNSON**

I. SUMMARY

CCHE Capital Assets staff recommends repeal of the following Capital Asset Policies:

1. Part I: Instructions and Forms for Completing Physical Plant Inventory
2. Part L: Policies and Criteria for Capital Construction Priority Setting
3. Part O: Policy Guidelines for Capital Outlay Expenditures
4. Part P: Policies for Construction Projects Administration

The four policies were waived in all the Performance Contracts negotiated with the various institutions of public higher education in early 2005.

II. BACKGROUND

The passage of SB04-189 and SB04-252 which set up the College Opportunity Fund, performance and fee- for- service contracts, and enterprise status for Colorado's public higher education institutions also paved the way for more streamlined regulations in various areas regulated by the Colorado Commission on Higher Education. One of those areas is Capital Assets.

Rather than waive any of the statute which governs higher education capital assets (23-1-106), CCHE decided to look closely at the various CCHE policies which govern the process by which capital projects are approved. It was determined that the four policies outlined in the Summary above and parts of the Master Plan and Facilities Program Plan policies could be waived in the Performance Contracts.

The Commission's Subcommittee on Capital Assets met with CCHE staff on February 2nd following the regular Commission meeting and then with the Capital Construction Advisory Committee on February 13th. That meeting, attended by representatives of many of the governing boards, produced agreement on the repeal of the policies named above.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

Justification for repealing the four policies is:

Part I: Instructions and Forms for Completing Physical Plan Inventory. This policy was last revised in 1990 and State Buildings and Real Estate Programs already collects such data annually.

Part L: Policies and Criteria for Capital Construction Priority Setting. This policy, revised in 2001 and which is waived in all the Performance Contracts, was used as the guidelines for prioritizing state-funded capital projects. At the time the Performance Contracts were being negotiated and finalized, Referendum C was on no one's radar screen and there hadn't been any appreciable general fund money for capital projects for three years. It made sense to waive and then repeal a policy that hadn't been used for three years and probably wouldn't be in the foreseeable future. Things have changed since the November 1, 2005 election and passage of Referendum C. Although CCHE staff is recommending the Commission repeal this policy, the Capital Construction Advisory Committee suggested at the February 13, 2006 meeting on these policies that a new policy be drafted in the future concerning the Commission's activities as far as prioritizing state-funded capital projects. The Subcommittee on Capital Assets agreed this would be a good idea.

Part O: Policy Guidelines for Capital Outlay Expenditures. Last revised in 1987, this policy is outdated and refers to legislation and procedures no longer in effect.

Part P: Policies for Construction Projects Administration. Last revised in 1987, State Buildings and Real Estate Programs tracks construction projects for all of state government, including higher education. We do not need a duplication of effort and State Buildings is much more qualified to track the construction phase of capital projects.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Commission repeal the following Capital Assets' policies:

Parts I, L, O and P that the Commission direct Staff to draft a new policy for prioritization of state-funded projects which reflects the Commission's commitment to providing a more stream-lined and efficient process.

Appendix A

STATUTORY AUTHORITY

23-5-129(2)(a) C.R.S. Governing boards – performance contract – authorization – operations.

TOPIC: **CCHE CAPITAL ASSETS POLICIES – PROGRESS REPORT**

PREPARED BY: **JOAN JOHNSON**

I. SUMMARY

One of the major goals of the Commission on Higher Education after the passage in 2004 of SB04-189 and SB04-252 was to streamline regulations, including those affecting capital assets. There are currently 15 sections to the Capital Assets Policies; in an earlier agenda item, CCHE staff is recommending that four of those sections: Parts I, L, O and P, be repealed. Staff is also recommending that the Commission direct staff to a new Part R which will provide more streamlined processes for prioritization of state funded projects (see Staff Analysis section below).

The Subcommittee on Capital Assets, consisting of Commissioners Dean Quamme, Ray Baker and Greg Stevinson, met to initially discuss revisions of the policies on February 2, 2006 following the regular Commission meeting. It was decided to meet with the Capital Construction Advisory Committee (which consists of the facilities folks and chief financial officers as well as other budget staff from all of the public higher education institutions) on Monday, February 13th and begin the process of revising the policies.

On February 13th, representatives from UNC, the Community College System, the CU System, the CSU System and the Colorado School of Mines as well as Commissioners Quamme and Stevinson and CCHE staff Joan Johnson and Andy Carlson, met for about two hours. This report summarizes what was accomplished on February 13th and the plans to continue to meet and work on the capital assets policies.

The Commissioners present as well as the CCAC members participating were in agreement that all policy revisions (except for those to be repealed) be presented at the same time.

II. BACKGROUND

As mentioned in the Summary section above, a major goal of both SB04-189 and SB04-252 was the streamlining of Commission policies in terms of regulation of institutions of public higher education in Colorado.

CCHE's statutory authority over all aspects of capital construction has been in Colorado law since CCHE was initially created in 1965. When the law was repealed and re-enacted in 1985, the first 8 paragraphs were written; those have not changed in the past 21 years. Amendments were added in 1992, 1993, 1994, 2001, 2003 and 2005 to deal with new aspects of capital construction. (23-1-106 C.R.S.)

Members of the Legislature's Capital Development Committee and, to a certain respect, members of the Joint Budget Committee, have, over the years, depended upon CCHE's reviews of program plans and recommendations of various capital construction projects. The CCHE reviews have been seen as comprehensive and addressing all major issues of any one particular program plan. In fact, the statutory language for capital projects for other agencies of state government, was modeled after the language in 23-1-106.

Thus, in early 2005, CCHE staff began the process of revising the Capital Assets Policies with the primary thought of streamlining as well as simplifying the language of those policies. It was also recommended that certain policies just be repealed.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

Here is a preliminary analysis of the current CCHE Capital Assets Policies:

Part A Purpose/Introduction – general revisions

Part B Statewide Postsecondary Education Master Planning Manual – it was first thought that we would just delete this policy. Since there is clear statutory authority for this – 23-1-108 C.R.S. – there will have to be a lot more discussion about this before a recommendation is made to the Commission.

