



CO L O R A D O

**Colorado Commission on
Higher Education**

Department of Higher Education

CCHE AGENDA

December 5, 2019

**Colorado Department of Higher Education
1600 Broadway, 5th Floor Conference Room
Denver, Colorado**

**COMMISSIONER & ADVISOR LEARNING SESSION
11:30am – 12:30am**

**BUSINESS MEETING
1:00pm – 5:00pm**

**CALL-IN NUMBER: 1-877-820-7831
PARTICIPANT CODE: 128479#**

1600 Broadway, Suite 2200 • Denver, Colorado 80202 • (303) 862.3001

DR. ANGIE PACCIONE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR



Colorado Commission on Higher Education

December 5, 2019

Colorado Department of Higher Education

1600 Broadway, 5th Floor Conference Room

Denver, Colorado

11:30am -12:30pm

COMMISSIONER & ADVISOR LEARNING SESSION

➤ TOPIC: Legislative Agenda and Roadmap to Cost Containment and Affordability

1:00 – 5:00pm

BUSINESS MEETING

I. Opening Business

- A. Attendance
- B. Approval of the Minutes for the October 24, 2019 Commission Meeting
- C. Reports
 - i. Chair
 - ii. Vice Chair
 - iii. Commissioners
 - iv. Commission Standing Committees
 - v. Advisors
- D. Executive Director Report
- E. Public Comment

II. Consent Items

- A. Approval of Remaining Program Plans for Fiscal Year 2020-21 Capital Requests - *Lauren Gilliland*
- B. Recommend Approval of Secondary Science at Colorado Mountain College – *Dr. Brittany Lane*
- C. Approval of Two-Year Cash Funded Capital Program List Amendment - Colorado Mesa University - *Lauren Gilliland*
- D. Approval of 2020 Commission Meeting Dates – *Katrina Smith*
- E. Approval of Bachelor of Applied Science Degree Program in Advanced Paramedic Practice at Arapahoe, Pikes Peak, and Pueblo Community Colleges – *Christina Carrillo*
- F. Approval of Bachelor of Applied Science Degree Program in Secure Software Development at Pueblo Community College – *Dr. Chris Rasmussen*



III. Commission Reports

- A. Annual Resident/Non-Resident report – *Michael Vente, CSU, CU*

IV. Action Items

- A. Degree Authorization Act: Recommendation for Renewal of Probationary Authorization for CollegeAmerica Fort Collins and CollegeAmerica Colorado Springs – *Heather DeLange*
- ~~B. Revision of CCHE Policy I, Part V: Creation of Academic Programs – Process for Review and Approval of Select Baccalaureate Degree Programs at Colorado Community College System Institutions and Local District Colleges – *Dr. Chris Rasmussen*~~

V. Discussion Items

- A. Proposed Revisions to CCHE Policy I, Part T: Student Complaint Policy – *Heather DeLange*
- B. Degree Authorization Act: American Management and Technology School – Voluntary Relinquishment Of Provisional Authorization – *Heather DeLange*
- C. Degree Authorization Act: Recommendation for Provisional Authorization of Calvary University – *Heather DeLange*

Break

- D. Process to Revise CCHE Policy I, Part E: Developmental Education – *Dr. Chris Rasmussen*

VI. Commission Initiatives

- A. Funding Allocation Formula Update – *Jason Schrock, Emily Burns, and Emma Fedorchuk*





**Minutes of the Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) Meeting
At Colorado Department of Higher Education, 1600 Broadway, Suite 2300
October 24, 2019**

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Tom McGimpsey called the business meeting to order at 12:56 pm.

I. PRESENTATION

A. Upcoming Ballot Initiative – Prop CC – *Dan Ritchie, Chancellor Emeritus of the University of Denver*

Chancellor Emeritus Ritchie explained Prop CC and what it would mean to IHE's in Colorado if passed.

II. OPENING BUSINESS

A. Attendance

Chair Tom McGimpsey, Vice Chair Vanecia Kerr, Commissioners Berrick Abramson (by phone), Mary Beth Buescher (by phone), Luis Colon, Cassie Gannett, Sarah Hughes, Charley Olena (by phone), Brittany Stich, Eric Tucker, Steven Trujillo (by phone).

CCHE Advisory Committee members attending: Sen. Tammy Story, Rep. Cathy Kipp, Rep. Julie McCluskie, Wayne Artis, Mark Cavanaugh (by phone), Brad Baca (by phone), Dr. Rick Miranda, Christina Powell (by phone).

B. Minutes

Commissioner Tucker moved to approve the minutes for the Sept. 5, 2019 CCHE Meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Kerr and passed unanimously.



C. Chair, Vice-Chair, Commissioners and Advisors Reports

Chair Report – Chair McGimpsey is working on a meeting with Colorado Tribes and the Department of Indian Affairs to discuss how we can work together. A draft agreement will be sent to commissioners for their review.

Vice Chair Report – Vice Chair Kerr reported on the College Track Breakfast and Fundraiser recently held. There were over 600 people in attendance, which is a 50% increase over last year.

Fiscal Affairs & Audit Committee – Chairman Tucker reported that the committee met on October 18. Discussion included the funding allocation formula, including adding concurrent enrollment to the formula. They also talked about capital expenditures.

Student Success & Academic Affairs Committee – Chairman Gannett reported that the committee met prior to this meeting. She reported the Free Application Day was a huge success. There is a question regarding whether the increased applications were due to students applying to multiple schools or more students applying overall. They are considering having another Free Application Day in the spring. The committee recognized the savings OER programs provide for students.

Commissioner Reports –

1. **Commissioners Stich and Olena** reported on the October 15 visit to Adams State University with Executive Director Paccione and others. They recognized many of the excellent programs at Adams State and said the visit was informative and energizing.
2. **Commissioner Colon** suggested that everyone read the recent article in the Colorado Independent regarding the income sharing scholarship program at Colorado Mountain College.
3. **Commissioner Hughes** presented the Prop CC Resolution developed by the commissioners. After some discussion, Commissioner Hughes moved that adoption of the resolution be moved to an Action Item. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Gannett and passed unanimously.

Advisor Reports-

1. **Advisor Artis** reported that there will be a Faculty-to-Faculty meeting tomorrow (10/25) at CSU Pueblo.
2. **Rep. McCluskie** reported that much work is being done by the Early Childhood Commission on the workforce pipeline for early childhood professionals.

D. Executive Director Report – Dr. Paccione reiterated that Free Application Day was hugely successful. The second year of the event resulted in 44,360 applications



compared to just over 23,000 last year. She thanked the department communications team for all their work on the successful program. My Colorado Journey is a new platform with multi-agency support and grant funding from the Schmidt Foundation. She was in Pueblo yesterday with staff visiting CSU-Pueblo and Pueblo Community College, which are participating in the TIE Grant work on equity and inclusion. Dr. Paccione reported that CSU enrollment is first in the state at over 34,000. CSU is opening a new campus in Rocky Ford. Fort Lewis College received a \$2 million consulting grant. Chancellor Horrell is retiring from UCD and Colorado Mesa announced permanent scholarship funds.

E. Public Comment- There were no requests for public comment.

III. CONSENT ITEMS

- A. Revised Fiscal Year 2020-21 Capital IT Prioritized List – *Lauren Gilliland*
- B. Recommendation of Approval of Amendment to Colorado Mesa University Two-Year Cash Funded Capital Program List – *Lauren Gilliland*
- C. Degree Authorization Act: Recommendation for Authorization of the William Tennent School of Theology as a Religious Training Institution/Seminary – *Heather DeLange*
Approval of Program Plans for Fiscal Year 2020-21 Capital Requests – *Lauren Gilliland*

Commissioner Colon moved to approve consent items A through C. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Tucker and passed unanimously.

IV. ACTION ITEMS

ADDED: Adoption of Prop CC Resolution – Commissioner Sarah Hughes presented the Prop CC Resolution developed by the commissioners. After some discussion, Commissioner Hughes moved that the second “Whereas” clause in the resolution be stricken from the document. Commissioner Colon seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. The resolution is attached to these minutes as part of the record.

The motion to adopt the resolution was made by Commissioner Hughes and seconded by Commissioner Colon and passed unanimously.

- A. Fiscal Year 2020-21 Student Budget Parameters – *Emily Burns and Emma Fedorchuk*. CDHE presented the proposed Student Budget Parameters for the 2020-21 fiscal year. These guidelines are used by financial aid administrators in determining cost of attendance for students at their respective institutions. This Cost of attendance is in turn used to determine the amount of need-based financial aid an eligible student can be awarded.



Commissioner Tucker moved to approve the item and Commissioner Gannett seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

~~**B. Revision of CCHE Policy I, Part V: Creation of Academic Programs—Process for Review and Approval of Select Baccalaureate Degree Programs at Colorado Community College System Institutions and Local District Colleges—Dr. Chris Rasmussen**~~ This agenda item was removed to allow for further review before consideration by the commission.

C. Funding Allocation Formula Revision and November 1 Budget Request – Jason Schrock, Chief Financial Officer; Emily Burns, Senior Finance Analyst; Emma Fedorchuk, Budget and Finance Analyst, CDHE provided an update on the revisions to the funding formula. The presentation was accompanied by the slides presentation entitled, “Funding Allocation Formula Revision and November 1 Budget Request.” They explained that the new proposed formula will need to allocate all state funding to higher education. Given that the new proposed formula that has been developed over the course of the summer and fall had been designed to allocate just new state funding, further evaluation of the formula is necessary to allocate increasing portions of base funding. Additional metrics and components will need to be incorporated into the formula to make it viable. Staff discussed the new timeline for formula development. The goal is for the formula to be finalized in the upcoming legislative session.

Staff also explained the new approach the Governor’s office has taken regarding the revenue sources available to cover core minimum costs for institutions in the annual budget request. Rather than limiting revenue to state funding and resident tuition increases, the Governor’s office is having non-resident graduate tuition, as well as resident and non-resident graduate tuition revenue, be used as revenue sources to cover institutions’ cost increases. Staff explained that the revenue assumptions for the budget request may not be feasible for certain institutions given tuition market conditions.

Staff also discussed the “current law formula,” otherwise known as the 1319 formula. Because the new proposed formula has not yet been established in statute, the 1319 formula is included in the annual budget request for state funding. FY 2020-21 represents the first year in which the guardrails that prevent large volatility in funding amounts are no longer required in statute, which can result in large swings in state support under the formula. Staff also discussed the changes which have been proposed to the 1319 formula, including the re-introduction of an under-represented minority weighting in both COF and performance, as well as the removal of non-resident completions from the



performance metrics. Staff also acknowledged how the 1319 formula can reward volume, which disadvantages small institutions.

Staff discussed the most recent iteration of the proposed formula. The formula was designed to be simple, transparent, and clearly aligned with Master Plan goals. Given that base funding, not just new funding, will now need to be allocated through this formula, staff communicated that additional metrics would need to be developed to allow for a greater degree of stability in the formula allocations.

The Commission discussed the path forward for the formula. Various scenarios and concepts were discussed, including a robust discussion of “base funding amounts.” The Commission discussed how the Department’s current contract with a research and analytics firm can be best utilized to allow better understanding of the concept of base funding. Staff fielded questions from commissioners regarding the relationship between funding amounts allocated through a formula and tuition revenue, as well as broader questions surrounding the purpose and philosophy of the formula. Several commissioners and advisors raised concerns that a high degree of formula volatility could have negative impacts on institutional operations as well as students.

The Commission adopted a resolution on the formula at the end of the discussion. The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas, The Commission is required to provide a funding allocation formula and budget recommendation by November 1, 2019

Whereas, additional time is required by the Commission to finalize such a formula and budget, however, the commission is supportive of principle-based approach consistent with the Master Plan

Now therefore, it is resolved by the Commission that:

- (a) The Commission supports an allocation formula this is consistent with the Master Plan and values completions, equity and graduation rates and improvements in those rates
- (b) That such final formula has predictability and reliability for institutions, families and students and drive affordability

Commissioner Tucker moved that the resolution be adopted. Commissioner Buescher seconded the motion. The Funding Allocation Formula Resolution was adopted by unanimous vote.

- D. CCHE Policy for Educator Loan Forgiveness Program – Mr. Crispin and Ms. Burns** provided a presentation on the new Educator Loan Forgiveness Program, and the working Policy that will guide the program and its materials, such as the Guidelines, Application Packet, FAQs, and other materials. They also provided



information on their plans for the selection process and a general timeline for implementation.

Chair McGimpsey moved that the Policy for the program be adopted. Commissioner Tucker seconded the motion. The Educator Loan Forgiveness Program Policy was adopted by unanimous vote.

V. Commission Initiatives

A. Open Educational Resources (OER) Updates & Review of Annual Report – Spencer Ellis (CDHE), OER Council Chair, Brittany Dudek (CCCS), and Lobna Alsrraj (CDHE) presented to the Commission on the current progress of the CDHE OER initiative. Staff reviewed the current progress of the program through highlighting progress toward goals of building awareness and community around open educational resources and open education practices in Colorado. Staff highlighted the initial cost savings to students (\$3.4 million) and the return on the investment of the state legislature (6 times return) for the Commission. Staff noted current findings from the [2019 Report](#), and talked about the recommendations which include: Building structure, Building Culture and Building Evidence

The Commission prompted staff to continue pursuits and consider further transparency in the data reporting process as well as consideration of furthering the strategic connections and opportunities that could compound and sustain the work beyond the provisions of the bill from 2018. Staff asked the Commission to join in as thought partners considering sustainability as a major point of longevity for the innovation work at the CDHE.

B. Equity Toolkit: for Inclusive Teaching and Learning – Ms. Banker provided a presentation on the the recently published equity toolkit on inclusive teaching and learning. Funded by the Talent, Innovation and Equity Grant (TIE) from Lumina Foundation, CDHE officially launched the toolkit on September 25, 2019. The toolkit is available at <http://masterplan.highered.colorado.gov/equitytoolkit/>. The toolkit is intended first on faculty development in three specific areas and is part of the department's broader goals to support equity in educational attainment for Coloradans.

The project to create the equity toolkit for inclusive teaching and learning was led by Co-Chairs of the TIE Steering Committee, Dr. Brenda Allen, former Vice Chancellor for Diversity and Inclusion at the University of Colorado Denver and the Anschutz Medical Campus, and Quill Phillips, College Equity Officer at Community College of Aurora and CEO of QP Equity and Inclusion Consulting, who curated the inclusive teaching resources available in the toolkit. The full TIE Steering Committee members provided ongoing input and insights into make the toolkit the most relevant resource possible. Additionally, Brandon Bishop, a current Policy Analyst with SHEEO, conducted hours of research on behalf of this project. The Department thanks the



faculty and staff across the state who shared resources and insights with the research team.

Drawing from evidence-based best practices, the equity toolkit is organized in three categories: Engaging in Ongoing Self-Inquiry, Creating and Maintaining a Culturally Relevant Classroom Community, and Designing and Implementing an Inclusive Course.

The presentation was an informational update, so Ms. Banker did not make any recommendations; however, Ms. Banker reiterated that the Department staff should assist the Commission in promotion and awareness of these resources and understand how to continue building this resource beyond the TIE grant to further support Master Plan goals.

Motion to adjourn by Commissioner Tucker, seconded by Commissioner Buescher.
The meeting was adjourned at 4:49 p.m.





CCHE Resolution in Support of Colorado Prop CC

Adopted October 24, 2019

Resolution in Support of Colorado Proposition CC - a voter referendum to change the constitutional limitation on state fiscal year spending to redirect existing tax funding to higher education, K-12 schools, and transportation. If the measure passes, it is estimated that well over \$300 million would be distributed equally among each of these areas over fiscal years 2020 and 2021.

