
COLORADO COMMISSION ON
 **HIGHER
EDUCATION**

ACCESS TO HIGH-QUALITY, AFFORDABLE EDUCATION FOR ALL COLORADANS

**HIGHER EDUCATION
MASTER PLAN**

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

Members of the Colorado Commission on Higher Education

Judith Altenberg
Raymond T. Baker
Terrance L. Farina
David E. Greenberg
Peggy Lamm, Chair
Preslano Montoya

Ralph J. Nagel
Dean L. Quamme
James M. Stewart
William B. Vollbracht
Judith Weaver

COLORADO COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Master Plan

I. Introduction

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

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

II. Overview of the Colorado Commission on Higher Education

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

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

By statute, CCHE is responsible for the following:

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

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

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

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

III. Trends in Higher Education in Colorado

Higher Education Financing: Tuition and fee revenue has assumed a larger role in the funding mix for Colorado's institutions. Colorado tuition and fee revenues totaled 46 percent of general funds and cash in FY 1987-88. This percentage increased to 50 percent in FY 2001-02. The decreasing reliance on general fund dollars follows a national trend. Nationally, funding of public higher education is increasingly reliant on tuition and other cash revenue sources to meet operational costs.

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

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

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

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

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

The Legislature in the past has supported tuition increases at or slightly under inflation rates for in-state students and slightly above the inflation rate for non-resident students. The non-resident increases provide additional resources for the five higher education

institutions in Colorado who enroll the majority of the non-resident students statewide – Fort Lewis College where 33.8 percent of its total FTE are non-resident students, the University of Colorado at Boulder with 32.3 percent, Western State College with 30.5 percent, Colorado School of Mines with 27.3 percent, and Colorado State University with 20 percent. The remaining institutions are less impacted than these five campuses because non-residents make up a much smaller proportion of their student populations.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

IV. Commission Mission, Goals and Objectives

A. Mission Statement

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

B. Goals and Objectives

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

Goal #1: Improved Access to Higher Education

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

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

The Governor's Opportunity Scholarship Program: Data show the long-term benefits of acquiring a bachelor's degree are great. Yet, students from low-income families do not pursue a postsecondary education. The largest barrier to entry into higher education for these students is financial: they simply are not able to pay for college. Low-income families also do not view student loans as a way of overcoming that barrier. On the other hand, they do view grants and scholarships as incentives but find limited resources at both the federal and state levels. Students from low-income families also face cultural issues as first generation attendees at institutions of higher learning. To increase college participation among low-income students, the Colorado Commission on Higher Education developed a new financial aid program, known as the Governor's Opportunity Scholarship (GOS), in August 1999. The GOS provides assistance to a limited number of low-income students who are able to attend institutions of higher learning at no cost. An important goal of the Governor's Opportunity Scholarship program is to provide assistance for students to not only enroll in an institution of higher education but also to provide counseling so that these students complete their program.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Marketing: Access to Colorado higher education opportunities is crucial to ensuring participation. The Commission believes that it is a partner with institutions in marketing the various opportunities available to Colorado's citizens. Using an array of vehicles such as the ColoradoMentor system, the Commission intends to engage the state's principals, teachers and counselors in a concerted effort to encourage more Colorado high school students to attend college. The Commission believes increasing financial aid opportunities and spreading the message that college is affordable and accessible for Colorado's high school students is central to its mission. The Commission's goal is to move from a participation rate of 38 percent of Colorado high school graduates in higher education to 45 percent of Colorado high school graduates measured annually through 2007.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Rural Education Access Program: The Rural Education Access Program (REAP) was implemented during FY 2001. The program provides financial support to deliver degree completion programs on the campuses of rural community colleges. These programs may be delivered either on-site or electronically. During the implementation year degree completion programs were developed by Adams State College in teacher education and business at Lamar community College, Otero Community College and Trinidad State Junior College. Enrollments in the teacher education programs were strong, but not as robust in business as anticipated.

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

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

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

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

Goal #2: Performance-Based Funding

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

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

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

Raise the Benchmark: The Commission expects to raise the bar/benchmark for performance funding indicators. The performance-funding indicators are as follows:

1. Graduation Rates
2. Freshmen retention and persistence rates
3. Support and success of minority students
4. Scores/passing rates on tests and exams Technical graduates employed – two year schools
5. Institutional support/administrative expenditures per SFTE
6. Undergraduate class size
7. Number of credits required for degree
8. Two Indicators identified by each institution – will not be scored
9. Faculty instructional workload – pending receipt of comparative data

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

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

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

Financial Reporting: The Commission expects to work toward increasing uniformity in higher education institutions' accounting systems to allow better comparisons between institutions, more relevant financial reporting and ways to assess institutional performance. As a follow up to HB1289's NORED study, CCHE created a common accounting practice sub-committee. The sub-committee reviewed current financial reports from the Colorado Financial Reporting System (COFRS), institutional Budget Data Books, governing board budget decision-making data and numerous other financial reports from the institutions. Outcomes from this effort include:

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

Areas that still may need to be addressed include:

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

Goal #3: Quality of Student Learning

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

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

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

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

Goal #4: Higher Education Financing

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

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

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

Graduate Enrollment 1990-2000				Percentage Change		
	89-90	94-95	99-00	90-95	95-00	90-00
Research						
University of Colo-Boulder	1,885	2,005	1,912	6.4 %	-4.6 %	1.4 %
University of Colo-Colorado Springs	645	649	678	0.6 %	4.5 %	5.1 %
University of Colo-Denver	1,978	2,018	2,038	2.0 %	1.0 %	3.0 %
University of Colo-Health Sciences	-	-	-			
Colorado State University-E&G	1,330	1,477	1,242	11.1 %	-15.9 %	-6.6 %
Colorado State University-PVM	-	-	-			
Colorado School of Mines	343	353	328	2.8 %	-7.1 %	-4.5 %
Universities and Colleges						
University of Northern Colorado	1,108	1,106	1,088	-0.2 %	-1.6 %	-1.8 %
						125.8
University of Southern Colorado	43	96	98	121.2 %	2.1 %	%
Adams State College	326	194	263	-40.5 %	35.6 %	-19.3 %
Mesa State College	-	-	18			
Western State College	80	-	-			
BOARD SUMMARY:						
Regents of the University of Colorado	4,508	4,672	4,628	3.6 %	-0.9 %	2.7 %
State Board of Agriculture	1,373	1,573	1,340	14.6 %	-14.8 %	-2.4 %
Trustees of the Colorado School of Mines	343	353	328	2.8 %	-7.1 %	-4.5 %
Board of Trustees Univ. of No. Colorado	1,108	1,106	1,088	-0.2 %	-1.6 %	-1.8 %
Trustees of State Colleges	406	194	281	-52.2 %	44.8 %	-30.7 %
State System	7,738	7,898	7,665	2.1 %	-3.0 %	-0.9 %

<i>Research</i>	6,181	6,502	6,198	5.2 %	-4.7 %	0.3 %
<i>Universities and Colleges</i>	1,557	1,396	1,467	-10.4 %	5.1 %	-5.8 %

Excludes UCHSC and CSU-PVM
CCHE, 3/29/01

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Building decision tree: The Commission seeks to engage institutions in creating a process for determining how facility decisions are made based on academic goals

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

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

Goal #5: Role and Mission Review

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

V. Conclusion

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