Part C Guidelines for Campus Site Selection – general revisions.

Part D Master Plans – general revisions and specific changes to:

1. Change to Guidelines Only: Institutional Data and Planning Concepts;
2. Eliminate requirement for Publication of Master Plans;
3. Updating of Master Plans – 10 year cycle where plans could be either amended or, if a majority of assumptions are still valid, a letter to the Director of Capital Assets would be the only thing required. Both Commissioners Stevinson and Quamme believed that CCHE should go back to 10 years for submitting new Master Plans rather than the currently required 6 year revision.

Part E Guidelines for Facilities Program Planning – general revisions and lots of interest in convening a special subcommittee of CCAC members on Libraries. A new form on Elements contained in the initial program plan that could be given to State Buildings and used as they monitor the construction phase of the project was also provided.

Part F Space Utilization Planning Criteria – last revised in 1999, there has been much discussion about the ratios of Assigned Square Feet (ASF) to Gross Square Feet (GSF). Many attending the Feb 13th meeting believed the ratios listed in the current policy were changed so that will require some research and more discussion.

Part H — Definitions/Abbreviations – last revised in 2001. The suggestions were made to (1) put these at the beginning of the policies (possibly make them a part of Part A) or as an Appendicee and (2) take out all those that are previously defined in some other part of the CCHE policies. CCHE staff would also like to add a section on acronyms.

Part J — Policy for Delegation of Facility Program Planning Approval Authority – last revised in 1994. CCHE staff will do a thorough re-evaluation of this policy, especially part 1.02 which talks about projects costing less than $2 million, regardless of source of funds, and no more than 20,000 GSF. CCAC members at the Feb 13th meeting as well as the two Commissioners were concerned these numbers just didn't apply anymore – especially when it comes to current construction costs.

Part M — Capital Improvements Program Policies – last revised in 2001, this is the Five Year Programs. It was suggested that the date of "no later than July 1" be put in the policy as far as governing board approval of these Five Year Plans each year. This would solve the problem of CCHE not getting the material until August or September and make sure we receive these plans in July of each year.

Part N — Criteria and Procedures for Implementation of 23-05-112 C.R.S., Concerning Gifts and Bequests to Institutions of Higher Education – last revised in 2001. General revisions.

Part Q — Policies for Self-Funded Capital Construction – last revised in 2001. Section 1.05 of the current policy is wrong in that the language says that higher education institutions are prohibited from using tuition, fees or general fund increases for construction of academic facilities. At the same time, our Section VI-C, p. 5, allows for the use of fees and/or tuition for construction of academic facilities. It is CCHE staff's intention to make the two policies conform and allow for such use.

Part R — This will be the new Part L and will set out the policies and procedures for prioritization of state-funded projects.

Parts G, K — Repealed by the Commission May 3, 2001

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

No recommendation at this time and no action required; this is a progress report.

Appendix A

STATUTORY AUTHORITY

(23-5-129(2)(a) C.R.S. Governing boards – performance contract – authorization – operations.

TOPIC: **CCHE – CAPITAL ASSETS QUARTERLY REPORTS (PROGRAM PLAN WAIVERS, CASH-FUNDED, SB 92-202, AND OTHER PROJECTS; AND LEASES)**

PREPARED BY: **JOAN JOHNSON/PRISCILLA GONZALES**

I. SUMMARY

This report covers the second, third, and the fourth quarters of 2005. The attachments, A and B are actions regarding matters the Commission has delegated to CCHE staff. Attachment A lists the program plan waivers, cash-funded and SB 92-202 projects, program plan amendments, and supplemental appropriations requests that the Commission has not seen before in the quarterly reports. Attachment B is a lease report; it summarizes general lease information, including lease categories and dollar amounts allocated for leases.

II. BACKGROUND

The Commission has delegated authority to the executive director, who has subsequently delegated authority to the director of capital assets, to grant waivers from the requirements of program plans for projects costing $500,000 or less, and to authorize cash-funded, SB 92-202 projects, program plan amendments and supplemental appropriation requests within the Commission guidelines and statutory authority. Delegated authority extends to lease approval.

No project using state capital construction funds, regardless of size, may proceed without Commission and legislative approval.

SB 92-202 projects are those constructed, operated, and maintained solely from student fees, auxiliary facility funds, wholly endowed gifts and bequests, research building revolving funds or a combination of such funds.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

Colorado School of Mines

The Colorado School of Mines (CSM) submitted program plan waiver requests for two property purchases at 1215 16th Street and 1620 Maple Street from the Colorado School of Mines Foundation for $1 each. Both properties are the eventual construction site for the proposed Wellness Center, a program plan amendment that CCHE approved on September 8, 2004.

The Colorado School of Mines SB 92-202 Aquatic Center project is an addition to the Student Recreation Center (Wellness Center). In June 2005, the CSM Board of Trustees approved the additional $6,904,652 (Amendment 2) for the Aquatic Center that had been in the initial program plan. Funding for this project will be all cash and will come from the following sources: $3 million in previous bond proceeds; $12.5 million in current bond proceeds; and $9.5 million in gifts, donations, and interest earnings.

Colorado State University

The Colorado State University (CSU) submitted three program-plan waivers. The research-oriented projects are: Center for Environment Toxicolgy and Technology Lab Renovation (Labs, 1, 3 and 4), Foothills BSL2 Preparatory Space, and Modular Unit for Animal Population Health Institute. The requests for waivers or exceptions are either for more space or to renovate. They are minor capital improvement projects consistent with CSU Facilities' Master Plan and costing less than $500,000.

Also, CSU requested a waiver to purchase a MoFlo Cytometer, equipment that is used in immunology and infectious disease research.