WHEREAS, the people of Colorado have been asked to vote this fall on Proposition CC, to decide whether to allow the State of Colorado, without raising taxes, to retain excess revenue it would otherwise be required by law to refund to Colorado taxpayers under the Tax Payer Bill of Rights (TABOR); and

WHEREAS, despite Colorado's booming economy and population growth, Colorado ranks 43rd in % of Taxable Resources Spent on Education, 41st in per-pupil spending adjusted for regional cost differences, and 48th in the country in funding of post-secondary education; and

WHEREAS, Colorado spends \$2,703 less annually per K-12 student than the national average which is below some of the poorest states in the country like Alabama and Mississippi, and state funding for higher education is 9.2 percent lower than it was in 2008 at the start of the great recession; and

WHEREAS, the Colorado's disinvestment in higher education over the past two decades has shifted the burden to Colorado students and families as the state's share of funding decreased from covering 68% of total costs in 2000 to 33% in 2016, thereby making college out of reach for too many Coloradans; and

WHEREAS, Colorado's K-12 schools and its institutions of higher education must work together to provide a seamless continuum of learning, increase graduation rates, solve the k-12 teacher shortage, increase access to higher education for students of color, and prepare Colorado's students for tomorrow's economy and democracy; and

WHEREAS, Colorado's Commission on Higher Education's goal to achieve 66 percent credential attainment by 2025 as outlined in its masterplan *Colorado Rises: Advancing Education and Talent Development* will be achieved by investing in projects to erase the equity gap, improve student success, increase affordability, and incent innovation; and

WHEREAS, Colorado must invest in the educational attainment of all its citizens to better prepare students for changing workforce demands and to maintain Colorado's high quality of life, its vibrant economy, and its engaged citizenry; and

WHEREAS, a strong system of higher education is essential to a skilled workforce, a strong and growing economy, and global competitiveness for the industries and businesses that are Colorado's backbone; and



WHEREAS, it is our responsibility as a Commission to advocate for Colorado’s campuses, students, faculties, and the advancement of higher education, and the Colorado Fair Campaign Practices Act authorizes the Commission on Higher Education, as a governing body, to formally take a position with respect to an election question by passing a resolution urging citizens to vote for or against the question; and

NOW THEREFORE, the Colorado Commission on Higher Education hereby supports and endorses the passage of Proposition CC to allow the state, without raising taxes, to retain excess revenue it is currently required to refund under existing state law in order to provide additional financial support to public schools, institutions of higher education, and transportation projects.



TOPIC: RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF REMAINING PROGRAM PLANS
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020-21 CAPITAL REQUESTS

PREPARED BY: LAUREN GILLILAND, LEAD FINANCE ANALYST

I. SUMMARY

This action item seeks approval of ten new or revised program plans for capital projects submitted in the Fiscal Year 2020-21 budget cycle, pursuant to C.R.S. 23-1-106(3). In October, staff reviewed all program plans submitted, but found that these ten had deficiencies and needed to be resubmitted by the institutions. The institutions have since remedied those deficiencies. Staff recommends these 10 program plans for approval.

II. BACKGROUND

State law, C.R.S. 23-1-106(3), states that no state-funded capital construction / renewal projects or cash-funded capital construction / renewal projects utilizing the state higher education revenue bond intercept program shall commence except in accordance with an approved facility master plan and program plan. Statute exempts projects with total expenditures of less than \$2 million. CDHE has analyzed all revised and new program plans associated with projects submitted as part of the FY 2020-21 capital request. CCHE must approve these for the projects to commence.

Per CCHE Policy Section III, Part E: Facilities Program Planning, program plans must analyze the amounts, types, and relative locations of space required and/or facility system upgrades or replacement for current and projected program plans and define program and cost elements. All of the following criteria must be met or included in the program plan for plan approval:

- Consistency with role and mission; academic, facility and technology planning goals; state higher education policy;
- Consistency with campus facilities master plan and academic master planning;
- Consistency of space utilization with CCHE guidelines and campus physical master plan space allocations;
- Alternative facilities solutions and life-cycle costs as required by CCHE; and
- Appropriateness of source of funds, cost estimate methods, financing implications for life-cycle of construction as required, operations, and maintenance at projected enrollment increases.

All program plans must include a third-party audit.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

In October, staff reviewed all program plans submitted as well as requests for program plan waivers from institutions to ensure compliance with statute and CCHE policy. Seventeen submissions required new or revised program approval, seven projects with less than \$2 million in

total costs requested a program plan waiver, and four projects with approved programs that are at least three-years-old requested a three-year program plan waiver. Only seven of the seventeen new or revised plans requiring approval were recommended and approved at CCHE's October meeting. Staff found that the remaining 10 program plans had deficiencies and needed to be resubmitted by the institutions. The institutions have since remedied those deficiencies and resubmitted the 10 program plans. Staff recommends these 10 program plans for approval.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Commission take the following action:

Approve the following ten new or revised program plans:

- **University of Colorado - Boulder – Economics Building Renovation**
- **University of Colorado - Boulder – Henderson Building Renovation**
- **University of Colorado - Boulder – Macky Auditorium**
- **Pikes Peak Community College – FREE Complex**
- **University of Colorado - Anschutz – College of Nursing and Student Support Services Renovation**
- **Adams State University – Facilities Services Center Replacement**
- **University of Colorado - Colorado Springs – Renovation of Existing Engineering Building**
- **Adams State University – Central Technology Renovation / Addition**
- **University of Colorado - Denver – Engineering and Physical Sciences Building**
- **Colorado Mesa University – Wingate North Housing**

V. STATUTORY AUTHORITY

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

- (3) The commission shall review and approve facility master plans for all state institutions of higher education on land owned or controlled by the state or an institution and capital construction or capital renewal program plans for projects other than those projects described in subsection (9) of this section. The commission shall forward the approved facility master plans to the office of the state architect. Except for those projects described in subsection (9) of this section, no capital construction or capital renewal shall commence except in accordance with an approved facility master plan and program plan.
- (5) (a) The commission shall approve plans for any capital construction or capital renewal project at any state institution of higher education regardless of the source of funds; except that the

commission need not approve plans for any capital construction or capital renewal project at a local district college or area technical college or for any capital construction or capital renewal project described in subsection (9) of this section.

- (b) The commission may except from the requirements for program and physical planning any project that requires two million dollars or less if the capital construction project is for new construction and funded solely from cash funds held by the institution or the project is funded through the higher education revenue bond intercept program established pursuant to section 23-5-139, or ten million dollars or less if the project is not for new construction and is funded solely from cash funds held by the institution.

TOPIC: RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF SECONDARY SCIENCE AT
COLORADO MOUNTAIN COLLEGE

PREPARED BY: DR. BRITTANY LANE, DIRECTOR OF EDUCATOR PREPARATION

I. SUMMARY

This consent item recommends approval to offer Secondary Science (4.17) at Colorado Mountain College (CMC).

II. BACKGROUND

Pursuant to C.R.S. §23-1-121, the Colorado Commission on Higher Education considers approval of all educator preparation programs at public and private institutions of higher education after receiving an affirmative recommendation from the State Board of Education.

The process for initial approval of new educator preparation programs is as follows:

- The Colorado Department of Higher Education (DHE) reviews an application, through the parameters of the Degree Authorization Act, for operational compliance. If the program meets the requirements, DHE makes a recommendation to the Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) for “provisional authorization.”
- The Colorado Department of Education (CDE) conducts a review of the endorsement program to ensure its content is designed and implemented in a manner that will enable a candidate to meet the requirements for licensure in Colorado (C.R.S. §22-60.5).
- Following that review, CDE makes a recommendation to the State Board of Education (SBOE) for consideration.
- If the SBOE approves the application, the approval is forwarded to DHE.
- Upon receiving an approval from SBOE, DHE reviews the proposed program for the following statutory performance criteria [C.R.S. §23-1-121(2)]:
 - a comprehensive admission system;
 - ongoing advising and screening of candidates; integration of theory and practice in coursework and field-based training;
 - supervised field-based experience; and,
 - assessment of candidates’ subject matter and professional knowledge and ability to apply the professional knowledge base.
 - Comprehensive ongoing candidate and program assessment
- DHE would then forward a recommendation for approval or denial to CCHE for action.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

The Colorado State Board of Education approved the content of CMC’s Secondary Science licensure program at its meeting of March 14, 2019 and CDE staff transmitted its affirmative recommendations to the DHE.

Taken from CMC's new program proposal:

With this proposed Secondary Science Endorsement, CMC aims to address a chronic teacher shortage in Colorado, especially in the rural mountain school districts that the college serves. CMC's Education Program embeds the Culturally and Linguistically Diverse (CLD) endorsement as key to successfully teaching the rapidly diversifying students in our partner school districts.

Department staff has analyzed the proposed programs, according to the statutory performance criteria set forth in C.R.S. §23-1-121(2) and confirmed it meets the statutory performance criteria. The following is summarized from the institution's proposal:

1. **Comprehensive admission system:** CMC has developed admissions criteria that include the following: a successful outreach to underserved populations (e.g., Latina/Latino students represent almost 30% of all students in the program).
2. **Ongoing screening and advising:** CMC student counselors and advisors engage students in outreach activities, provide academic counseling in concert with faculty advisors and the program director, and maintain a variety of mental health programs, disability services, etc. CMC provides free online and face-to-face tutoring, counseling and advising.
3. **Course work and field-based training integrate theory and practice and educates candidates in methodologies, practices and procedures of teaching standards-based education, specifically in teaching the content defined in the Colorado Academic Standards:** Specifically, educator preparation programs are reviewed to ensure that:
 - a) An appropriate mix of general education, content knowledge and professional knowledge exists;
 - b) That teachers understand Teacher Quality Standards (Rule 5.00, *Rules for the Administration of the Educator Licensing Act of 1991, 2016 revision*); that principals understand Principal Quality Standards (Rule 6.00, *Rules for the Administration of the Educator Licensing Act of 1991, 2016 revision*), and Colorado Academic Standards; and
 - c) That educator preparation programs have a commitment to equity and excellence (C.R.S. §22-7-403), that teachers are able to prepare students to actively participate in democracy (C.R.S. §22-7-1002), and to ensure that K-12 students will be post-secondary and workforce ready (C.R.S. §22-7-1008).

This secondary science endorsement is designed as a General Science program, as rural schools may be limited to hiring only one teacher to teach all science classes. Candidates take coursework in physics, chemistry, biology, geology, and astronomy. All science methods courses and education courses include field-based practice.

4. **Candidate skills and content knowledge:** Various key assessments have been developed by the institution to evaluate student success and ability to serve as an educator with novice proficiency (or greater) upon their program completion. These assessments include the following: work samples, video of themselves teaching along with samples of their students' work and a reflection on their professional practice, PRAXIS registration, and panel interview.

Pursuant to Colorado Revised Statutes §23-5-129(6)(b), department staff finds the proposed degree is consistent with the institution's statutory role and mission and meets the educator preparation requirements in §23-1-121, C.R.S. The Colorado Mountain College's Curricular council approved the program at its May 7, 2019 regular meeting.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Commission approve the Secondary Science (4.17) educator preparation program at Colorado Mountain College.

III. STATUTORY AUTHORITY

C.R.S. §23-1-121-Commission directive - approval of educator preparation programs – review

(2) The commission shall adopt policies establishing the requirements for educator preparation programs offered by institutions of higher education. The department shall work in cooperation with the state board of education in developing the requirements for educator preparation programs. At a minimum, the requirements shall ensure that each educator preparation program complies with section 23-1-125, is designed on a performance-based model, and includes:

(a) A comprehensive admission system that includes screening of a candidate's dispositions for the field in which he or she is seeking licensure, consideration of a candidate's academic preparation for entry into his or her desired endorsement area or areas, and preadmission advising for students who are considering becoming candidates. The department shall work in collaboration with the programs to define any dispositions considered to be appropriate for educators.

(b) Ongoing advising and screening of candidates by practicing educators or faculty members;

(c) Course work and field-based training that integrates theory and practice and educates candidates in the methodologies, practices, and procedures of standards-based education, as described in parts 4 and 10 of article 7 of title 22, C.R.S., and specifically in teaching to the state academic standards adopted pursuant to section 22-7-406, C.R.S., or, beginning December 15, 2012, teaching to the state preschool through elementary and secondary education standards adopted pursuant to section 22-7-1005, C.R.S.;

(d) A requirement that, during the course of the preparation program, each teacher candidate in an initial licensure program complete a minimum of eight hundred hours, each principal and administrator candidate complete a minimum of three hundred hours, and each other advanced degree or add-on endorsement candidate complete appropriate supervised field-based experience that relates to predetermined learning standards and includes best practices and national norms related to the candidate's endorsement;

(e) A requirement that each candidate, prior to graduation, must demonstrate the skills required for

licensure, as specified by rule of the state board of education pursuant to section 22-2-109 (3), C.R.S., in the manner specified by rule of the state board;

(f) Comprehensive, ongoing assessment including evaluation of each candidate's subject matter and professional knowledge and ability to demonstrate skill in applying the professional knowledge base.

TOPIC: RECOMMEND APPROVAL TWO-YEAR CASH FUNDED CAPITAL PROGRAM LIST AMENDMENT- COLORADO MESA UNIVERSITY

PREPARED BY: LAUREN GILLILAND, LEAD FINANCE ANALYST

I. SUMMARY

This consent item is to amend the Two-Year Cash Funded Capital Program List for Colorado Mesa University. The list would be amended to reflect the addition of the \$4,435,324 cash funded Track Addition and Future Development project.

II. BACKGROUND

Under state law, C.R.S. 23-1-106, the Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) and the legislative Capital Development Committee (CDC) must approve amendments to the two-year cash funded capital program lists for capital construction projects or acquisition of real property exceeding \$2 million dollars that are exclusively cash funded. Governing boards have the authority to submit new two-year lists and amendments to the CCHE or CDC at any point during the fiscal year; however, projects on the two-year list may not commence until both the CCHE and the CDC approve the list. Any project expected to exceed the originally approved appropriation by fifteen percent or more must submit an amended two-year list item for approval.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

Track Addition and Future Development:

Table 1 displays the cost of the Track Addition and Future Development

Table 1: Two-Year Cash Funded Capital Program, Track Addition and Future Development

FY 2020-21 List	
Cash Funds	\$4,435,324
Federal Funds	\$ -
Total Funds	\$4,435,324

Project Description: Colorado Mesa University (CMU) requests \$4,435,324 in cash spending authority to build a new facility for their track and field teams. CMU currently does not have an NCAA-certified track. The track and field team practice at a local high school and sometimes a local stadium that is inconsistently available. This leads to confusion, lost practice time, and daily travel requirements for students. The team is also not able to host championships.

This project includes a 400 meter, eight lane, all weather, full pour, polyurethane running track surface, including paved “D” zones; a bidirectional long jump runway, take-off board and sand

pit; a bi-directional triple jump runway, take-off board and sand pit; a bi-directional pole vault runway and vault boxes; a steeplechase pit and water jump hurdle; two shot put throwing circles, a discus throwing circle with cage, a throwing circle for hammer throw with cage; a javelin throw runway; and a high jump area. This project also includes a drainage system for track and D-Zone areas; athletic field lighting at Fc levels appropriate for track and field events; an 8' tall, vinyl coated chain link perimeter security fence and track and any support building area; as well as landscape design for the venue including connection to and design of the irrigation system.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Commission approve the amended Two-Year Cash Funded Capital Program List for Colorado Mesa University and forward the list to the Capital Development Committee and Office of State Planning and Budgeting.

V. STATUTORY AUTHORITY

C.R.S. 23-1-106(1) Except as permitted by subsection (9) of this section, it is declared to be the policy of the general assembly not to authorize any activity requiring capital construction or capital renewal for state institutions of higher education unless approved by the commission.

(5) (a) The commission shall approve plans for any capital construction or capital renewal project at any state institution of higher education regardless of the source of funds; except that the commission need not approve plans for any capital construction or capital renewal project at a local district college or area technical college or for any capital construction or capital renewal project described in subsection (9) of this section.

(b) The commission may except from the requirements for program and physical planning any project that requires two million dollars or less if the capital construction project is for new construction and funded solely from cash funds held by the institution or the project is funded through the higher education revenue bond intercept program established pursuant to section 23-5-139, or ten million dollars or less if the project is not for new construction and is funded solely from cash funds held by the institution.

(7)(c)(I)(B) The commission annually shall prepare a unified, two-year report for capital construction projects for new acquisitions of real property or for new construction, described in subsection (10) of this section, estimated to require total project expenditures exceeding two million dollars, coordinated with education plans. The commission shall transmit the report to the office of state planning and budgeting, the governor, the capital development committee, and the joint budget committee, consistent with the executive budget timetable.

(II)(A) The commission shall submit the two-year projections prepared by each state institution of higher education for each two-year period to the office of state planning and budgeting and the capital development committee. The capital development committee shall conduct a hearing in each regular legislative session on the projections and either approve the projections or return the projections to the state institution of higher education for modification. The commission and the

office of state planning and budgeting shall provide the capital development committee with comments concerning each projection.

(B) A state institution of higher education may submit to the staff of the capital development committee, the commission, and the office of state planning and budgeting an amendment to its approved two-year projection. The capital development committee shall conduct a hearing on the amendment within thirty days after submission during a regular legislative session of the general assembly or within forty-five days after submission during any period that the general assembly is not in regular legislative session. The capital development committee shall either approve the projections or return the projections to the state institution of higher education for modification. The commission and the office of state planning and budgeting shall provide the capital development committee with comments concerning each amendment.

(10)(b) For any project subject to subsection (9) of this section, the governing board may enhance the project in an amount not to exceed fifteen percent of the original estimate of the cost of the project without the approval of the commission, the office of state planning and budgeting, the capital development committee, or the joint budget committee so long as the governing board notifies the commission, the office of state planning and budgeting, the capital development committee, and the joint budget committee in writing, explaining how the project has been enhanced and the source of the moneys for the enhancement.

ATTACHMENTS:

ATTACHMENT A: Amended Two-Year Cash Funded Capital Program List – Colorado Mesa University

Form CC-LCF

Two-Year Capital Construction - List of Cash Funded Projects
 FY 2020-21 to FY 2021-22
 Revised 11/19

Prepared By: Laura Glatt

Phone: 970-248-1867

E-Mail: lglatt@coloradomesa.edu

Project Title:		Track Addition and Future Development			
Funding Source		Total Project Cost		Project Type:	New Construction
Cash Funds	CF	\$	4,435,324	Intercept Project:	No
Federal Funds	FF	\$	-	DHE Approved Program Plan:	N/A
Total Funds	TF	\$	4,435,324	List Approval Date (month/year)	
				Project Category:	Auxiliary
				Est. Start Date:	June-19
				Est. Completion Date:	June-20
				Funding Method:	Cash Funds

TOPIC: RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE 2020 COMMISSION MEETING DATES

PREPARED BY: KATRINA SMITH, EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT TO THE COMMISSION

I. SUMMARY

This consent item is to establish a schedule of meeting dates, times and locations for the Colorado Commission on Higher Education for the 2020 calendar year.

II. BACKGROUND

The Colorado Commission on Higher Education meets monthly for regular business meetings, except for January, July and November.

During the months of February through May 2019, the Commission meets on the first Friday of the month in the Denver metro area. During the months of June through December, the Commission meets on the first Thursday of the month except for the October meeting, which is scheduled in conjunction with the timing of the annual budget request. These meetings are held at the DHE offices. The Commission's Annual Retreat is held in either late July or August. All business meetings are scheduled to begin at 1 p.m. with a learning session from 11:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. Teleconference or special meetings may be scheduled during the year based upon need.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

Below is a recommended meeting schedule for the 2020 calendar year.

<u>MONTH</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>
Friday, February 7	1600 Broadway, 5 th Floor Conference Room - <i>Denver</i>
Friday, March 6	1600 Broadway, 5 th Floor Conference Room - <i>Denver</i>
Friday, April 3	1600 Broadway, 5 th Floor Conference Room - <i>Denver</i>
Friday, May 1	1600 Broadway, 5 th Floor Conference Room - <i>Denver</i>
Thursday, June 4	1600 Broadway, 5 th Floor Conference Room - <i>Denver</i>
Annual Retreat, August 6-7	University of Northern Colorado, Greeley
Thursday, September 3	1600 Broadway, 5 th Floor Conference Room - <i>Denver</i>
Thursday, October 22	1600 Broadway, 5 th Floor Conference Room - <i>Denver</i>
Thursday, December 3	1600 Broadway, 5 th Floor Conference Room - <i>Denver</i>

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends the Commission approve the 2020 meeting schedule, as listed above.

V. STATUTORY AUTHORITY

§23-1-102 (6), C.R.S. – *The commission shall meet as often as necessary to carry out its duties as defined in this article.*

TOPIC: RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF BACHELOR OF APPLIED SCIENCE DEGREE IN ADVANCED PARAMEDIC PRACTITIONER AT ARAPAHOE COMMUNITY COLLEGE, PIKES PEAK COMMUNITY COLLEGE, AND PUEBLO COMMUNITY COLLEGE

PREPARED BY: CHRISTINA CARRILLO, ACADEMIC & STUDENT POLICY OFFICER AND ADVOCATE

I. SUMMARY

This consent item recommends approval for Arapahoe Community College (ACC), Pikes Peak Community College (PPCC), and Pueblo Community College (PCC) to offer a Bachelor of Applied Science (B.A.S.) degree in Advanced Paramedic Practitioner.

II. BACKGROUND

Colorado Community College System institutions, as well as Aims Community College, received state authorization to propose Bachelor of Applied Science degrees through Senate Bill 14-004, which allows the State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education (SBCCOE) and the board of Trustees for Aims Community College to seek approval from the Commission for technical, career, and workforce development Bachelor of Applied Science degree programs and specifies the criteria to be used in evaluating said requests. Among other criteria, the boards must demonstrate workforce and student demand for the degree program and cost-effectiveness to the student and to the system.

Community colleges are required to submit proposals for new degree programs to the Department, which are then reviewed by staff relative to the statutory requirements listed elsewhere in this agenda item under “Statutory Authority” (pursuant to C.R.S. §23-1-133. Commission directive - Bachelor of Applied Science degree programs – community colleges – approval). As part of its due diligence, the staff engages the Academic Council as key stakeholders and subject matter experts on matters of academic policy and programs. (The Academic Council is an advisory body and not a decision-making body.) If the proposed degree program meets statutory requirements, it is recommended for approval by the Commission. If the proposed degree program does not meet statutory requirements, staff advises the institution to revise the program and proposal accordingly.

It is helpful to note the difference between the B.A.S. and other types of degrees. The Associate or Bachelor of Arts (A.A. or B.A.) and the Associate or Bachelor of Science (A.S. or B.S.), are grounded in the traditional liberal arts and sciences, with a general education core inclusive of courses in written and oral communication, mathematics, arts and humanities, social and behavioral sciences and natural/physical sciences. Applied degrees, such as the Associate or Bachelor of Applied Science (A.A.S. or B.A.S), are more career and technically oriented and designed to focus on professional preparation for a specific vocation.

Since applied degrees are usually aligned with a specific profession, are based on demonstrated in-demand workforce needs, and feature more applied learning outcomes, their general education component is usually contextualized within the career. As a result, many but not all B.A.S. degrees have received waivers from the Commission allowing the sponsoring institution to create an academic program that does not include the full GT Pathways curriculum.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

The following responses to the Statutory Review Criteria are adapted from the combined proposal from ACC, PCC, and PPCC to the SBCCOE to offer the Bachelor of Applied Science in Advanced Paramedic Practitioner. The SBCCOE approved the proposed degree program at its November 13, 2019 meeting. Pending approval from the Higher Learning Commission, the new degree is scheduled to be offered starting with the Fall 2020 academic term.

Statutory Review Criteria

1. Data demonstrates workforce and student demand for the degree program.

All labor market data combines emergency medical technicians (EMTs) and paramedics in the data with Burning Glass projecting the employment need for both to increase annually at a rate of 32% through 2026. Labor market data currently does not indicate job postings for a bachelor level paramedic; however, looking deeper into the Burning Glass report, it indicates the top 15 specialized skills include patient care, advanced cardiac life support, trauma, patient transportation and transfer and emergency care with projected growth ranging from 8%- 30% in the selected skill categories. In the top 15 skill clusters, emergency and intensive care, along with emergency services, comprise 66% and 17% of the job postings, respectively. The top 15 salary premium skills include vital signs measurement, emergency medicine, emergency vehicle operation and critical care, with projected growths ranges of 9% - 25%.

In Colorado, there have been two recent legislative changes that affect the practice of paramedics. The first is SB 19-052, concerning the expansion of an emergency medical service provider's scope of practice. This bill, which passed in April 2019, extends the practice settings for EMT's and paramedics to any clinical health facility that is licensed or certified by the department of regulatory agencies. This offers a significant expansion of the types of health care settings in which paramedics may practice. The second legislative change is SB 19-242, concerning the creation of an emergency medical service provider license that includes the completion of a four-year bachelor's degree program. This legislation passed in May 2019 and allows certified paramedics that complete a bachelor program in a field related to health sciences or an equivalent field to become licensed in the State of Colorado. Currently, all EMS providers in Colorado are certified, not licensed. With the aging population, increase in drug addiction, and incidents of violence, these trends correspondingly increase the need for qualified emergency service providers with an advanced skill set to handle the psychological and socioeconomic factors in our society. Each college collected surveys from employers, alumni and current students to gather additional data. Each college focused on their regional area for the surveys.

PCC's results of the surveys are summarized below:

- Employers:
 - On a scale of 1-5, with 5 being the highest, employers rated at 3.41 on the need for people with bachelor's degrees in EMS due to the recent Colorado legislature changes
 - 47% state they would prefer to hire a person with a B.A.S. in Paramedic practice, with another 37% as possible

- 53% state a B.A.S. degree would increase their earning potential; another 21% state as possible
- 65% state a B.A.S. degree would be preferred for advancement in their agency; another 15% state as possible
- As far as areas of emphasis based on recent legislative changes, community paramedic received the highest ranking, while the other two (critical care and behavioral health) were close with no significant difference between the two of them.
- Alumni:
 - 26% of alumni went on to pursue a bachelor's degree
 - Of that 26%, 36% went out of state
 - 100% attended an online program
 - 65% are interested in pursuing a B.A.S. in paramedic practice
 - Primary reasons for reservations to a bachelor's degree is that the profession of EMS has a reputation of underpaying and not compensating for advanced degrees.
 - Primary reasons for supporting the B.A.S. in paramedic practice
 - A great way to offer advanced degrees for paramedics, without having to start over
 - Feel this is the future of paramedic practice
 - Would assist in evolving the profession of paramedics to be recognized as a profession and standardized the practice like nursing and other health care professions
 - Would assist in the effort to improve the low wages for paramedics
- Current Students:
 - 66% are interested in pursuing a bachelor's degree in paramedic practice
 - Primary reason listed is for personnel reasons
 - Most have not decided where they would attend to complete their bachelor program
 - Student comments support PCC offering a bachelor's program and would attend PCC if it were offered.

ACC's results of the surveys are summarized below:

- Employers:
 - On a scale of 1-5, with 5 being the highest, employers rated at 3.67 on the need for people with bachelor's degrees in EMS due to the recent Colorado legislature changes
 - 44% stated they would prefer to hire a person with a BAS in Paramedic practice, with another 56% as possible
 - 44% stated a B.A.S. degree would increase their earning potential
 - 78% stated a B.A.S. degree would be preferred for advancement in their agency; another 11% stated as possible
 - As far as areas of emphasis based on recent legislative changes *community paramedic* received the highest ranking, while the other two (critical care and behavioral health) were close with no significant difference between the two of them.
- Alumni:
 - 5% of alumni went on to pursue a bachelor's degree
 - 71% are interested in pursuing a B.A.S. in paramedic practice
 - Of alumni currently enrolled or intending to pursue a bachelor's degree, 10% indicated they would pursue a degree out of state, 25% in state, and 65% were still undecided

- Current Students:
 - 75% indicated they would enroll in a B.A.S. in Paramedicine if offered at ACC and another 20% stated as possible
 - Primary reason listed was for personal reasons
 - Most have not decided where they would attend to complete their bachelor program
 - Student comments supported ACC offering a bachelor's program and would attend ACC if it were offered

PPCC's results of the surveys are summarized below:

- Employers (17 contacted by phone and sent the survey, 3 responded):
 - On a scale of 1-5, with 5 being the highest, employers rated at 1.5 on the need for people with bachelor's degrees in EMS due to the recent Colorado legislature changes
 - 20% state they would prefer to hire a person with a B.A.S. in Paramedic practice, with another 20% as possible
 - 20% state a B.A.S. degree would increase their earning potential; another 20% state as possible
 - 20% state a B.A.S. degree would be preferred for advancement in their agency; 0% state as possible
 - As far as areas of emphasis based on recent legislative changes critical care and behavioral health equally received the highest ranking, while community paramedic was close.
- Working Paramedics:
 - 0% of working paramedics went on to pursue a bachelor's degree
 - 25% are interested in pursuing a B.A.S. in paramedic practice
 - Primary reasons for reservations to a bachelor's degree is that the profession of EMS has a reputation of underpaying and not compensating for advanced degrees.
 - Primary reasons for supporting the B.A.S. in paramedic practice
 - Good start for something that is sorely needed in emergency medicine; standardization.

Although the data appear to suggest that demand for the degree is less than robust, CCCS' advisory committee believes this program is needed. It is proposed that the industry has not quite caught up with the new legislation, and the small sample size certainly makes the data appear worse. A local needs assessment will be conducted again prior to launching the program to ensure that this is, in fact, desired. CCCS would like to move this program ahead at this time based on the advisory committee's recommendation that they are prepared to serve the developing need in Fall 2020.

2. The regional and professional accreditation requirements for the degree program, if applicable, have been met.

This program will require approval by the Higher Learning Commission (HLC). ACC, PPCC and PCC have drafted and will submit the HLC *B.A.S. Degree Request for Degree Approval and Substantive Change Application* upon receiving all appropriate system and State approvals of the program. This process will likely take a minimum of six months and will require a panel review by the HLC. The Committee on Accreditation of Emergency Medical Services Programs (CoAEMSP), through the Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health

Education Programs (CAAHEP), does not require additional accreditation for bachelor level programs. ACC, PPCC and PCC's associate degree program are fully accredited with CoAEMSP, through CAAHEP. Therefore, no additional accreditation is necessary.

3. Providing the degree program within the Colorado Community College System is cost-effective for the students and the Colorado Community College System.

Supporting data:

ACC, PPCC and PCC will offer the B.A.S. in Advanced Paramedic Practitioner program curriculum in an online format, except for one capstone course that will include some clinical hours that the students can complete in their local community. This format will provide convenient access and flexibility for the working paramedic.

ACC specific:

The A.A.S. Paramedic program at ACC requires 66 credits for completion, leaving 54 credit hours remaining to meet the Colorado Department of Higher Education's requirement of 120 credit hours for a baccalaureate degree. The degree completion approach is a cost-effective way for students to obtain a bachelor's degree that will offer them more flexible career options and enhance their employability. Offering the program primarily in an online format will avoid pass-through costs associated with the use and maintenance of physical space and enhance the access and flexibility of post-secondary education for busy paramedic professionals.

ACC's B.A.S. will apply the 66 credits earned at the A.A.S. so that ACC students will only need an additional 54 credits to complete the B.A.S. degree. For students that are from other CCCS programs, ACC will accept their A.A.S. degree in full and award Prior Learning Assessment (PLA) credit, if needed, for verified current paramedic state certification/license that has no restrictions. For students outside of the CCCS, that have a current paramedic state certification/license, ACC will accept 60 credits from their associate degree and award PLA for verified current paramedic state certification/license that has no restrictions. All students will meet the required 30 credits of residency along with 30 credits of general education with a minimum of 15 of the general education credits being guaranteed transfer (GT) pathway.

PPCC specific:

PPCC's B.A.S. will apply the 62 credits earned at the A.A.S. so that PPCC students will only need an additional 58 credits to complete the B.A.S. degree. For students that are from other CCCS programs, PPCC will accept their A.A.S. degree in full and award PLA credit, if needed, for verified current paramedic state certification/license that has no restrictions. For students outside of the CCCS, that have a current paramedic state certification/license, PPCC will accept 60 credits from their associate degree and award PLA for verified current paramedic state certification/license that has no restrictions. All students will meet the required 30 credits of residency along with 30 credits of general education with a minimum of 15 of the general education credits being guaranteed transfer (GT) pathway.