The Alumni Center and Summit Hall are additional parking SB 92-202 projects for the Colorado State University (CSU). Both projects meet city standards and are consistent with the CCHE approved CSU Facilities' Master Plan. The Alumni Center parking lot provides 93 new parking spaces, curbs and gutters, lighting, landscaping and irrigation. The Summit Hall project provides 127 new parking spaces for the new residence hall (the South Residence Hall will eventually be called Summit Hall).

Mesa State College

Since the CCHE approval of the 1999 Mesa State College (MSC) Facilities Master Plan, MSC through its internal housing study found that there is a greater need for on-campus housing. Mesa State College proposed a New Residence Hall for additional student housing of 250-300 beds as a SB 92-202 project. The Board of Trustees of Mesa State College approved the program plan and budget request for this project on May 16, 2005.

University of Colorado System

The department of molecular, cellular, and developmental biology at the University of Colorado at Boulder requested a program plan waiver for Porter Biosciences Microscope Infill, room B0011, B0011C, and B0011D. The waiver is for the removal of an obsolete high-voltage electron microscope from Porter Boisciences freeing up much needed space. The vacated space will be converted into research labs.

The University of Colorado at Boulder Improvement of Outdoor Recreation Facilities is a SB 92-202 project to improve its outdoors recreation facilities for students. The proposal calls for artificial turf on specific fields, purchase of fixed equipment, artificial lighting, fences, goals, benches, and other permanent fixtures. Although the project does not create additional playing fields, the artificial lighting will increase the availability for use and expand the hours of operation.

The building of a new Campus Recreation Center is a SB 92-202 project for the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs (UCCS). The new recreation center would provide students with amenities they desire that can't be accommodated by the existing facility. The varied recreational services would accommodate simultaneous multiple uses, special events, exercise classes, student athlete training, ROTC activities, and general use. According to the Master Plan, UCCS is becoming more of a traditional campus, with more students living on-campus. This recreational center would enable the university to offer expanded recreational opportunities to the university's growing population. This program plan was submitted and approved by CCHE in the spring of 2000.

University of Northern Colorado

The University of Northern Colorado students voted for the fee-funded Campus Recreation Center, a project to make improvements to the recreational and athletic facilities on campus. It encompasses four areas: the Butler Hancock Gymnasium, Campus Recreation Center, Butler Hancock Fields, and the Jackson Sport Complex. The project will construct 28,600 new gross square feet and will renovate 3,950 gross square feet, a total of 32,500 gsf.

Western State College

Western State College's Master Plan was approved in 1992 and amended in January 2002. The amended plan recognizes the need for modern and flexible facilities, and additional space to house the department of business, accounting, and economics because of a steady increase of enrollment in their business program, its largest major. Because this trend is expected to continue, Western State College proposed to construct the Borick Business Building as a SB 92-202 project.

Attachment B is a list of all the leases requested for the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th quarters from higher education institutions. It contains the following information: date of approval, lease description, cost of the lease, square footage, cost per square foot, type of lease, and lease dates. Also, the Governing Boards' total cost for leases was calculated.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

No formal action is required. This report is submitted for Commission's review.

Appendix A

STATUTORY AUTHORITY

23-1-106 C.R.S.- Duties and powers of the commission with respect to capital construction and long-range planning.

(3) The commission shall review and approve master planning and program planning for all capital construction projects of higher education on state-owned or state-controlled land, regardless of source of funds, and no capital construction shall commence except in accordance with an approved master plan, program plan, and physical plan.

(5)(b) The commission may except from the requirements of program and physical planning any project that shall require less than five hundred thousand dollars of state moneys.

(8) Any acquisition or utilization of real property by a state-supported institution of higher education which is conditional upon or requires expenditures of state-controlled funds or federal funds shall be subject to the approval of the commission, whether acquisition is by lease, lease-purchase, purchase, gift, or otherwise.

(9)(a) The commission shall review and approve any plan for a capital construction project that is estimated to require total expenditures exceeding two hundred fifty thousand dollars and that is to be constructed, operated, and maintained solely from student fees, auxiliary facility funds, wholly endowed gifts and bequests, research building revolving funds, or a combination of such sources. Any such plan for a capital construction project that is estimated to require total expenditures of two hundred fifty thousand dollars or less shall not be subject to review or approval by the commission.

2nd, 3rd, and 4th Quarters 2005
2nd, 3rd, and 4th Quarters 2005
(April 1, 2005, through December 31, 2005)

Approval Date	Project	Type	Institution	Total Project Cost	Funding Sources	Gross Square Feet	Notes
14-Apr-2005	Property Acquistion - at 1222 17th Street	Waiver	CSM	$300,000	CFE	7,405	The property includes a 2,040 gross square foot house, and a 624 gross square foot detached building on a 7,405 gross sqaure foot lot.
12-Jul-2005	Wellness Center, Admendment 2, Aquatics Center	SB 92-202	CSM	$6,904,652	CFE	24,985	Funding for project : previous and current bond proceeds, student fees, gifts, donations, and interest earnings.
COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES TOTALS				**$300,000**		**7,405**	
21-Apr-2005	Center for Environmental Toxicology and Technology Lab Renovation - Labs 1, 3 and 4.	Program Plan Waiver	CSU	$490,000	CFE	2,900	Renovated lab space. The Research Bldg Revolving Fund is created from rents or user fees paid for research space, specific grants, or gifts made to the fund, proceeds from warrents, or sale of bonds.
21-Apr-2005	Foothills BSL2 Preparatory Space	Program Plan Waiver	CSU	$475,000	CFE	2,000	New preparatory lab space. Research Bldg Revolving Fund.
21-Apr-2005	Modular Unit for Animal Population Health Institute	Program Plan Waiver	CSU	$480,000	CFE	4,000	New preparatory lab space. Research Bldg Revolving Fund .
12-May-2005	MoFlo Cytometer	Program Plan Waiver	CSU	$337,825	CFE	NA	Equipment separates cells and particles in fluid by their fluorsescent properties.
12-May-2005	Alumni Center Parking Lot	SB 92-202	CSU	$279,000	CFE	NA	93 new paved parking spaces. Revenue from parking fees and fines.
12-May-2005	Summit Hall Parking Lot	SB 92-202	CSU	$381,000	CFE	NA	127 New paved parking spaces. Revenue from parking fees and fines.
COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM TOTALS				**$2,361,825**		**12,305**	
23-May-2005	New Residence Hall	SB 92-202	MSC	$19,200,000	CFE	108,000	A new residence hall of 250-300 beds. Project to be built from housing bonds, and student rents will repay the bonds.

2nd, 3rd, and 4th Quarters 2005

2nd, 3rd, and 4th Quarters 2005

(April 1, 2005, through December 31, 2005)

Approval Date	Project	Type	Institution	Total Project Cost	Funding Sources	Gross Square Feet	Notes
MESA STATE COLLEGE TOTALS				**$2,361,825**		**12,305**	
4-May-2005	Porter Biosciences Microscope Infill - Rooms B0011, B0011C, and B0011D	Program Plan Waiver	UCB	$492,000	CFE	915	Gifts and indirect cost recovery money from federal grants will be used to carry out renovations needed to consolidate the electon mircoscope facilities.
20-Oct-2005	Improvement of Outdoor Recreation Facilities	SB 92-202	UCB	$5,712,500	CFE	495,800	
20-Oct-2005	Campus Recreation Center	SB 92-202	UCCS	$12,000,000	CFE	53,371	
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO SYSTEM TOTALS				**$8,566,325**		**509,020**	
11-Jul-2005	Campus Recreation Center	SB 92-202	UNC	$15,798,422	CFE	NA	In 1993 students voted to fee-fund the student recreation facility.
UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN COLORADO TOTALS				**$8,566,325**		**0**	
20-Oct-05	Borick Business Building	SB 92-202	WSC	$4,875,000	CFE	25,000	
WESTERN STATE COLLEGE TOTALS				**$8,566,325**		**0**	

Institution	Lease Status	Date of Approval	Address	Lease Description	Total Annual Cost	Square Feet	Cost Per Sq. Ft.	Type of Lease	Date From	Date To
CSU	Approved and Notification sent	5/11/2005	Suite 226, Lincoln Office Center, 419 Canyon Avenue, Fort Collins, Colorado 80521	Office	$60,925.85	3,565	$17.09	New	5/15/2005	6/30/2006
CSU	Approved and Notification sent	6/22/2005	ARDEC 4616 NE Frontage Road, Fort Collins, CO 80524	Special Use	$140,000.00	0		New	7/1/2005	6/30/2006
CSU	Approved and Notification sent	7/22/2005	1730 S College Ave Suite 300 Fort Collins, Colorado 80524	Office	$27,000.00	2,550	$10.59	New	10/1/2005	9/30/2008
CSU	Approved and Notification sent	8/8/2005	Bay Farm Parcel at Centre for Adv.Tech. CSU South Campus Fort Collins, CO 80521	Special Use	$7,300.00	58	$125.86	Renewal	9/1/2005	8/31/2006
CSU	Approved and Notification sent	8/29/2005	Southeastern Colorado Research Center, PO Box 1018 Lamar, CO 81052	Special Use	$0.00	14	$0.00	New	9/1/2005	5/31/2010
CSU	Approved and Notification sent	8/23/2005	1220 11th Ave Suite 203 Greeley, CO 80631	Office	$7,200.00	600	$12.00	Renewal	9/1/2005	8/31/2007
CSU	Approved and Notification sent	8/30/2005	7990 W HWY 50 Suite C Salida, CO 81201	Office	$14,259.39	1,968	$7.25	Renewal	9/1/2005	8/31/2007
CSU	Approved and Notification sent	9/22/2005	Apartment #307 Pheasant Run Wiley, CO 81092-0519	Residential	$7,440.00	1,100	$6.76	New	10/1/2005	6/30/2007
CSU	Approved and Notification sent	9/28/2005	Approx 28 acres of farm land located 10 mi S & 1 mi W of Platner, Washington County CO	Special Use	$2,800.00	1,219,680	$0.00	Renewal	10/1/2005	9/30/2007
CSU	Approved and Notification sent	9/28/2005	Trumbull Cabin No. 2 – 7940 & Trumbull No.13 – 7986 S Hwy 67 Sedalia, CO 80135	Special Use	$1.00	850	$0.00	Renewal	10/1/2005	9/30/2006
CSU	Approved and Notification sent	9/28/2005	Suite 2100 3300 Mitchell Lane Boulder, CO 80303	Office	$31,821.76	1,108	$28.72	Renewal	10/1/2005	9/30/2006
CSU	Approved and Notification sent	10/19/2005	6221 Downing Street - J, K, & L Comm.College of Denver-North Denver, CO 80216	Office	$8,150.21	431	$18.91	Renewal	11/1/2005	6/30/2006
CSU	Approved and Notification sent	10/28/2005	2764 Compass Dr. Suite 232 Grand Junction, CO 81506	Office	$10,080.00	775	$13.01	Renewal	11/1/2005	6/30/2010