PCC specific:

PCC's B.A.S. will apply the 65 credits earned at the A.A.S. so that PCC students will only need an additional 55 credits to complete the B.A.S. degree. For students that are from other CCCS programs, PCC will accept their A.A.S. degree in full and award PLA credit, if needed, for verified current paramedic state certification/license that has no restrictions. For students outside of the CCCS, that have a current paramedic state certification/license, PCC will accept 60 credits from their associate degree and award PLA for verified current paramedic state certification/license that has no restrictions. All students will meet the required 30 credits of residency along with 30 credits of general education with a minimum of 15 of the general education credits being guaranteed transfer (GT) pathway.

Program budget assumptions:

ACC specific:

Revenue projections are based on the 300 and 400 level emergency medical services courses and the additional general education courses at the 100 and 200 level that are needed to complete the degree. The pathway at ACC requires 11 credits of additional general education courses, 43 credits of B.A.S. EMS and Emergency Service Administration 300 and 400 level courses to reach 120 total for the B.A.S. after accounting for the 66 credit A.A.S. degree.

ACC has initiated some efficiencies in the common skills that industry is requesting in their public service and health bachelor level profession. ACC's B.A.S. in Emergency Service Administration (ESA) includes courses that align with the needs of the B.A.S. in Paramedicine. Courses in leadership, communication and public relations, public health, and research. These four courses have an emergency service administration (ESA) prefix and are part of each of the program's curriculum. This provides cross-discipline discussion, collaboration and learning in each of the courses, promoting teamwork amongst various public service and health providers. This also increases ACC's efficiency in instructor workload and management of class size.

PPCC specific:

PPCC will use a series of 300 and 400 level courses designed for the bachelor level emergency services administration degree in lieu of the 300 and 400 level health professions courses. This provides cross-discipline discussion, collaboration and learning in each of the courses, promoting teamwork amongst various emergency services programs. This also increases PPCC's efficiency in instructor workload and management of class size.

PCC specific:

PCC projects that the B.A.S. will begin to cover program costs in year 3 with a return on investment in year 5.

Revenue projections are based on the 300 and 400 level emergency medical services courses and the additional general education courses at the 100 and 200 level that are

needed to complete the degree. The pathway at PCC requires 10 credits of additional general education courses, 45 credits of B.A.S. EMS and Health Professional (HPR) 300 and 400 level courses to reach 120 total credit hours for the B.A.S.

PCC has initiated some efficiencies in the common skills that industry is requesting in their bachelor level professionals, whether that is in dental hygiene, respiratory therapy, radiologic technology and now paramedic practice. This includes courses in leadership, management, communication in health care, quality assurance in health care, pedagogy in health care and critical review of health care research. These five courses have a general health professions (HPR) prefix and are part of each of the program's curriculum. This provides cross-discipline discussion, collaboration and learning in each of the courses, promoting teamwork amongst various health care providers. This also increases PCC's efficiency in instructor workload and management of class size.

Enrollment:

ACC will accept a cohort of 12 students for year 1 and increase each year incrementally, up to 24 students. The program will accept beyond 24 students as appropriate. Enrollment is estimated on the number of A.A.S. EMS students currently expressing an interest in the B.A.S. degree program.

PPCC will accept up to 25 students for year 1, but actual enrollment is expected to be closer to 10 for the initial year, Enrollment is estimated on the number of A.A.S. EMS students currently expressing an interest in the B.A.S. degree program.

PCC will accept a cohort of 10 students for year 1 and increase each year incrementally, up to 18 students. The program will accept beyond 18 students as appropriate. Enrollment is estimated on the number of A.A.S. EMS students currently expressing an interest in the B.A.S. degree program.

Personnel:

ACC's current Emergency Medical Services Program Chair will dedicate 30 percent of his time to the oversight of the B.A.S. EMS courses at the Littleton campus. Additional part-time instructors will be hired to cover some of the instructional hours in the A.A.S. program, to allow the current full-time master's degree prepared faculty to teach in the B.A.S. along with recruiting part-time instructors to teach in the B.A.S. program. PPCC's current Emergency Medical Services Program Chair will dedicate 30 percent of her time to the oversight of the B.A.S. EMS courses at the Colorado Springs campus. Additional part-time instructors will be hired to cover some of the instructional hours in the A.A.S. program, to allow the current full-time Master prepared faculty to teach in the B.A.S. along with recruiting part-time instructors to teach in the B.A.S. program.

PCC's current Emergency Medical Services Program Chair will dedicate 30 percent of her time to the oversight of the B.A.S. EMS courses at the Pueblo campus. Additional part-time instructors will be hired to cover some of the instructional hours in the A.A.S. program, to allow the current full-time Master prepared faculty to teach in the B.A.S. along with recruiting part-time instructors to teach in the B.A.S. program.

Non-Instructional Operating Expenses:

All services integral to the success of students are represented in the direct line-item cost in the budget. These include academic advising, library services, tutoring, and general business and human resources services necessary for supporting students, faculty, and staff. Marketing of the program is included in the operating line item in the budget. No additional labs or equipment will be necessary.

See the following tables that represent costs:

- Table 1 for budget/financial analysis (ACC)
- Table 2 for budget/financial analysis (PPCC)
- Table 3 for budget/financial analysis (PCC)
- Table 4 for tuition/cost comparison

Table 1: ACC Program Budget/Financial Analysis for BAS in Advanced Paramedic Practitioner

CCCS NEW Program Financial Analysis							
<i>BAS Advance Paramedic Practice</i>							
Analysis Summary							
	Five Year	Year 0	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
	Totals	FY20	FY21	FY22	FY23	FY24	FY25
<i>Student Full Time Equivalents (SFTE) ¹</i>	138.6		10.8	22.5	27.0	35.1	43.2
Revenues							
Resident Tuition			49,208	105,593	130,513	174,757	221,538
Non-Resident Tuition ²							
Tuition Differential			108,910	233,702	288,856	386,778	490,315
Adjusted COF/FFS			29,545	61,552	73,863	96,022	118,180
Gaming			2,774	5,779	6,935	9,015	11,096
Fees: High Cost			1,709	4,015	4,914	6,492	8,131
Fees: Program			-	-	-	-	-
Grants		-	-	-	-	-	-
Miscellaneous Revenue		-	-	-	-	-	-
Estimated Total Revenues	2,630,192	0	192,146	410,641	505,080	673,064	849,261
Expenses							
Admin Salaries		30,795	31,719	32,670	33,651	34,660	35,700
Admin Benefits		10,871	11,355	11,859	12,552	12,928	13,316
Faculty Salaries		43,200	44,496	45,831	47,206	48,622	50,081
Faculty Benefits		15,898	16,597	17,324	18,080	18,622	19,181
Adjunct Wages		-	12,746	29,758	30,651	45,499	46,864
Adjunct Benefits		-	3,148	7,499	7,877	11,693	12,044
Classified Salaries		13,950	14,369	14,800	15,244	15,701	16,172
Classified Benefits		6,026	6,279	6,541	6,814	7,018	7,229
Hourly Wages		-	-	-	-	-	-
Hourly Benefits		-	-	-	-	-	-
Operating		5,000	5,500	6,050	6,655	7,321	8,053
Travel		5,000	5,250	5,513	5,788	6,078	6,381
Capital		-	-	-	-	-	-
Grant Expenses		-	-	-	-	-	-
Estimated Total Expenses	1,067,722	130,740	151,459	177,846	184,517	208,141	215,020
Estimated Net Operating Income (DE Only)	1,562,470	-130,740	40,687	232,796	320,564	464,922	634,241
Estimated Net Operating Income (DE & 50% IDC)	1,028,609	-196,109	-35,042	143,873	228,305	360,852	526,731
Cumulative Return on Investment		-196,109	-231,152	-87,279	141,026	501,878	1,028,609

1. This analysis is a pro forma financial statement, not an approved budget. 2. This analysis should be reviewed by division leadership (Budget assistance available upon request) during the budget development process and revised with appropriate amounts within the context of the campus budget request. 3. Budget Services provides this financial analysis based on the program structure/anticipated enrollment inputs provided by the instructional team. We have not evaluated the enrollment assumptions. 4. Assumption is that all tuition is resident; please work with Budget Services if this is not the case.

Table 2: PPCC Program Budget/Financial Analysis for BAS in Advanced Paramedic Practitioner

Pikes Peak Community College Program Financial Analysis							
BAS Paramedicine Program							
Analysis Summary							
	Five Year	Year 0	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
	Totals	FY20	FY21	FY22	FY23	FY24	FY25
<i>Student Full Time Equivalents</i>	42.9		4.2	7.0	9.3	11.2	11.2
Revenues							
Resident Tuition			40,939.10	70,278.79	96,516.21	119,294.03	122,872.85
Non-Resident Tuition							
Tuition Differential			-	-	-	-	-
Adjusted COF/FFS			11,531.52	19,219.20	25,625.60	30,750.72	30,750.72
Gaming			1,059.66	1,766.10	2,354.80	2,825.76	2,825.76
Fees: High Cost			1,574.37	1,605.86	2,183.97	2,673.17	2,726.64
Fees: Program			-	-	-	-	-
Grants			-	-	-	-	-
Miscellaneous Revenue			-	-	-	-	-
Estimated Total Revenues	589,374.82	\$ -	\$ 55,104.65	\$ 92,869.95	\$ 126,680.57	\$ 155,543.68	\$ 159,175.97
Expenses							
Admin Salaries		-	-	-	-	-	-
Admin Benefits		-	-	-	-	-	-
Faculty Salaries	26,400.00	54,384.00	56,015.52	57,695.99	59,426.87	61,209.67	
Faculty Benefits	9,094.80	19,007.21	19,857.50	20,741.71	21,661.09	22,616.97	
Adjunct Wages	-	30,000.00	30,900.00	31,827.00	32,781.81	33,765.26	
Adjunct Benefits	-	6,555.00	6,751.65	6,954.20	7,162.83	7,377.71	
Classified Salaries	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Classified Benefits	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Hourly Wages	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Hourly Benefits	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Operating	-	10,000.00	5,000.00	5,000.00	5,000.00	5,000.00	
Travel	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Capital	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Grant Expenses	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Estimated Total Direct Expenses (DE)	652,187	\$ 35,494.80	\$ 119,946.21	\$ 118,524.67	\$ 122,218.89	\$ 126,032.59	\$ 129,969.62
Estimated Net Operating Income	-62,812	\$(35,494.80)	\$(64,841.56)	\$(25,654.72)	\$ 4,461.68	\$ 29,511.09	\$ 29,206.35
Estimated Net Operating Income (DE & 30% IDC)	-258,468	\$(46,143.24)	#####	\$(61,212.13)	\$(32,203.99)	\$(8,298.69)	\$(9,784.54)
Cumulative Return on Investment		\$(46,143.24)	#####	#####	#####	#####	#####

Table 3: PCC Program Budget/Financial Analysis for BAS in Advanced Paramedic Practitioner

Pueblo Community College Program Financial Analysis							
BAS EMS Program							
Analysis Summary							
	Five Year	Year 0	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
	Totals	FY19	FY20	FY21	FY22	FY23	FY24
(SFTE) ¹	106.7		9.3	19.3	23.9	25.7	28.5
Revenues							
Resident Tuition			71,671.00	167,539.34	213,447.93	238,465.21	269,819.07
Non-Resident Tuition ²							
Tuition Differential			-	-	-	-	-
Adjusted COF/FFS			25,920.00	66,096.00	81,648.00	89,424.00	97,200.00
Gaming			-	-	-	-	-
Fees: High Cost			1,350.00	3,511.35	4,424.30	4,942.58	5,479.81
Fees: Program			-	-	-	-	-
Grants			-	-	-	-	-
Miscellaneous Revenue			-	-	-	-	-
Estimated Total Revenues	1,340,938.59	\$ -	\$ 98,941.00	\$237,146.69	\$299,520.24	\$332,831.79	\$372,498.88
Expenses							
Admin Salaries		16,948.00	39,353.00	40,336.83	41,345.25	42,378.88	43,438.35
Admin Benefits		5,745.37	13,340.67	13,674.18	14,016.04	14,366.44	14,725.60
Faculty Salaries		-	-	56,000.00	57,400.00	58,835.00	60,305.88
Faculty Benefits		-	-	19,824.00	20,319.60	20,827.59	21,348.28
Adjunct Wages		-	20,776.00	18,550.00	19,013.75	19,489.09	19,976.32
Adjunct Benefits		-	4,387.75	3,917.64	4,015.58	4,115.97	4,218.87
Classified Salaries		-	3,740.00	3,833.50	3,929.34	4,027.57	4,128.26
Classified Benefits		-	1,544.62	1,583.24	1,622.82	1,663.39	1,704.97
Hourly Wages		-	-	-	-	-	-
Hourly Benefits		-	-	-	-	-	-
Operating		1,000.00	10,000.00	10,300.00	10,609.00	10,927.27	11,255.09
Travel		-	-	-	-	-	-
Capital		-	-	-	-	-	-
Grant Expenses		-	-	-	-	-	-
Estimated Total Expenses	814,859	\$ 23,693.37	\$ 93,142.04	\$168,019.38	\$172,271.37	\$176,631.20	\$181,101.61
Estimated Net Operating Income	526,080	\$(23,693.37)	\$ 5,798.96	\$ 69,127.30	\$127,248.87	\$156,200.59	\$191,397.27
Estimated Net Operating Income (DE & 30% IDC)	281,622	\$(30,801.38)	\$(22,143.65)	\$ 18,721.49	\$ 75,567.46	\$103,211.23	\$137,066.79
Cumulative Return on Investment		\$(30,801.38)	\$(52,945.04)	\$(34,223.55)	\$ 41,343.91	\$144,555.15	\$281,621.93

1. Budget Services provides this financial analysis based on the program structure/anticipated enrollment inputs provided by the instructional team. We have not evaluated the enrollment assumptions. 2. Assumption is that all tuition is resident; please work with Budget Services if this is not the case.

Table 4:
Tuition/Cost Comparison

Finding comparison colleges that offer a degree completion in paramedic practice was difficult. The National Associate of Emergency Medical Technicians (NAEMT) website lists twenty-one EMS degree programs. Only four were paramedic practice degree completion programs; the remaining were health care administration, not degree completion programs, or discontinued. The only neighboring state with a bachelor's completion degree in paramedic practice is New Mexico. The University of New Mexico and Eastern Kentucky University are shown in comparison below since they have the most similar programs. All institutions researched refer to their bachelor's degrees as Bachelor of Science rather than a Bachelor of Applied Science.

The other 2 paramedic practice degrees listed on NAEMT's website were the University of Texas Health at San Antonio (UT San Antonio) and Central Washington University (CWU). UT San Antonio students must complete all general education credits (42 credits) at a different institution prior to transfer, 6 of those credits must be taken at a Texas University as they are required to complete 6 credits of Texas history. CWU requires 180 credits for completion of their bachelor's degrees.

	CCCS Colleges (ACC, PPCC, PCC)			University of New Mexico (UNM)			Eastern Kentucky University (EKU)		
	Credits	Rate	Total	Credits	Rate	Total	Credits	Rate	Total
General education courses and electives	10	\$196 ^{5,6}	\$1,960	30 ¹	\$563 ²	\$16,890	59 ¹	\$409 ³	\$24,131
EMS/HPR BAS courses	45	\$315 ^{3,6}	\$14,175	33	\$563 ²	\$18,579	21	\$409 ³	\$8,589
Total cost for BAS only	\$16,135			\$35,469			\$32,720		
Number of credits from the AAS	65; includes the courses for the paramedic certificate			22 general education credits			22 general education credits		
PLA ⁴				47			18		
Total credits	120			132			120		

¹Assumption that the transfer institutions will accept 22/25 of PCC's general education courses, the additional credits were then based on each institution's general education requirements.

²Tuition calculated at University of New Mexico's Western University Exchange (WUE) rate of 150% of resident tuition.

³PCC & ECU have one rate for online courses.

⁴PLA (Prior Learning Assessment) is for the paramedic certificate that is currently active.

⁵If PCC general education courses were taken online it would be an additional \$82 per credit for a total additional of \$492.

⁶PCC tuition calculated at student cost who is COF eligible. If student is not COF eligible, an additional \$94 per credit would be charged.

4. The degree program is sufficiently distinguishable from:

- a) an existing degree program at a state four-year institution of higher education that is provided to a student who resides in the community college's geographic service area, as defined by the Commission pursuant to Section 23-1-109 (2), without the student having to change his or her residence, or**
- b) a degree program that has been successfully offered previously in conjunction with a state four-year institution of higher education, which degree program will be reinstated sooner than the degree program could be offered by the community college.**

The program's Burning Glass feasibility, along with data gathered from NAEMT, indicates that there are no four-year Advance Paramedic Practitioner programs in Colorado. The only neighboring state with a similar degree is New Mexico; all other neighboring states offer a degree in emergency services administration. CCCS currently offers a B.A.S. in Emergency Service Administration (ESA). The Advance Paramedic Practitioner B.A.S. is differentiated from the Emergency Service Administration (ESA) CCCS B.A.S. degree as the ESA degree is focused on administration, management, and leadership in unpredictable and catastrophic situations. The B.A.S. in Advanced Paramedic Practitioner will be a clinical/practitioner degree that includes the following key elements in advanced paramedic practice: community paramedic, critical care paramedic and behavioral health paramedic practice. Other key courses that will complement the paramedic practice curriculum are leadership, teaching, research, communication and quality improvement in health care.

With the addition of ACC, PPCC and PCC's B.A.S. in Advanced Paramedic Practitioner, the three CCCS colleges will be the only colleges in Colorado that offer an EMS bachelor level degree at the clinical/practitioner level.

5. The degree program could not be provided through a statewide transfer agreement pursuant to Section 23-1-108 (7) with an accredited state four-year institution in the community college's geographic service area or with an accredited state four-year institution of higher education that has a statewide service area, as defined by the Commission pursuant to Section 23-1-109 (2), that will deliver an existing Bachelor of Applied Science program in the community college's service area sooner than the degree program could be offered by the community college.

Colorado does not have any four-year institutions that offer a B.A.S. Advanced Paramedic Practitioner degree. ACC, PPCC and PCC are unable to pursue a transfer agreement within the state of Colorado in Advanced Paramedic Practitioner.

6. The Best Interests of the State:

In determining whether to approve a Bachelor of Applied Science degree program, the commission shall consider whether the state board has met the criteria set forth above and whether the proposed Bachelor of Applied Science degree program is in the best interests of the state of Colorado. Department staff conclude the criteria above have been sufficiently

met, and concur that the proposed degree is in the best interests of the state of Colorado.

ACC specific:

ACC has discussed the need for a B.A.S. in Advanced Paramedic Practitioner at multiple advisory board meetings and has heard outside of these meetings from industry partners. With the recent legislative changes and the direction the EMS field is moving, there is an anticipated need for advanced patient care skills of the paramedic in the fields of community paramedic, critical care paramedic and behavioral health paramedic to assist in meeting the ever changing health needs of society.

PPCC specific:

PPCC has discussed the B.A.S. at recent advisory committee meetings and will discuss it again at an upcoming meeting later this month. PPCC has continued support from the community for the degree that is strengthened by the legislation that was passed in the 2019 Regulation Session, SB19-242, which allows emergency medical service providers to obtain a licensure with a bachelor's degree from a related field. The Advanced Paramedic Practitioner will allow paramedics a pathway to licensure by being the only paramedic bachelor's degree in Colorado.

PCC specific:

PCC has discussed the need for a B.A.S. in Advanced Paramedic Practitioner at multiple advisory board meetings and has also heard outside of these meetings from industry partners. With the recent legislative changes and the direction the EMS field is moving, there is an anticipated need for advanced patient care skills of the paramedic in the fields of community paramedic, critical care paramedic and behavioral health paramedic to assist in meeting the ever-changing health needs of society.

With the State of Colorado now regulating paramedics with bachelor's degrees at the licensure level, ACC, PPCC and PCC are proactively collaborating to meet the anticipated need of paramedics advancing their profession to the licensure level.

7. Anticipated System-wide Effects:

In determining whether to approve a bachelor of applied science degree program, the commission may also consult with any state four-year institution of higher education that shares the same geographic service area concerning the proposed degree program to inform the commission of any anticipated system-wide effects of the new degree program. Since every four-year institution's geographic service area is the entire state (per [Commission Policy I, N](#)), every four-year institution was consulted.

As indicated earlier, Colorado does not have any four-year institutions that offer a bachelor's degree in Advanced Paramedic Practitioner. As per a process developed by Department staff in February 2018, the ACC, PPCC, and PCC combined proposal was sent to representatives

of all public four-year institutions in Colorado with a 30-day period to submit any comments or concerns. Three responses were received—two of which were affirmative and one which suggested potential overlap of programs. The latter suggested that the proposed program was duplicative of allied health bachelor's degree completion programs at Colorado State University-Pueblo and at the University of Colorado-Colorado Springs. In response to this concern, representatives of ACC, PCC, and PPCC provided the following:

The baccalaureate degree at UCCS focuses on leadership and preparing students to advance to another health career such as physician's assistant. The program at CSU-Pueblo is a degree in General Health Science with a focus on pre-athletic training, pre-nursing and public health. The proposed BAS in Advanced Paramedic Practitioner is a degree that focuses on providing a pathway for EMS professionals to advance in their chosen career field. The BAS degree is a clinical degree that will give paramedics advanced training in scope of practice, and open arenas of work as community paramedics, critical care paramedics and in the behavioral patient care arena.

In addition, one institution expressed concern about the need for bachelor's level training for individuals working as paramedics. The staff asked representatives of ACC, PCC, and PPCC to respond to the question "what practical advantage would accrue to paramedics with a bachelor's degree that are not available to individuals with associate degrees, and how would this represent a net positive return on investment for bachelor's degree completers?" In response to this concern, the institutions provided the following:

Beyond the paramedic state certification to practice, there are two advanced practice endorsements in the Colorado EMS scope of practice rule. Chapter two of 'Rules Pertaining to EMS Practice and Medical Director Oversight' lays out the requirements for those endorsements, Critical Care Paramedic and Community Paramedic. The Critical Care endorsement opens employment opportunities for paramedics in hospitals and in inter-facility transport, both ground transport and flight. Community paramedicine is a relatively new addition to the EMS arena. With a community paramedic endorsement, a paramedic can provide care in non-emergency settings in a patient's home with a goal of connecting that patient to the resources that can meet their needs. Many fire departments and EMS agencies in the state are starting Community paramedic programs to reduce the load on the 911 system. These two endorsements require additional education beyond the paramedic education and certification along with passing additional certifying national exams. Both of these areas of advanced education and endorsements are included in the proposed BAS.

In addition, many employers are interested in hiring Bachelor's prepared employees preferentially over those with only a state certification to practice. In the PCC survey of employers 50% of employers said they would hire a paramedic with a BAS preferentially. 77% said a paramedic with a BAS would be preferred for advancement. The CCCS colleges are paving the way for paramedics that would like to advance their education in the clinical practice of paramedic medicine to gain additional training and take advantage of the two recent legislative changes.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Commission approve the Bachelor of Applied Science degree in Advanced Paramedic Practitioner at Arapahoe Community College, Pikes Peak Community College, and Pueblo Community College.

V. STATUTORY AUTHORITY

C.R.S. §23-1-125

Commission directive - student bill of rights - degree requirements - implementation of core courses - competency test - prior learning

(1)(a) Students should be able to complete their associate of arts and associate of science degree programs in no more than sixty credit hours or their baccalaureate programs in no more than one hundred twenty credit hours unless there are additional degree requirements recognized by the commission;

(3) Core courses. The department, in consultation with each Colorado public institution of higher education, is directed to outline a plan to implement a core course concept that defines the general education course guidelines for all public institutions of higher education... Individual institutions of higher education shall conform their own core course requirements with the guidelines developed by the department and shall identify the specific courses that meet the general education course guidelines. Any such guidelines developed by the department shall be submitted to the commission for its approval. In creating and adopting the guidelines, the department and the commission, in collaboration with the public institutions of higher education, may make allowances for baccalaureate programs that have additional degree requirements recognized by the commission;

C.R.S. §23-1-133

Commission directive - Bachelor of Applied Science degree programs - community colleges – approval

(1) (a) The state board for community colleges and occupational education, referred to in this section as the "state board", shall submit to the commission for its approval technical, career, and workforce development Bachelor of Applied Science degree programs to be offered at one or more community colleges within the state system. The commission shall consider the following criteria in determining whether to approve a bachelor of applied science degree program:

(I) Whether the state board provides data demonstrating workforce and student demand for the degree program;

(II) The regional and professional accreditation requirements for the degree program, if applicable, and whether the college can satisfy those requirements, as appropriate, at both the institutional and program levels;

(III) Whether the state board can demonstrate that providing the degree program within the

community college system is cost-effective for the student and the community college system;

(IV) Whether the state board can demonstrate that the degree program is sufficiently distinguishable from:

(A) An existing degree program at a state four-year institution of higher education that is provided to a student who resides in the community college's geographic service area, as defined by the commission pursuant to section 23-1-109 (2), without the student having to change his or her residence; or

(B) A degree program that has been successfully offered previously in conjunction with a state four-year institution of higher education, which degree program will be reinstated sooner than the degree program could be offered by the community college; and

(V) Whether the bachelor of applied science degree program could be provided through a statewide transfer agreement pursuant to section 23-1-108 (7) with an accredited state four-year institution in the community college's geographic service area or with an accredited state four-year institution of higher education that has a statewide service area, as defined by the commission pursuant to section 23-1-109 (2), that will deliver an existing bachelor of applied science program in the community college's geographic service area sooner than the degree program could be offered by the community college.

(b) In addition, in determining whether to approve a Bachelor of Applied Science degree program, the commission:

(I) Shall consider whether the state board has met the criteria set forth in subparagraphs (I) to (IV) of paragraph (a) of this subsection (1) and whether the proposed bachelor of applied science degree program is in the best interests of the state of Colorado;

(II) Shall consult with the state board and state four-year institutions of higher education concerning whether the collaboration described in subparagraph (V) of paragraph (a) of this subsection (1) is feasible; and

(III) May consult with any state four-year institution of higher education that shares the same geographic service area, as defined by the commission pursuant to section 23-1-109 (2), concerning the proposed degree program to inform the commission of any anticipated system-wide effects of the new degree program.

TOPIC: RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF BACHELOR OF APPLIED SCIENCE
DEGREE IN SECURE SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT AT PUEBLO
COMMUNITY COLLEGE

PREPARED BY: DR. CHRIS RASMUSSEN, DIRECTOR OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

I. SUMMARY

This consent item recommends approval for Pueblo Community College (PCC) to offer a Bachelor of Applied Science (B.A.S.) degree in Secure Software Development.

II. BACKGROUND

Colorado Community College System institutions, as well as Aims Community College, received state authorization to propose Bachelor of Applied Science degrees through Senate Bill 14-004, which allows the State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education (SBCCOE) and the board of Trustees for Aims Community College to seek approval from the Commission for technical, career, and workforce development Bachelor of Applied Science degree programs and specifies the criteria to be used in evaluating said requests. Among other criteria, the boards must demonstrate workforce and student demand for the degree program and cost-effectiveness to the student and to the system.

Community colleges are required to submit proposals for new degree programs to the Department, which are then reviewed by staff relative to the statutory requirements listed elsewhere in this agenda item under “Statutory Authority” (pursuant to C.R.S. §23-1-133. Commission directive - Bachelor of Applied Science degree programs – community colleges – approval). As part of its due diligence, the staff engages the Academic Council as key stakeholders and subject matter experts on matters of academic policy and programs. (The Academic Council is an advisory body and not a decision-making body.) If the proposed degree program meets statutory requirements, it is recommended for approval by the Commission. If the proposed degree program does not meet statutory requirements, staff advises the institution to revise the program and proposal accordingly.

It is helpful to note the difference between the B.A.S. and other types of degrees. The Associate or Bachelor of Arts (A.A. or B.A.) and the Associate or Bachelor of Science (A.S. or B.S.), are grounded in the traditional liberal arts and sciences, with a general education core inclusive of courses in written and oral communication, mathematics, arts and humanities, social and behavioral sciences and natural/physical sciences. Applied degrees, such as the Associate or Bachelor of Applied Science (A.A.S. or B.A.S), are more career and technically oriented and designed to focus on professional preparation for a specific vocation.

Since applied degrees are usually aligned with a specific profession, are based on demonstrated in-demand workforce needs, and feature more applied learning outcomes, their general education component is usually contextualized within the career. As a result, many but not all B.A.S. degrees have received waivers from the Commission allowing the sponsoring institution to create an academic program that does not include the full GT Pathways curriculum.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

The following responses to the Statutory Review Criteria are adapted from PPC's proposal to the SBCCOE to offer the Bachelor of Applied Science in Secure Software Development. The SBCCOE approved the proposed degree program at its November 13, 2019 meeting. Pending approval from the Higher Learning Commission, the new degree is scheduled to be offered at PCC starting Fall 2020.

Statutory Review Criteria

1. Data demonstrates workforce and student demand for the degree program.

- **Competitive Landscape:** Two third-party feasibility reports showed no competitors in PCC's service area to include the following counties: Pueblo, Fremont, Custer, La Plata, Dolores, Montezuma, Archuleta and San Juan.
- **Employment Potential:** The Burning Glass report for select counties in southern Colorado indicates the relative growth rate is high with 3,523 postings for the 12-month period from 4/1/2018 to 3/31/2019 for secure software development related jobs. State-wide there were 32,051 job postings in the same 12 months. The need for qualified secure software developers in Colorado and the Southern Colorado region is clear and great, and the output of graduates is comparatively low. Nationally, Colorado is in the top tier for both demand and pay for this skill set. Furthermore, the employment prospects are only going to rise. According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, the job outlook for software developers will increase 24% from 2016-2026, which is an increase of 302,000 jobs. The median pay is \$105,590.
- **Student Demand:** During the fall of 2019, 52 student surveys were gathered from approximately 200 that were distributed to currently enrolled students and past graduates, equivalent to a 26% response rate. The survey results demonstrated demand for the program. For the question of interest in obtaining a degree in Secure Software Development from PCC, 46 (88%) responded with a yes.
 - Dr. Erjavec, PCC president, was approached by a group of students who signed a petition of interest in the degree being offered at Pueblo Community College.
 - A program feasibility study was performed by Interact Communications, Inc. The feasibility study found that graduates of the proposed program are and will be in demand by relevant businesses and industries in the Denver Metro area, the rest of Colorado, and elsewhere. Of the firms studied, 68% are currently hiring employees with Software Development training. These firms additionally provided that their estimate of need for new employees with Software Development training in the future were at; 35% High Expectations, 29% Some expectations, and 19% Slight Expectations. Sixty-five percent of the respondents stated that educational level expected for secure software development is a bachelor's degree.
- **Environmental Scan:** Pueblo Community College has provided the Interact Communications program feasibility study that included both an environmental scan of state and federal data along with in-depth interviews with 31 potential employers in Colorado. This document was prepared for the Red Rocks Community College BAS and shared with PCC.

- The study concluded that the proposed BAS in Secure Software Development has few competitors from Colorado 4-year higher education institutions.
- The executive summary of the environmental scan stated that “the situation for jobs in computer related fields in general in Colorado appears to be both strong now, and very promising for future growth”.
- Additionally, Burning Glass Technologies provided further data with the following key points:
 - PCC has 17% of the Colorado market share of all colleges who offer associates degrees in CIS. Additionally, the percentage of CIS degrees awarded compared to the total enrollment is three times greater at PCC than the 2 larger institutions in the market share report.
 - Between 2013-2017 PCC increased CIS awards by 50%.
- The summary of findings indicated a current and growing market for BAS Secure Software Development graduates and stated, “it does appear that the program is feasible as proposed, and that graduates of the proposed program are and will be in demand by relevant businesses and industries in the Denver Metro area, the rest of Colorado, and elsewhere.”