Institution	Lease Status	Date of Approval	Address	Lease Description	Total Annual Cost	Square Feet	Cost Per Sq. Ft.	Type of Lease	Date From	Date To
CSU	Approved and Notification sent	10/27/2005	219 West Magnolia Fort Collins, CO 80521	Office	$9,120.00	607	$15.02	Renewal	11/1/2005	6/30/2007
CSU	Approved and Notification sent	11/2/2005	15260 So. Golden Road Golden, CO 80401	Office	$1.00	5,706	$0.00	Renewal	11/1/2005	10/31/2010
CSU	Approved and Notification sent	11/2/2005	Suite 202A, Pine Grove Office Bldg 1475 Pine Grove Road Steamboat Springs, CO 80477	Office	$5,360.00	335	$16.00	Renewal	11/1/2005	6/30/2006
CSU	Approved and Notification sent	11/2/2005	Building D, Unit 6 2121 S. College Ave Fort Collins, CO 80525	Special Use	$1,309.00	200	$6.55	New	11/1/2005	10/31/2010
CSU	Approved and Notification sent	11/14/2005	215 N Linden St Cortez, CO 81321	Office	$29,472.00	4,900	$6.01	Renewal	12/1/2005	9/30/2006
CSU	Approved and Notification sent	11/18/2005	1515 Cleveland Place Suite 200 Denver, Colorado 80202	Office	$2,475.00	150	$16.50	Renewal	12/1/2005	4/30/2007
CSU	Approved and Notification sent	11/21/2005	Building C, Unit 5 2121 S. College Ave Fort Collins, CO 80525	Special Use	$759.00	100	$7.59	New	1/1/2006	12/31/2010
CSU	Approved and Notification sent	12/5/2005	Building C, Unit 15 2121 S. College Ave Fort Collins, CO 80525	Special Use	$759.00	100	$7.59	New	1/1/2006	12/31/2009
CSU	Approved and Notification sent	12/5/2005	Building A, Unit 15 2121 S. College Ave Fort Collins, CO 80525	Special Use	$1,485.00	250	$5.94	New	1/1/2006	12/31/2008
CSU	Approved and Notification sent	12/5/2005	Units A- 14 and C-21 2121 S. College Ave Fort Collins, CO 80525	Special Use	$2,243.50	350	$6.41	New	1/1/2006	12/31/2010
CSU	Approved and Notification sent	12/5/2005	Kit Carson County Airport 14111 Highway 385 (.9183 ac) Burlington, CO 80807	Special Use	$200.00	40,001	$0.00	Renewal	1/1/2006	12/31/2010
CSU	Approved and Notification sent	12/21/2005	BLM Colo State Office Bldg 2850 Youngfield Street Lakewood, CO 80215-0793	Office	$8,630.00	500	$17.26	Renewal	1/1/2006	12/31/2006

Institution	Lease Status	Date of Approval	Address	Lease Description	Total Annual Cost	Square Feet	Cost Per Sq. Ft.	Type of Lease	Date From	Date To
CSU	Approved and Notification sent	12/21/2005	102 Par Place Montrose, CO 81401	Office	$17,658.80	1,348	$13.10	New	2/1/2006	6/30/2009
COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM TOTALS					**$396,450.51**					
FRCC	Approved and Notification sent	4/7/2005	565 N. Cleveland Avenue, Loveland, Colorado 80537	Classrooms	$6,120.00	2,003	$3.06	Renewal	7/1/2004	6/30/2005
FRCC	Approved and Notification sent	5/9/2005	4600 Innovation Drive Fort Collins, Colorado 80525-3437	Classrooms	$6,400.00	800	$8.00	New	5/15/2005	8/15/2005
FRCC	Approved and Notification sent	5/27/2005	800 South Taft Avenue Loveland, Colorado 80537	Classrooms	$51,888.00	6,486	$8.00	Renewal	6/1/2005	5/31/2007
FRCC	Approved and Notification sent	8/19/2005	5400 Ziegler Road Fort Collins, Colorado 80528	General Use	$14,175.00	1,500	$9.45	New	8/23/2005	5/8/2006
FRCC	Approved and Notification sent	8/19/2005	3400 Lambkin Way Fort Collins, Colorado 80525	Classrooms	$2,880.00	1,050	$2.74	New	8/23/2005	5/8/2006
MCC	Approved and Notification sent	4/15/2005	215 S. Main Yuma, CO 80759	Office	$1,500.00	462	$3.25	Renewal	7/1/2005	6/30/2006
MCC	Approved and Notification sent	4/20/2005	280 Colfax Bennett, CO	Office	$7,200.00	642	$11.21	Renewal	7/1/2005	6/30/2006
MCC	Approved and Notification sent	6/7/2005	2400 E. Bijou Avenue Fort Morgan, CO 80701	Labs	$13,680.00	2,500	$5.47	Renewal	7/1/2005	6/30/2007
MCC	Approved and Notification sent	6/7/2005	117 Main Street Fort Morgan, CO 80701	Classrooms	$73,500.00	10,000	$7.35	Renewal	7/1/2005	6/30/2006
MSC	Approved and Notification sent	7/6/2005	1222 Elm Avenue Grand Junction CO 81501	Residential	$135,666.66	15,840	$8.56	New	8/1/2005	6/30/2006

Institution	Lease Status	Date of Approval	Address	Lease Description	Total Annual Cost	Square Feet	Cost Per Sq. Ft.	Type of Lease	Date From	Date To
NJC	Approved and Notification sent	6/20/2005	Logan County Fairgrounds 1120 Pawnee Avenue Sterling, Colorado 80751	Labs	$8,100.00	38,840	$0.21	Renewal	8/18/2005	5/18/2007
NJC	Approved and Notification sent	6/17/2005	Hoffman House 302 Cleveland Sterling, CO 80751	Special Use	$27,000.00	3,132	$8.62	Renewal	7/1/2005	6/30/2006
TSJC	Approved and Notification sent	9/21/2005	1304 San Juan Alamosa, CO, 81101	General Use	$40,040.00	6,500	$6.16	Renewal	10/1/2005	6/30/2010
TSJC	Approved and Notification sent	9/21/2005	Prator Gun Range Gray Creek Road Las Animas County, Colorado	General Use	$3,640.00	958,320	$0.00	Renewal	10/1/2005	6/30/2010
COMMUNITY COLLEGES OF COLORADO SYSTEM TOTALS					**$391,789.66**					
UCB	Approved and Notification sent	4/29/2005	5465 Pennsylvania Avenue, Boulder, CO 80303	Classrooms	$15,000.00	15,600	$0.96	New	5/17/2005	8/12/2005
UCB	Approved and Notification sent	4/29/2005	6717 South Boulder Road Boulder, CO 80303	Classrooms	$1,500.00	15,000	$0.10	New	6/13/2005	8/12/2005
UCB	Approved and Notification sent	5/27/2005	910 28th Street Boulder, CO	Office	$63,899.00	7,400	$8.64	Renewal	7/1/2005	12/31/2005
UCB	Approved and Notification sent	11/3/2005	605 S. Kuner Road Brighton, CO 80601	Office	$15,156.00	1,304	$11.62	New	1/1/2006	6/30/2006
UCB	Approved and Notification sent	11/17/2005	726 3rd Street Alamosa, CO 81101	Office	$5,640.00	900	$6.27	New	1/1/2006	6/30/2006
UCD	Approved and Notification sent	9/12/2005	1625 Broadway Ste 950 Denver 80202	Office	$14,739.00	1,673	$8.81	New	10/1/2005	11/30/2009
UCHSC	Approved and Notification sent	6/9/2005	4300 E. 8th Ave Denver	Support	$19,159.00	5,950	$3.22	Renewal	7/1/2005	6/30/2007