2. The regional and professional accreditation requirements for the degree program, if applicable, have been met.

- This program will require approval by The Higher Learning Commission (HLC). Once approvals are received from the SBCCOE and the Colorado Commission on Higher Education, the BAS Degree Request will be forwarded to the HLC for its review. This process will likely take a minimum of six months and will require a panel review by HLC.

3. Providing the degree program within the Colorado Community College System is cost-effective for the students and the Colorado Community College System.

Supporting Data

- PCC will offer the BAS in Secure Software Development curriculum in a hybrid format to allow for improved access and flexibility for students. The AAS Software Development program at PCC requires 60 credits for completion, leaving 60 credit hours remaining to meet the Colorado Department of Education’s requirement of 120 credit hours for a baccalaureate degree. The degree completion approach is a cost-effective way for students to obtain a degree that will offer them more flexible career options and enhance their employability.
- PCC expects that the BAS program will reach a break-even point within 3 years with a return on investment in year 4. Please see the program budget description below for the key assumptions that allow this BAS program to obtain sustainability while being cost-effective for students. The program currently has sufficient resources, equipment and facilities to support the growth of the BAS program.
- The College is prepared to support the program providing funding to meet expected costs that exceed expected revenue during this development without any negative impact to other programs or operations.

Program Budget Assumptions

- Program Administration Needs: The program administration will be provided by the existing member of our current staff. The Department Chair for Computer Information Systems will dedicate 30% of his time to manage administrative tasks. An Administrative Assistant will be hired to support this department, and a percentage of the salaries for the Dean and Academic Excellence Administrator will be included.
- Faculty and Instructor Needs: The program will add one full-time faculty member in computer science, and in year two will add part-time instructors to round out the instruction team in secure software development. Our existing computer science faculty member will teach lower-level coursework.

Pueblo Community College Program Financial Analysis

BAS Secure Software Development Program

Analysis Summary

	Five Year Totals	Year 0 FY20	Year 1 FY21	Year 2 FY22	Year 3 FY23	Year 4 FY24	Year 5 FY25
(SFTE) ¹	149.9		14.5	27.5	30.4	35.3	42.2
Revenues							
Resident Tuition		119,733.00	234,430.52	266,868.39	319,520.37	392,704.32	
Non-Resident Tuition ²							
Tuition Differential		-	-	-	-	-	-
Adjusted COF/FFS		46,200.00	90,701.80	103,225.57	123,609.28	151,898.67	
Gaming		-	-	-	-	-	-
Fees: High Cost		2,475.00	4,811.85	5,423.09	6,430.92	7,825.98	
Fees: Program		-	-	-	-	-	-
Grants		-	-	-	-	-	-
Miscellaneous Revenue		-	-	-	-	-	-
Estimated Total Revenues	1,875,858.75	\$ -	\$ 168,408.00	\$ 329,944.17	\$ 375,517.04	\$ 449,560.57	\$ 552,428.97
Expenses							
Admin Salaries	12,847.00	33,394.00	34,228.85	35,084.57	35,961.69	36,860.73	
Admin Benefits	4,355.13	11,320.57	11,603.58	11,893.67	12,191.01	12,495.79	
Faculty Salaries	-	57,500.00	58,937.50	60,410.94	61,921.21	63,469.24	
Faculty Benefits	-	20,355.00	20,863.88	21,385.47	21,920.11	22,468.11	
Adjunct Wages	-	5,194.00	27,454.00	28,140.35	28,843.86	29,564.96	
Adjunct Benefits	-	1,096.94	5,798.10	5,943.06	6,091.63	6,243.92	
Classified Salaries	-	34,750.00	35,618.75	36,509.22	37,421.95	38,357.50	
Classified Benefits	-	14,351.75	14,710.54	15,078.31	15,455.27	15,841.65	
Hourly Wages	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hourly Benefits	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Operating	1,000.00	10,000.00	10,300.00	10,609.00	10,927.27	11,255.09	
Travel	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Capital	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Grant Expenses	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Estimated Total Expenses	1,118,025	\$ 18,202.13	\$ 187,962.25	\$ 219,515.20	\$ 225,054.58	\$ 230,733.99	\$ 236,556.98
Estimated Net Operating Income	757,834	\$(18,202.13)	\$(19,554.25)	\$ 110,428.97	\$ 150,462.46	\$ 218,826.57	\$ 315,871.99
Estimated Net Operating Income (DE & 30% IDC)	422,426	\$(23,662.77)	\$(75,942.93)	\$ 44,574.41	\$ 82,946.08	\$ 149,606.38	\$ 244,904.90
Cumulative Return on Investment		\$(23,662.77)	\$(99,605.70)	\$(55,031.29)	\$ 27,914.79	\$ 177,521.17	\$ 422,426.07

1. Budget Services provides this financial analysis based on the program structure/anticipated enrollment inputs provided by the instructional team. We have not evaluated the enrollment assumptions. 2. Assumption is that all tuition is resident; please work with Budget Services if this is not the case.

4. The degree program is sufficiently distinguishable from:

a) an existing degree program at a state four-year institution of higher education that is provided to a student who resides in the community college's geographic service area, as defined by the Commission pursuant to Section 23-1-109 (2), without the student having to change his or her residence, or

b) a degree program that has been successfully offered previously in conjunction with a state four-year institution of higher education, which degree program will be reinstated sooner than the degree program could be offered by the community college.

- The BAS in Secure Software Development is a unique degree. It is highly technical and applied in nature. The program prepares individuals to apply basic engineering principles and technical skills to support engineers in developing, implementing, and evaluation computer software and program applications. Includes instruction in computer programming, programming languages, databases, user interfaces, networking and warehousing, encryption and security, software testing and evaluation, and customization.
- Additionally, it has a strong emphasis on security. The focus on vulnerabilities, cost threats, security concepts, policies, software engineering, coding flaws, code mitigation and exploits makes this degree highly valuable to industry. PCC will offer nearly the same degree in Secure Software Development as Red Rocks Community College, which was approved with no objections.
- Colorado State University-Pueblo (CSU-P) does offer a BS degree in Computer Information Systems with an emphasis in Software Development. However, the following information shows the degree is not similar to the proposed BAS in secure software development. (Appendix G)
 - The Colorado Department of Higher Education listing for the CSU-P degree is for a degree in Computer Information Systems, with a CIP code of 11.0401 (for programs in Information Science/Studies). The CIP code for the PCC BAS in Secure Software Development will be 15.1204 (Computer Software Technology/Technician).
 - The CSU-P degree has only a 13-credit emphasis area in software development, which the catalog refers to as electives.
 - The two independent third-party feasibility reports do not recognize this institution as a competitor in any analysis.
 - In an effort to be transparent to our partners at CSU-P, we've had three meetings to discuss PCC's effort to launch our BAS in Secure Software Development.
 - One meeting included the Dean and Provost from CSU-P, and the Department Chair, Dean, and Chief Academic Officer from PCC.
 - The other two meetings were between the Presidents of the two institutions.

- Dr. Erjavec extended a collaborative offer to the university that included a dual enrollment pathway in secure software development and Business that could also lead to an MBA degree. They declined this opportunity, even though we average 144 students per year with simultaneous enrollment at both institutions. A paper that outlined the proposal was shared with the President of CSU-P.
- No four-year college or university objected to the proposed BAS program in secure software development from Red Rocks Community College, and the degree was approved by the Colorado Commission on Higher Education at its May 2018 meeting.
- The number of credits in computer science varies greatly between the two degrees. In the PCC BAS, 62 of the 90 credits in the content area are in computer science. At CSU-P, there are no computer science prefix courses, and only 13 credits that make up the emphasis area.
- While PCC has historically promoted transfer options heavily for the CSU-P bachelor's degree program, many PCC students do not transfer to this institution. In the last four years, the average number is 7 students, and none have earned the CIS degree with an emphasis in Software Development. Therefore, we believe we can impact the number of students completing a bachelor's degree, in the fewest number of credits, by offering the program at Pueblo Community College.
- Following discussions between PCC and CSU-P, and engagement of leadership from the Colorado Community College System Office, CSU-P agreed to not object to the proposed BAS program from PCC. The two institutions are committed to continue working together toward collaborative programming opportunities.

Comparison of Student Tuition and Fees

	Pueblo Community College		University of Colorado - Colorado Springs		Colorado Technical University		Metropolitan State University of Denver	
	Credits	Rate	Credits	Rate	Credits	Rate	Credits	Rate
Lower Level	81	\$195.72	60	\$348.76	93	\$305.00	60	\$304.98
		\$15,853.32		\$20,925.60		\$28,365.00		\$18,298.80
Upper Level	39	\$315.45	68	\$419.76	90	\$305.00	60	\$304.98
		\$12,302.55		\$28,543.68		\$27,450.00		\$18,298.80
Total Bachelor	120	\$28,155.87	128	\$49,469.28	183	\$55,815.00	120	\$36,597.60

5. The degree program could not be provided through a statewide transfer agreement pursuant to Section 23-1-108 (7) with an accredited state four-year institution in the community college's geographic service area or with an accredited state four-year institution of higher education that has a statewide service area, as defined by the Commission pursuant to Section 23-1-109 (2), that will deliver an existing Bachelor of Applied Science program in the community college's service area sooner than the degree program could be offered by the community college.

- The BAS SSD is an applied, technical degree that adds value to the software development coursework with an added focus on security. It is unique in that over 45 of the 90 core credits relate specifically to security in software development. There are other related computer information systems bachelor's degrees, but none that has the specific concentration of secure software development. While secure software development is related to the subject of Cybersecurity, it is a distinct degree pathway.

6. The Best Interests of the State:

In determining whether to approve a bachelor of applied science degree program, the commission shall consider whether the state board has met the criteria set forth above and whether the proposed bachelor of applied science degree program is in the best interests of the state of Colorado. Department staff concludes the criteria above have been sufficiently met. Staff agrees this proposed degree is in the best interests of the state of Colorado.

The proposed program addresses the needs of "the community" as demonstrated by the following:

- PCC student survey: On question "Are you interested in a career in secure software development?" 46 (88%) responded with yes.
- PCC received 27 letters of support from students, and 6 letters of support from industry members to formally support the adoption of the BAS.
- In the Interact feasibility study, 31 employer surveys were collected state-wide indicating the likelihood of graduates being hired with this degree. This survey targeted business professionals in industries related to computer software development and computer systems and information technology security.
- In addition, the report stated that "most of the respondents believe that a potential new hire with the completed coursework proposed in the BAS Secure Software Development program would be more likely to be able to start at a higher level of employment and would move up more quickly in their industry than those without the training. Most do not value graduates of programs less than at least a bachelor's degree level."
- Additionally, it was reported that "overall, there appears to be a current and growing market for potential PCC BAS Secure Software Development graduates from the perspective of relevant employers, and this is reflected in the data gathered from state and government sources".

7. Anticipated System-wide Effects:

In determining whether to approve a bachelor of applied science degree program, the commission may also consult with any state four-year institution of higher education that shares the same geographic service area concerning the proposed degree program to inform the commission of any anticipated system wide effects of the new degree program. Since every four-year institution's geographic service area is the entire state (per [Commission Policy I, N](#)), every four-year institution was consulted.

As indicated earlier, Colorado does not have any four-year institutions that offer a bachelor's degree specifically in Secure Software Development. As per a process developed by Department staff in February 2018, the PCC proposal was sent to representatives of all public four-year institutions in Colorado with a 30-day period to submit any comments or concerns. Responses from six different institutions were received, with additional comment provided at the November 12, 2019 meeting of the Academic Council. Department staff summarized public comments and offered representatives of PCC an opportunity to respond; the text that follows is adapted from the response.

Q: There is concern about a blurring of lines among academic programs in software development, computer and software engineering, cybersecurity, computer science, and computer information systems. What distinguishes the proposed BAS degree in secure software development from existing baccalaureate programs in Colorado under the umbrella of computer and information sciences and support services (CIP 11.XXXX)?

A: The BAS is an applied, more technical degree with an alignment to an industry standard certification Certified Secure Software Lifecycle Professional (CSSLP). The CIP we have identified for the BAS degree is 15.1204 Computer Software Technology/Technician.

Comparing the CIP descriptions

First line of description:

11.0401 - A program that focuses on the theory

15.1204 - A program that prepares individuals to apply

The degree will focus on application of principles; it is comprised of computer science classes that all have an intentional emphasis on security. It is more than an emphasis or general CIS degree with a strand dedicated to programming or web applications.

Q: A related concern is that this blurring of lines could send errant signals to employers about the knowledge and skills associated with completion of a program in secure software development vs. completion of a program in cybersecurity or computer

science. What measures will be taken to communicate to employers what the BAS degree in secure software development represents?

A: The BAS degree in Secure Software Development aligns to an industry-standard certification the CSSLP Certified Secure Software Lifecycle Professional. The issuing international association (ISC) for the CSSLP has a web site with information on the eight domains of the Secure Software Lifecycle Common Body of Knowledge. PCC will also have a web page with info on this degree. Further, we have an active advisory committee for the academic department and have vetted this degree with the committee and other industry partners. Our feedback has been positive, and companies in this space clearly understand the value of this degree.

Q: There is concern that while the proposed program may provide students with a set of specialized skills to meet immediate workforce needs, the credential could quickly become obsolete given the rapid evolution of the industry, potentially leading to reduced employment opportunities for graduates and the need for additional training or retraining. This might suggest that students would be better served in a BA or BS program that provides a more strategic foundation and perspective on software development and its application to security. How might you address this concern?

A: One of the strategic advantages of community colleges is the ability to adapt and respond to industry. In a Career and Technical Education (CTE) program we meet with industry, listen to input and adapt to change in the industry. The number one job advertisement by occupation (as of Oct 2019) in Colorado is Software Developer/Engineer recently passing Registered Nurses. PCC seeks to respond to this need and address the workforce shortage as it looks today. Clearly, there is a gap between bachelor's graduates and the demand from employers. The principles and practice learned in the BAS will provide an excellent foundation for graduates entering this hi-tech field.

Q: While the proposed program is designed as a completion degree for students who earn a related AAS from Pueblo Community College, it may attract students who earn an AAS from other community colleges, including, for example, the AAS in secure software development from Arapahoe Community College. How will PCC evaluate transfer applicants and support timely BAS completion for transfer students?

A: PCC will accept the AAS in Secure Software Development. PCC will have on-ramp paths in place for other 2-year CIS/CSC/CNG non-programming degrees. Students will need a verified background in programming before entering the BAS pathway.

Q: There are concerns about how this degree program will prepare students for potential future admission into graduate programs in computer science or cybersecurity. While BAS degrees are designed to be terminal and are not structured as pathways into graduate study, degree completers may nonetheless aspire to advanced education, and should be advised on opportunities and potential limitations

upon completion of the BAS in secure software development. How might you address this concern?

A: Students will be advised that the BAS is a terminal degree, but this in no way would mean they could not pursue a masters. PCC will continue to advise students who are interested in computer science and computer information systems (and potentially in graduate study) to pursue an AS or AGS that will transfer to other universities to meet the student's goals. PCC and the CIS department list transfer opportunities to other universities on our website, if a student is looking for a traditional path to a graduate degree.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Commission approve the Bachelor of Applied Science degree in Secure Software Development at Pueblo Community College.

V. STATUTORY AUTHORITY

C.R.S. §23-1-125

Commission directive - student bill of rights - degree requirements - implementation of core courses - competency test - prior learning

(1)(a) Students should be able to complete their associate of arts and associate of science degree programs in no more than sixty credit hours or their baccalaureate programs in no more than one hundred twenty credit hours unless there are additional degree requirements recognized by the commission;

(3) Core courses. The department, in consultation with each Colorado public institution of higher education, is directed to outline a plan to implement a core course concept that defines the general education course guidelines for all public institutions of higher education... Individual institutions of higher education shall conform their own core course requirements with the guidelines developed by the department and shall identify the specific courses that meet the general education course guidelines. Any such guidelines developed by the department shall be submitted to the commission for its approval. In creating and adopting the guidelines, the department and the commission, in collaboration with the public institutions of higher education, may make allowances for baccalaureate programs that have additional degree requirements recognized by the commission;

C.R.S. §23-1-133

Commission directive - Bachelor of Applied Science degree programs - community colleges – approval

(1) (a) The state board for community colleges and occupational education, referred to in this section as the "state board", shall submit to the commission for its approval technical, career, and workforce development Bachelor of Applied Science degree programs to be offered at one or more community colleges within the state system. The commission shall consider the following criteria in determining whether to approve a bachelor of applied science degree program:

(I) Whether the state board provides data demonstrating workforce and student demand for the degree program;

(II) The regional and professional accreditation requirements for the degree program, if applicable, and whether the college can satisfy those requirements, as appropriate, at both the institutional and program levels;

(III) Whether the state board can demonstrate that providing the degree program within the community college system is cost-effective for the student and the community college system;

(IV) Whether the state board can demonstrate that the degree program is sufficiently distinguishable from:

(A) An existing degree program at a state four-year institution of higher education that is provided to a student who resides in the community college's geographic service area, as defined by the commission pursuant to section 23-1-109 (2), without the student having to change his or her residence; or

(B) A degree program that has been successfully offered previously in conjunction with a state four-year institution of higher education, which degree program will be reinstated sooner than the degree program could be offered by the community college; and

(V) Whether the bachelor of applied science degree program could be provided through a statewide transfer agreement pursuant to section 23-1-108 (7) with an accredited state four-year institution in the community college's geographic service area or with an accredited state four-year institution of higher education that has a statewide service area, as defined by the commission pursuant to section 23-1-109 (2), that will deliver an existing bachelor of applied science program in the community college's geographic service area sooner than the degree program could be offered by the community college.

(b) In addition, in determining whether to approve a bachelor of applied science degree program, the commission:

(I) Shall consider whether the state board has met the criteria set forth in subparagraphs (I) to (IV) of paragraph (a) of this subsection (1) and whether the proposed bachelor of applied science degree program is in the best interests of the state of Colorado;

(II) Shall consult with the state board and state four-year institutions of higher education concerning whether the collaboration described in subparagraph (V) of paragraph (a) of this subsection (1) is feasible; and

(III) May consult with any state four-year institution of higher education that shares the same geographic service area, as defined by the commission pursuant to section 23-1-109 (2), concerning the proposed degree program to inform the commission of any anticipated system-wide effects of the new degree program.

TOPIC: ANNUAL RESIDENT/NON-RESIDENT REPORT

PREPARED BY: MICHAEL VENDE, SENIOR DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH
LAURA JENSEN, VICE PROVOST FOR PLANNING AND
EFFECTIVENESS, COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY
KEVIN MACLENNAN, ASSISTANT VICE-CHANCELLOR,
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

I. SUMMARY

This item summarizes the recent Resident/Non-Resident report, which shows resident and non-resident student percentages for each public institution of higher education in Colorado. Additionally, a representative from Colorado State University (CSU) and the University of Colorado (CU) will present on how they ensure that the growth in out-of-state enrollment does not displace in-state students.

II. BACKGROUND

Annually, the Colorado Department of Higher Education releases a Resident/Non-Resident report pursuant to CRS 23-1-113.5(4)(a) and (d). This report provides a snapshot of resident and non-resident student populations at Colorado public institutions of higher education.

CRS 23-1-113.5 4 (b) requires the University of Colorado and Colorado State University to report to the Colorado Commission on Higher Education information demonstrating that qualified in-state students are not displaced or denied admissions and that any increase in the enrollment of foreign students at a specific campus of the University of Colorado System or at Colorado State University is a result of increased capacity at the campuses. Additionally, CRS 23-1-113.5 4 (d) requires institutions to demonstrate that academic admission standards for students who do not have in-state status are equal to or exceed those established for determining admission of in-state students. As part of the Resident/Non-Resident report, the Department links to reports produced by CSU and CU to meet this obligation.

In 2018, Senate Bill 206 increased the threshold for the number of out-of-state and international students who could be enrolled by public institutions of higher education. Given this recent change, the department has invited institutional representative to share with the Commission their efforts to ensure that the growth of out-of-state enrollment does not displace in-state applicants.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

Faced with declining state support, many institutions of higher education nationwide have looked to increase the proportion of their student body that is out-of-state. These students pay higher tuition due to their residency status, providing a new revenue stream to institutions. However, increasing out-of-state enrollments have led state policymakers to raise concern that out-of-state students displace qualified in-state students at public institutions of higher education.

Nationally, several states have adopted maximum thresholds for out-of-state/non-resident enrollment. For example, California and North Carolina maintain a cap of 18 percent non-resident enrollment at several public institution campuses. Legislators in Hawaii set a cap of 30 percent non-resident students for University of Hawaii campuses. In Colorado, the caps for out-of-state/non-resident enrollment are significantly higher compared to other states. CRS 23-1-113.5 sets several different thresholds for non-resident enrollment based on three different cohorts. For Fall incoming freshman, up to 45 percent of the incoming class can be non-resident; this percentage was 33 percent prior to the passage of SB 18-206. For the total student population as calculated by FTE (full-time equivalent), up to 33 percent of the student population can be non-resident. For Fall enrollment of foreign students, up to 15 percent (previously 12 percent) can be foreign. Additionally, these percentages are calculated on a three-year rolling average. It is important to note that statute allows for several student populations to be excluded from these calculations and for institutions to receive added resident counts. These allowances provide further flexibility to Colorado campus to enroll non-resident students.

Staff prepares an annual report summarizes these data for each public institution of higher education in Colorado. The most recent report can be found here:
https://highered.colorado.gov/Publications/Reports/Legislative/ResNonRes/2019/Resident_Non_Resident_2019.pdf

All institutions currently meet the minimum thresholds for each cohort outlined in statute.

In conjunction with this report, the CU and CSU Systems both report their own report demonstrating that qualified in-state students are not displaced or denied admissions as a result of increased out of state enrollment. These reports can be found here:

University of Colorado System:

https://highered.colorado.gov/Publications/Reports/Legislative/ResNonRes/2019/admissionreport_CUB_2019.pdf

Colorado State University:

https://highered.colorado.gov/Publications/Reports/Legislative/ResNonRes/2019/admissionreport_CSU_2019.pdf

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Information item only. No action is needed.

V. STATUTORY AUTHORITY

C.R.S. §23-1-113.5- Commission directive - resident admissions - report – definitions

(1) It is the intent of the general assembly that all state-supported institutions of higher education operate primarily to serve and educate the people of Colorado. The general assembly therefore

directs the commission to develop admission policies to ensure that, beginning with the fall term of 1994 and for the fall term of each year thereafter, not less than fifty-five percent of the incoming freshman class at each state-supported institution of higher education are in-state students as defined in section 23-7-102 (5). Commencing with the fall term of 1995, this requirement shall be met if the percentage of in-state students in the incoming freshman class for the then current fall term and the two previous fall terms averages not less than fifty-five percent. Such fifty-five percent requirement shall also apply to the percentage of incoming freshmen students who are admitted based on criteria other than standardized test scores, high school class rank, and high school grade point average pursuant to section 23-1-113 (1)(b). In addition, the commission shall develop admission policies to ensure, beginning with the fiscal year which begins July 1, 1994, and for each fiscal year thereafter, that not less than two-thirds of the total student enrollment, including undergraduate and graduate students, at each campus of each state-supported institution of higher education, except the Colorado school of mines, are in-state students as defined in section 23-7-102 (5) and that not less than sixty percent of the total student enrollment, including undergraduate and graduate students, at the Colorado school of mines are in-state students as defined in section 23-7-102 (5). This requirement shall be met if, commencing with the fiscal year that begins July 1, 1995, the fraction of in-state students, as defined in section 23-7-102 (5), enrolled at each state-supported institution of higher education, except the Colorado school of mines, averages not less than two-thirds of the total fiscal year student enrollment for the then current fiscal year plus the two previous fiscal years. For the Colorado school of mines, this fraction of in-state students shall be not less than three-fifths. Such policies shall be implemented no later than July 1, 1994.

(2) (a) The provisions of subsection (1) of this section regarding the fraction of students who are in-state students attending the Colorado school of mines shall also apply to Western Colorado university.

(b) Repealed.

(c) After one hundred percent of all qualified Colorado applicants have been accepted by Adams state university, Colorado Mesa university, and Western Colorado university, the provisions of subsection (1) of this section regarding the fraction of students who are in-state students ceases to apply to said three state institutions of higher education.

(d) After one hundred percent of all qualified Colorado applicants have been accepted by Adams state university, Fort Lewis college, Colorado Mesa university, and Western Colorado university, the provisions of subsection (1) of this section regarding the fraction of students who are in-state students ceases to apply to said four state institutions of higher education.

(3) The provisions of subsection (1) of this section regarding the fraction of students who are in-state students at institutions of higher education do not apply to any Native American student who attends Fort Lewis college. The calculation of the fraction of students at Fort Lewis college who are in-state students shall exclude any Native American student attending the college.

(4) (a) The provisions of subsection (1) of this section regarding the percentage and fraction of students who are in-state students, as defined in section 23-7-102 (5), do not apply to the university of Colorado system, Colorado state university, the university of northern Colorado, or the Colorado school of mines if the following requirements are met:

(I) The percentage of incoming freshmen admitted to the institution who are in-state students calculated on a three-year rolling average and excluding foreign students, is not less than fifty-five percent;

(II) The percentage of students enrolled at each campus of the university of Colorado system, at Colorado state university, at the university of northern Colorado, or at the Colorado school of mines who are in-state students is not less than fifty-five percent of the total student enrollment at each campus of the university of Colorado system, at Colorado state university, at the university of northern Colorado, or at the Colorado school of mines, respectively, including undergraduate and graduate students, calculated on a three-year rolling average and excluding foreign students and students enrolled solely in online courses;

(III) The institution continues to admit one hundred percent of all Colorado first-time freshman applicants who meet the guaranteed admissions criteria;

(IV) The percentage of in-state students admitted to each campus of the university of Colorado system, to the university of northern Colorado, or to Colorado state university based on criteria other than standardized test scores, high school class rank, and high school grade point average pursuant to section 23-1-113 (1)(b) does not fall below the average of the percentage admitted to the campus or to Colorado state university, respectively, for the three preceding academic years; and

(V) The total number of foreign students enrolled at each specific campus of the university of Colorado system, at Colorado state university, at the university of northern Colorado, or at the Colorado school of mines does not exceed fifteen percent of the total student enrollment, including undergraduate and graduate students, enrolled at the campus, at Colorado state university, at the university of northern Colorado, or at the Colorado school of mines, respectively.

(b) The university of Colorado and Colorado state university shall annually report to the commission information demonstrating that qualified in-state students are not displaced or denied admissions as a result of the provisions of this subsection (4) and that any increase in the enrollment of foreign students at a specific campus of the university of Colorado system or at Colorado state university is a result of increased capacity at the campus or at Colorado state university, respectively.

(c) For purposes of this subsection (4), "foreign student" means a student who is counted as foreign and present in the United States on a nonimmigrant visa.

(d) (I) (A) Beginning October 15, 2018, and no later than October 15 each year thereafter, the department shall submit a report to the joint budget committee and to the education committees of the house of representatives and of the senate, or their successor committees, demonstrating that the institutions included in this subsection (4) have met resident admission and enrollment requirements set forth in this section for the prior fiscal year.

(B) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 24-1-136 (11)(a)(I), the reporting requirements in subsection (4)(d)(I)(A) of this section continue indefinitely.

(II) The department and the institutions shall ensure that the data required for these calculations is consistently included in the state's student records database, including data on the number of students with in-state classification and out-of-state classification, the number classified as international students for purposes of the calculation, the resident and nonresident students classified as online only students for purposes of the calculation, and the number of students classified as Colorado scholars pursuant to subsection (5) of this section. The report shall include both the nominal numbers of students in each relevant category and the calculation demonstrating the institution's compliance with this section.

(III) As part of the report required pursuant to this subsection (4)(d), in collaboration with the institutions, the department shall demonstrate that the institutions are complying with the

provisions of section 23-1-113 (1)(a) that require that the academic admission standards for students who do not have in-state status, as determined pursuant to section 23-7-103, are equal to or exceed those established for determining admission of in-state students, and the requirements of subsection (4)(b) of this section, that require that certain institutions annually report information demonstrating that qualified in-state students are not displaced or denied admission as a result of the provisions of this subsection (4).

(5) (a) Notwithstanding any provision of this section to the contrary, beginning in the fall semester of 2013, a state-supported institution of higher education or a campus of the institution may count each Colorado scholar who enrolls at the institution or the campus of the institution as two in-state students for purposes of calculating the percentages and fractions of in-state students required in this section.

(b) Notwithstanding any provision of this section to the contrary, beginning in the fall semester of 2013, a state-supported institution of higher education or a campus of the institution meets the requirements specified in subparagraph (IV) of paragraph (a) of subsection (4) of this section if the percentage of in-state students admitted to the institution or to each campus of the institution based on criteria that are in lieu of the established statewide criteria as provided in section 23-1-113 (1)(b) plus the percentage of in-state students enrolling as Colorado scholars exceeds the percentage of nonresident students admitted to the institution or to each campus of the institution based on criteria that are in lieu of the established statewide criteria.

(c) The provisions of this subsection (5) apply only to a state-supported institution of higher education, or to a campus of the institution, that establishes and funds a Colorado scholar program.

(d) Notwithstanding any provision of this subsection (5) to the contrary, the number of Colorado scholars that each institution counts for purposes of subparagraphs (a) and (b) of this subsection (5) in an academic year shall not exceed eight percent of the total number of in-state students that the institution counts in the applicable fraction or percentage in that academic year.

(e) As used in this subsection (5):

(I) "Colorado scholar" means an in-state student who is eligible to participate in an institutional Colorado scholar program and is designated by the state-supported institution of higher education as a Colorado scholar. A student is eligible to participate in a Colorado scholar program only if the student graduates in the top ten percent of the student's high school class or graduates with at least a 3.75 grade point average, having completed a highly rigorous college preparatory curriculum, and meets any additional criteria established by the institution.

(II) "Colorado scholar program" means an institutional program or group of programs that awards institutional financial aid or scholarships to undergraduate, degree-seeking, in-state students, with the goal of attracting in-state students to and retaining them in Colorado institutions of higher education. A state-supported institution of higher education shall provide each student who is designated as a Colorado scholar for purposes of paragraphs (a) and (b) of this subsection (5) at least two thousand five hundred dollars in annual financial aid or scholarship moneys through the institution's Colorado scholar program.

TOPIC: DEGREE AUTHORIZATION ACT: RECOMMENDATION FOR RENEWAL OF PROBATIONARY AUTHORIZATION FOR COLLEGEAMERICA-FORT COLLINS AND COLLEGEAMERICA-COLORADO SPRINGS

PREPARED BY: HEATHER DELANGE, OFFICE OF PRIVATE POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

I. SUMMARY

This action item recommends the renewal of Probationary Authorization for CollegeAmerica-Colorado Springs and CollegeAmerica-Fort Collins pursuant to §23-2-101, et seq., C.R.S.

II. BACKGROUND

The Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) has statutory responsibility for the administration of Title 23, Article 2 of the Colorado Revised Statutes, commonly referred to as the Degree Authorization Act, which sets the terms under which private, not-for-profit and certain other types of institutions may offer degrees or degree credits.

The CCHE has the statutory authority to place a private college or university on probation if the institution fails to meet any of the minimum standards described in the Commission's policies. More specifically, CCHE policy Section I, Part J allows the Commission to place an institution on probationary authorization if the institution has had provisional authorization for a period of three or more years or if an institution receives an adverse action or sanction from its accrediting body.