Institution	Lease Status	Date of Approval	Address	Lease Description	Total Annual Cost	Square Feet	Cost Per Sq. Ft.	Type of Lease	Date From	Date To
UCHSC	Approved and Notification sent	6/9/2005	1122 Albion St Denver	Support	$25,788.00	11,244	$2.29	Renewal	7/1/2005	6/30/2007
UCHSC	Approved and Notification sent	6/9/2005	1145 Albion St. Denver	Support	$20,106.00	6,630	$3.03	Renewal	7/1/2005	6/30/2007
UCHSC	Approved and Notification sent	8/16/2005	4200 E. 9th Avenue Denver 80262	Labs	$25,320.00	1,266	$20.00	New	7/1/2005	6/30/2006
UCHSC	Approved and Notification sent	9/6/2005	1611 S. Federal Blvd Stes 243-246 Denver	Office	$10,734.00	1,148	$9.35	Renewal	9/1/2005	8/31/2006
UCHSC	Approved and Notification sent	9/6/2005	1611 S. Federal Blvd Stes 230-232 Denver	Office	$10,734.00	1,148	$9.35	Renewal	9/1/2005	8/31/2006
UCHSC	Approved and Notification sent	4/22/2005	1793 Quentin St Unit 2 Aurora 80045	Office	$23,275.00	2,508	$9.28	New	5/1/2005	4/30/2007
UCHSC	Approved and Notification sent	6/9/2005	12635 E. Montview Stes 124, 125, 128, 150, 160 Aurora 80045	Labs	$100,270.00	4,076	$24.60	Renewal	7/1/2005	8/31/2008
UCHSC	Approved and Notification sent	6/21/2005	13050 E. Smith Rd. Aurora 80011	Support	$75,800.00	10,000	$7.58	New	6/1/2005	5/31/2017
UCHSC	Approved and Notification sent	7/27/2005	7290 Magnolia Street Commerce City, 80022	Office	$3,600.00	150	$24.00	New	8/1/2005	7/31/2007
UCHSC	Approved and Notification sent	8/22/2005	1600 Downing St, Ste 550 Denver	Office	$23,218.80	1,920	$12.09	Renewal	9/1/2005	8/31/2006
UCHSC	Approved and Notification sent	8/31/2005	1600 Pierce St. Lakewood 80214	Labs	$247,500.00	15,000	$16.50	New	9/1/2005	12/31/2009
UCHSC	Approved and Notification sent	9/29/2005	105 S. Sunset St. Stes. C-G Longmont, CO 80501	Labs	$26,928.00	2,400	$11.22	New	10/1/2005	12/31/2005

Institution	Lease Status	Date of Approval	Address	Lease Description	Total Annual Cost	Square Feet	Cost Per Sq. Ft.	Type of Lease	Date From	Date To
UCHSC	Approved and Notification sent	12/21/2005	12635 E. Montview Boulevard Ste. 360 Aurora, CO 80045	Office	$50,973.00	2,888	$17.65	New	3/1/2006	2/28/2011
UC-SYS	Approved and Notification sent	7/22/2005	12635 E Montview Blvd Aurora, CO	Office	$55,077.00	3,338	$16.50	New	8/1/2005	8/1/2010
UC-SYS	Approved and Notification sent	12/5/2005	225 East 16th Ave Suite 580 Denver, CO 80203	Office	$25,326.00	1,876	$13.50	New	11/1/2005	10/31/2006
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO SYSTEM TOTALS					**$859,742.80**					
UNC	Approved and Notification sent	6/28/2005	District Boardroom 1405 Grand Avenue Glenwood Springs, CO 81601	Classrooms	$0.00	0	$0.00	New	5/2/2005	12/31/2006
UNC	Additonal Information Requested from Institution	Not Approved	Rampart Range Campus 11195 Highway 93 Colorado Springs, CO 80921	Classrooms	$3,500.00	140	$25.00	Renewal	7/1/2005	6/30/2007
UNIVERSITY OF NORTHEN COLORADO TOTALS					**$3,500.00**					
WSC	Approved and Notification sent	10/4/2005	Western State College	Classrooms	$1.00	21,780	$0.00	New	9/1/2005	9/1/2055
WESTERN STATE COLLEGE TOTAL					**$1.00**					

TOPIC: **TEACHER EDUCATION AUTHORIZATION: JONES INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY**

PREPARED BY: **MATTHEW GIANNESCHI AND DAVID WHALEY**

I. SUMMARY

Jones International University, a state approved, regionally accredited on-line university authorized to operate in Colorado pursuant to the Degree Authorization Act (23-2-101 et seq C.R.S.), has been approved by the Colorado State Board of Education to offer an educator licensing program leading to initial teacher licensure pursuant to rules found in 22-2-109 C.R.S.

Jones International University's teacher licensure proposal was submitted, as specified in 22-2-109 (3) C.R.S., to the Colorado Department of Education for content review and program authorization in summer 2005. The Colorado State Board of Education authorized the program on August 11, 2005.

Based on the Colorado State Board of Education's approval, the Jones International University proposal for authorization was subsequently reviewed by CCHE in January 2006 by staff for alignment/compliance with the state's performance measures found in 23-1-121 (5) C.R.S.:

1. *Candidates complete a minimum of 800-hours of field experience, including student teaching; and,*

2. *Program content is designed and implemented in a manner that will enable the teacher candidate to meet licensure requirements as specified by the State Board of Education pursuant to 22-2-109 (3) and 22-60.5-106 C.R.S.*

CCHE staff determined that the Jones International University educator licensing program, as proposed, will satisfactorily meets these state measures.

II. STAFF ANALYSIS

Pursuant to 23-1-121 (5) C.R.S., non-public institutions of higher education in Colorado with teacher education preparation programs are authorized by State Board of Education and the Colorado Commission on Higher Education. The focus of each review is to ensure the teacher education program's compliance with the Colorado State Board of Education's Teacher Preparation Content Standards and the Commission on Higher Education's requirement that each preparation program includes 800 hours of field experiences.

Following statute, the State Board of Education (SBE) is the first agency to review and act upon requests for authorization. Upon SBE approval of preparation program content, the Colorado Commission on Higher Education takes its action.

As described on the Jones International University website (http://www.jonesinternational.edu),

> *The Jones International University (JIU) Master of Education (M.Ed.) Teacher Licensure…Program of Preparation is designed for students who would like to become licensed teachers and/or licensed principals/administrators in public K–12 institutions in the United States. The program is open to students living in the United States or abroad.*

The programs are 100% web-based, and candidates are required to possess a bachelor's degree from a regionally accredited college or university at the time of admission. Completers of the programs will meet Colorado's licensing requirements, although they may be geographically located elsewhere. Each candidate is required to pass the required Colorado assessment for educators (PLACE or Praxis II) in the respective teaching endorsement or licensing area prior to student teaching. Candidates for initial teacher licensing complete 800 hours of field experience and a portfolio project as a summative experience.

On August 11, 2005, Jones International University was approved by the State Board of Education to offer M.Ed. degree in Elementary Curriculum, Assessment, and Instruction (Elementary Educator); the M.Ed. in Secondary Curriculum, Assessment, and Instruction (Agriculture and Renewable Natural Resources Education, Art, Business/Marketing Education, Drama, English Language Arts, Family and Consumer Studies, Foreign Language [French, German, Italian, Japanese, Latin, Russian and Spanish], Health, Instructional Technology Teacher, Mathematics, Music, Physical Education, Science, Social Studies, Speech, Trade and Industry Education; and the M.Ed. degree in Educational Leadership and Administration (Principal and Administrator Licensure).

III. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Commission grant authorization to Jones International University to offer the M.Ed. degree in Elementary Curriculum, Assessment, and Instruction (Elementary Educator); the M.Ed. in Secondary Curriculum, Assessment, and Instruction (Agriculture and Renewable Natural Resources Education, Art, Business/Marketing Education, Drama, English Language Arts, Family and Consumer Studies, Foreign Language [French, German, Italian, Japanese, Latin, Russian and Spanish], Health, Instructional Technology Teacher, Mathematics, Music, Physical Education, Science, Social Studies, Speech, Trade and Industry Education; and the M.Ed. degree in Educational Leadership and Administration (Principal and Administrator Licensure).

IV. STATUTORY AUTHORITY

23-1-121 (5) C.R.S.

V. SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Copies of the Jones International University teacher education licensure application materials as well as the letter of authorization from the Colorado State Board of Education are on file in the Office of Academic and Student Affairs.

TOPIC: PROPOSED MODIFICATION TO THE MESA STATE COLLEGE ADMISSION INDEX

PREPARED BY: MATT GIANNESCHI

I. OVERVIEW

At its December 14, 2005, meeting, the Mesa State Board of Trustees approved changes to the institution's admission policies. The MSC Board of Trustees voted to approve increasing the institution's freshman index from 80 to 85 beginning in summer 2007 and creating a "provisional admission" status for students admitted through the window (i.e., between 75 and 84 index). Consistent with the institution's historical role and mission as a moderately selective institution maintaining both two- and four-year academic operations, Mesa State College proposes to admit all applicants with an index of 74 or below into the institution's two-year college.

CCHE staff recommends that the Commission approve the recommendations made by the Mesa State College Board of Trustees in accordance with 23-1-108 (1) (d), 23-1-108 (1) (e), and 23-1-113 C.R.S.

II. BACKGROUND

From its establishment in 1985, the Colorado Commission on Higher Education has promulgated, monitored, and approved all changes to the admission policies at the state's public colleges and universities. In 2003, major revisions to the CCHE Admissions Standards Policy were adopted by the Commission, which included recalibrated admission indexes for the state colleges and universities (see Table 1).

Table 1: CCHE Approved Admission Indexes at Public Colleges and Universities in Colorado

Institution	*Selectivity*	*Index/Transfer GPA*
Community Colleges	Open	n/a
Metro State College	Modified Open*	76/2.30
Adams State College	Moderately Selective**	80/2.30
Mesa State College	Moderately Selective**	80/2.30
Western State College	Moderately Selective	80/2.30
CSU – Pueblo	Moderately Selective***	86/2.30
CU – Colorado Springs	Selective	92/2.40
CU – Denver/HSC	Selective	93/2.40

Fort Lewis College	Selective	86/2.40 (92/2.40[1])
UNC	Selective	94/2.40
CSU – Fort Collins	Selective	101/2.50
CU – Boulder	Selective	103/2.70
Mines	Highly Selective	110/2.70

*Applies to students 19 years of age and younger.
**Applies to applicants to the four-year programs only.
***Index of 82 effective with fall 2003, index of 84 expected for fall 2004, and index of 86 for fall 2005 in accordance with change in role, mission, and name change (HB-01-1406.)

The foregoing indexes have been in effect for three years and have been altered for Colorado State University at Pueblo and Fort Lewis College as a result of governing board requests following enacted legislation.

III. ANALYSIS

The current admission index "floor" for Mesa State College, 80, is liberal by design. According to the CCHE Admission Standards Policy, students with an 80 index demonstrate academic qualifications roughly equivalent to a 2.5 grade point average and an 18 ACT. The changes to Mesa State College's admission index recommended by the MSC Board of Trustees are conservative and would, for example, increase the minimum grade point average by two tenths (e.g., 2.5 to 2.7) or the minimum ACT by two composite points (e.g., 18 to 20) but not necessarily both. Importantly, students with an index score equal to or greater than the CCHE approved index level are only considered eligible for consideration as a candidate for admission and are not guaranteed admission.

An index of 85 is within the current range of accepted indexes for moderately selective institutions as adopted by the Colorado Commission on Higher Education (current range: 80 – 86). Importantly, requests to increase an institution's index outside of the presently accepted range will not be recommended for approval without first making major changes to the entire admission index classification system. That is, requests from moderately selective institutions to increase their admission index comparable to that of a selective institution or from a selective institution increase its admission index comparable to that of a highly selective institution will not be recommended for approval without first revisiting the entire admission index classification system.

Mesa State maintains a two-year college mission, which has and will maintain open admission standards, and a four-year college mission, which is and will continue to be defined as moderately selective. Therefore, Mesa State College is in a somewhat unique situation in that it can find a way to enroll any interested student who applies to the institution, either into its two- or four-year college. Consequently, conservative changes to Mesa State College's admission index, like those recommended by the Mesa State College Board of Trustees described herein, will have no ostensible effect on the institution's overall enrollment and will not affect access to postsecondary education for citizens on Colorado's Western Slope.

[1] FLC's freshman admission index will increase to 92 in fall 2008 pursuant to Commission action taken in October 2005.

IV. RECOMMENDATION

That the Commission approve the recommendation by the Mesa State College Board of Trustees to increase the Mesa State College admission index from 80 to 85 beginning summer 2007, as well as require CCHE staff to monitor changes in enrollment, retention, and graduation statistics at Mesa State College resulting from the implementation of an increased admission index score and possibly recommend increases in the MSC performance contract goals regarding student retention (including transfer; goal 1.1) and graduation (goal 2.1) in summer 2008.

V. STAUTORY AUTHORITY

23-1-108 C.R.S.

23-1-113 C.R.S.

TOPIC: CLAIRIFYING CHANGES TO CCHE POLICY SECTION IV: EXTENDED STUDIES

PREPARED BY: MATT GIANNESCHI/MATT McKEEVER

I. SUMMARY

At the January 2006 meeting the Commission approved major revisions of CCHE Policy Section IV: Extended Studies. Upon implementation of these approved policies, several minor changes were required for clarification purposes.

II. BACKGROUND

In response to the passage of Senate Bill 04-189 (College Opportunity Fund Act), CCHE staff reviewed and revised all Statewide Extended Studies policies and procedures to meet the requirements of that legislation and the resulting performance contracts, which were the impetus for revising the Statewide Extended Studies policies. Clarifying language was required concerning Part B Paragraph 3.04.02: Indirect Cost Recovery, and Part B Paragraph 7.03: COF Stipend Eligibility. These minor changes to the Section IV of CCHE policies are for clarification purposes and do not reflect a change in policy intent.

III. ACTION

The following clarifying changes were made to CCHE Policy Section IV: Extended Studies, Part B Paragraph 3.04.02

3.04.02 Indirect Cost Recovery

Each participating extended studies unit assists in the financial support of Statewide Extended Studies through indirect cost recovery (ICR). The Commission administers ICR funds on behalf of all participating ~~institutions~~ extended studies units in support of Statewide Extended Studies.

3.04.02.01 ICR Amount

The level of ICR will be determined each fiscal year based on estimated expenses of the CCHE Statewide Extended Studies Department. The extended studies unit ICR contribution ~~for each campus~~ is a CCHE administrative expense for all credit and non-credit Extended Studies instruction that will be determined by CCHE annually.

3.04.02.02 Authorized Expenditure of ICR Funds and Financial Control

Except for appropriated overhead and CCHE Statewide Extended Studies administrative expenses, funds obtained from ICR held by CCHE Statewide Extended Studies shall be expended only for activities directly in support of institutions' extended studies units and their programs including:

- Expenses in serving disabled students;

- Program development grants (See Procedural Document G-1 for development grant criteria and procedures);
- Publication of the Colorado Consortium for Independent Study Bulletin;
- Publication of the Resource Directory for Educators;
- Public information to promote Statewide Extended Studies;
- Deans and directors meetings held three times yearly;
- The Statewide Extended Studies Annual Professional Development Conference;
- The Statewide Extended Studies Annual Report;
- Statewide Extended Studies scholarship program; and
- Other allocations as approved by the Advisory Committee.

The following clarification was made to CCHE Policy Section IV: Extended Studies, Part B Paragraph 7.01:

7.01 COF Stipend Eligibility

The College Opportunity Fund was implemented to encourage participation in and increase access to postsecondary activities and to develop an educated workforce that will allow Colorado to compete in the global economy. Approval for off campus programs to collect COF stipends from eligible students will be determined by an internal CCHE committee. When reviewing proposals, the committee will take into consideration the following:

- State of Colorado's workforce development needs;
- Extent that the program is serving underrepresented populations;
- Amount of COF eligible FTE used in the prior fiscal year by the institution's extended studies unit (if any); and,
- Available off-campus COF stipend allocation.

The committee will only approve for funding programs that result in the completion of a degree. Programs approved to collect COF stipends must adhere to all CCHE COF Guideline rules and regulations.

Conditional on available funding, the amount of allocated COF FTE will be not less than the institution's previous year actual COF FTE usage.

STATUTORY AUTHORITY

The Commission is given responsibility to administer any centralized, statewide extension and continuing education program of instruction offered by any state-supported baccalaureate and graduate institution in 23-1-109(4) C.R.S.