In October 2011, the Commission approved CollegeAmerica (CA) for provisional authorization to offer baccalaureate degree programs at three Colorado campuses: Colorado Springs, Denver, and Fort Collins. Currently, the Colorado Springs campus has 16 baccalaureate students in its Business Administration (13) and Computer Science (3) programs. Fort Collins has 30 baccalaureate students in its Business Administration (26), Healthcare Administration (3) and Web Design and Development (1) programs and the Denver location no longer offers baccalaureate level degree programs.

In 2017, with a change in CCHE policy, the CCHE placed CA on probationary authorization due to the institution having been on provisional authorization for more than three years. At its September 2019 meeting, the accrediting body ACCSC voted to continue the system of the Center for Excellence in Higher Education (CEHE) affiliated schools on Probation, including the CollegeAmerica campuses.

Because the CA-Denver campus no longer holds operational authorization under the Colorado Commission on Higher Education, the recommended action concerns only the CA-Colorado Springs and CA-Fort Collins as independently accredited branch campuses.

The Commission's action to move the CA campuses to Probationary Authorization also has a time limit. The request for this renewal of authorization is the final request for renewal under the CCHE's policy. Pursuant to CCHE Policy Part I, Section J, an institution with an adverse action or sanction by its accrediting agency or other governmental agency may be recommended for probationary authorization. If the probationary authorization status is imposed by the Commission, the institution shall remain in the probationary authorization status until such time the Commission determines, and, as verified by the Department, that the adverse action or sanction has been lifted by the accrediting body or other governmental agency. If an institution remains in probationary authorization status for three years, the Commission may, at its discretion, continue to extend the probationary authorization or revoke the authorization.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

CollegeAmerica provided staff the materials required for renewal of probationary authorization. Staff reviewed the materials and found them to be satisfactory to recommend renewal of authorization until 2020.

Included in the materials was the notification from the administration that the organization is undergoing a strategic review of the ground campus operations over the next several years. The review is initiated by the recognition that more of its students are desiring fully online degree programs or variations of programs with most curriculum delivered in an online format. The administration for CA is reviewing the options for both the future of the institution and the students they currently instruct.

CEHE stated that while they are in this review period, it is not appropriate to continue to enroll new students into the on-ground degree programs, including the Colorado CollegeAmerica campuses. The CEO stated the institutions are not closing; they are only discontinuing enrollment temporarily. The campuses are continuing to provide all enrolled students with the education, training, student services, career services and other student support functions during this time.

The ACCSC directed CEHE to provide an updated Institutional Teach-Out Plan Approval form for each school. Additionally, the ACCSC has imposed its Maximum Timeframe to Achieve Compliance on the CollegeAmerica campuses. The timeframe to achieve compliance began as of September 6, 2018 and ends on September 7, 2020. The ACCSC is under no obligation to wait for the maximum timeframe to expire and may take an adverse action prior to the expiration of the maximum allowable timeframe. The CollegeAmerica schools must inform current students in writing that the school has been placed on Probation and that additional information can be obtained on the ACCSC website.

The probation order by the CCHE has required the status to be posted on the schools' websites. Staff has found this to be the case.

It is important to recognize that CA remains accredited by ACCSC, a U.S. Department of Education recognized accreditor, even though it is currently under a probation order. Pursuant to statute and policy, CollegeAmerica meets the requirements for renewal for one more year.

The extension of probationary authorization is important to the students who have enrolled at the various CA campuses in Colorado. Allowing the operation to continue for one more year allows those students to complete their programs and allows the institutions the time to create the pathways for those students who will not complete within the probationary allowance as defined by the CCHE or the maximum timeframe allowance imposed by the ACCSC.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends the Colorado Commission on Higher Education renew the probationary authorization for one year for CollegeAmerica-Colorado Springs and CollegeAmerica-Fort Collins.

V. STATUTORY AUTHORITY

§ 23-2-103.4. Authorization - revocation - probationary status

(2) With regard to the authorization of a private college or university, the commission may:

(a) Revoke the private college's or university's authorization or place the institution on probationary status if the private college or university:

(I) Fails to meet any of the minimum standards set forth in this article or in the commission's policies or rules adopted to implement this article;

(b) Revoke the private college's or university's authorization if the institution loses its accreditation

TOPIC: PROPOSED REVISIONS TO CCHE POLICY I, PART V: CREATION OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS – PROCESS FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF SELECT BACCALAUREATE DEGREE PROGRAMS AT COLORADO COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM INSTITUTIONS AND LOCAL DISTRICT COLLEGES

PREPARED BY: DR. CHRIS RASMUSSEN, DIRECTOR OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

I. SUMMARY

This action item outlines proposed revisions to Commission Policy I, V: Creation, Modification or Discontinuance of Academic and Vocational Programs at Public Institutions of Higher Education. The bulk of the revisions are to codify a process for institutional application, Department staff review, and Commission consideration of the following proposed degree programs: Bachelor of Applied Science programs at Colorado Community College System Institutions and at Aims Community College; Bachelor of Science in Nursing programs at Aims Community College; and all baccalaureate degree programs at Colorado Mountain College.

The proposed revisions also reflect a statutory change resulting from HB 19-1153, which amended §23-71-102, C.R.S. to authorize Colorado Mountain College to offer “a limited number” of baccalaureate degree programs. Additionally, the proposed revisions outline the reasonable and prudent due diligence conducted by Department staff in evaluating academic programs and providing recommendations to the Commission. This includes engagement of the Academic Council in the process of review, addition, modification, and discontinuance of academic programs. The proposed policy revisions also include technical changes to improve clarity.

Further revisions were made in response to feedback received from commissioners and from institutional representatives at and since the Commission meeting on Sept. 5, 2019. These changes primarily clarify the role of the Academic Council as an advisory/consultative body without decision making authority and accelerate the process of bringing a proposed program to the Commission if the staff believes that the proposing institution has addressed all concerns raised by institutions during a first round of feedback (rather than requiring a second round of feedback with Academic Council). The additional proposed revisions also correct a drafting error in referencing statutory criteria for approval of baccalaureate degree programs at local district colleges.

II. BACKGROUND

The Commission revised Policy I, V in December 2017, following enactment of SB 17-297, which amended §23-1-107(1), C.R.S. to state:

“A governing board of a state-supported institution of higher education is not required to submit a proposal to or obtain approval from the commission to create, modify, or discontinue academic or vocational programs offered by the institution, so long as the creation, modification, or discontinuance of the academic or vocational program is consistent with the institution's statutory role and mission.”

Commission policy articulates four exceptions where proposed degrees carry additional statutory requirements:

- i. New baccalaureate degree program proposals at Colorado Mountain College, which require Commission approval per §23-71-133, C.R.S.;
- ii. New Bachelor of Applied Science (B.A.S.) degree proposals from Colorado Community College System (CCCS) institutions and from Aims Community College, which require Commission approval per §23-1-133, C.R.S.;
- iii. New Bachelor of Science in Nursing (B.S.N.) degree proposals from Aims Community College, which require Commission approval per §23-71-102, C.R.S.; and
- iv. Educator preparation programs that lead to endorsement for educator licensure, which require Commission approval per §23-1-121, C.R.S.

The current Commission policy addresses the program proposal review process in a fairly general manner, indicating that Department staff will confirm alignment with statutory criteria for the program and that the Academic Council will be engaged in the process. In response to feedback from institutions that a more detailed, transparent, step-by-step process was needed to guide proposing institutions—and to help ensure that four-year institutions have adequate time to review and provide feedback on program proposals—Department staff members have drafted and tested a revised process for review and approval of proposed BAS programs. The process was vetted with the Academic Council in early 2018 and was followed by Department staff in two instances in late 2018 and early 2019. Two-year institutions have appreciated the additional transparency of the process and improved clarity of expectations, while four-year institutions have responded favorably to the advance notification process and formalized mechanism for soliciting their input. Staff believes it is prudent for this process to be codified in Commission policy and applied to all proposed baccalaureate degree programs at two-year institutions that require Commission approval.

It should be noted that statutory authority granted to Aims Community College by HB 18-1300 to offer the Bachelor of Science in Nursing (B.S.N.) degree is distinct from statutory authority granted to Colorado Community College System institutions by HB 18-1086 to offer the B.S.N. degree. Whereas HB 18-1300 requires Aims Community College to obtain approval from the Colorado Commission on Higher Education to offer the B.S.N. degree, HB 18-1086 requires only that the State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education and/or individual CCCS campuses inform the Colorado Commission on Higher Education of their intent to offer the degree and solicit the Commission's input in a joint meeting of the CCCS board and the Commission. They must also provide ninety days advance notice to the Commission and to all state public and nonpublic institutions of higher education prior to a CCCS institution requesting board approval to offer a B.S.N. degree.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

The following substantive changes are proposed:

1. Section 2.00 Statutory Authority: Revised language reflects changes required by HB 19-1153 regarding the authority of Colorado Mountain College to offer “a limited number of baccalaureate degree programs.”
2. Section 4.00 New and Substantively Modified Programs: Process and Procedures
 - Sub-section 4.02.03 outlines a step-by-step process for application, review, and approval of proposed BAS degree programs at CCCS institutions and Aims Community College, and proposed BSN degree programs at Aims Community College. It also clarifies the role of the Academic Council.
 - Sub-section 4.02.04 outlines a step-by-step process for application, review, and approval of proposed baccalaureate degree programs at Colorado Mountain College. It also clarifies the role of the Academic Council.
 - Sub-section 4.02.05 clarifies the role of the Academic Council in cases of new or substantially modified programs that do not require approval by the Commission.
3. Section 5:00 Non-Substantive Modifications to and Discontinuance of Existing Programs: Clarifies the role of the Academic Council in cases of discontinued or non-substantively modified programs.

A copy of the revised policy showing changes can be found in Appendix A. Changes proposed at the September 5 Commission meeting appear in red or purple. Additional changes proposed based on Commissioner and institutional feedback on the September 5 version appear with yellow highlight. The proposed, revised policy is in line with statute and other CCHE policies.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Commission approve proposed revisions to Policy I, V: CREATION, MODIFICATION OR DISCONTINUANCE OF ACADEMIC AND VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS AT PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

V. STATUTORY AUTHORITY

§23-1-107(1), C.R.S. – noted above

§23-71-102, C.R.S – Local district colleges – organization – definitions.

As used in this article 71, unless the context otherwise requires:

(1)(a) ...

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (1)(a) of this section:

(l) Colorado mountain college, in addition to its mission as a local district college, may also offer a

limited number of baccalaureate degree programs as its board of trustees determines appropriate to address the needs of the communities within its service area and that are approved by the Colorado commission on higher education.

(II) Aims community college, in addition to its mission as a local district college, may also offer, as its board of trustees determines appropriate to address the needs of the communities within its service area that are approved by the Colorado commission on higher education pursuant to the criteria set form in section 23-1-133 (2):

(A) Bachelor of applied science degree programs; and

(B) Bachelor of science degree in nursing programs as a completion degree to students who have or are pursuing an associate degree in nursing.

§23-1-133, C.R.S. - Commission directive - bachelor of applied science degree programs - community colleges – approval.

(1)(a) The state board for community colleges and occupational education, referred to in this section as the "state board", shall submit to the commission for its approval technical, career, and workforce development bachelor of applied science degree programs to be offered at one or more community colleges within the state system. The commission shall consider the following criteria in determining whether to approve a bachelor of applied science degree program:

...

§23-71-133, C.R.S. – Local district colleges – approval of baccalaureate degrees – attorney general to advise.

(1) When approving baccalaureate degrees for any local district college pursuant to the authority in section 23-71-102 (1), the Colorado commission on higher education shall make its determination based on the following criteria:

...

§23-1-121, C.R.S. - Commission directive - approval of educator preparation programs – review.

(1) As used in this section, unless the context otherwise requires:
(a) "Approved educator preparation program" means an educator preparation program that has been reviewed pursuant to the provisions of this section and has been determined by the commission to meet the performance-based standards established by the commission pursuant to this section and the requirements of section 23-1-108.

...

VI. APPENDICES:

Appendix A: (with track changes) Proposed Revisions to CCHE Policy I, V: CREATION, MODIFICATION OR DISCONTINUANCE OF ACADEMIC AND VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS AT PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.



SECTION I

PART V CREATION, MODIFICATION OR DISCONTINUANCE OF ACADEMIC AND VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS AT PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

1.00 Introduction

Senate Bill 17-297 amended §23-1-107(1), C.R.S. to clarify that Commission approval is not required for new academic or vocational programs, so long as the new program is consistent with the institution's statutory role and mission. The Commission delegates review of statutory role and mission to Department staff (see Section 4.02.01 below). There are several exceptions where proposed degrees have additional statutory requirements, including educator preparation degrees, baccalaureate degrees at Colorado Mountain College, bachelor of science in nursing (B.S.N.) completion degrees at Aims Community College, and bachelor of applied science (B.A.S.) degrees at Aims Community College and at Colorado Community College System campuses, which are explained in detail below. This policy does not apply to certificate programs offered at area technical colleges, local district colleges, community colleges or 4-year institutions.

It should be noted that 4-year institutions may offer other programs that are commonly referred to as “certificates” that do not require review by the Department and are not eligible for entry into SURDS. Examples include, but are not limited to, non-credit bearing programs offered on a cash-funded basis, emphasis areas within degrees, and other sequences of courses that do not result in a bona fide credential. To be eligible for entry into SURDS, certificates must be credit-bearing, standalone programs (i.e., not part of a baccalaureate or graduate degree program). Certificates that can be applied to degree program requirements, such as “stackable certificates,” are considered to be standalone programs.

2.00 Statutory Authority

The Commission’s role and responsibility in the creation, modification and discontinuance of academic and vocational programs is defined in §23-1-107, which states that:

- (1) A governing board of a state-supported institution of higher education is not required to submit a proposal to or obtain approval from the commission to create, modify, or discontinue academic or

vocational programs offered by the institution, so long as the creation, modification, or discontinuance of the academic or vocational program is consistent with the institution's statutory role and mission.

There are four exceptions where proposed degrees have additional statutory requirements:

- 2.01 Educator preparation program review and approval is a collaborative review between the Colorado Department of Education and the Colorado Department of Higher Education and a dual approval process between the State Board of Education and the Colorado Commission on Higher Education, per §23-1-121, C.R.S.
- 2.02 Colorado Community College System institutions, as well as Aims Community College, received state authorization to propose bachelor of applied science (B.A.S.) degrees when Senate Bill 14-004 was enacted, creating §23-1-133, C.R.S. and amending §23-71-102, C.R.S., which require the State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education (SBCCOE) or the Board of Trustees for Aims Community College to submit to the Commission for its approval technical, career, and workforce development bachelor of applied science degree programs and specify the criteria to be used in evaluating requests.
- 2.03 Similarly, Senate Bill 10-101 and House Bill 19-1153 amended §23-71-102, C.R.S. to read, "...Colorado mountain college, in addition to its mission as a local district college, may also offer a limited number of baccalaureate degree programs as its board of trustees determines appropriate to address the needs of the communities within its service area and that are approved by the Colorado commission on higher education." The Commission has the authority to approve those degrees based on the criteria outlined in §23-71-133, C.R.S.
- 2.04 Similarly, House Bill 18-1300 amended §23-71-102, C.R.S. to read, "...Aims community college, in addition to its mission as a local district college, may also offer, as its board of trustees determines appropriate to address the needs of the communities within its service area...bachelor of science degree in nursing programs as a completion degree to students who have or are pursuing an associate degree in nursing" and the Commission has the authority to approve those degrees based on the criteria outlined in §23-1-133, C.R.S.

3.00 Policy Goal

The goal of this policy is to ensure that a new or substantively modified program is consistent with the statutory role and mission of the institution and additional statutory requirements (where applicable). Additionally, the Department needs certain information, including but not limited to degree level and CIP code, to enter new programs into the Student Unit Record Data System (SURDS) so that

institutions may report enrollment and completion, for instance, in those programs.

4.00 New and Substantively Modified Programs: Process and Procedures

4.01 Governing Board Approval

4.01.01 A governing board may act to approve a new degree program before or after the Department's approval of the program or endorsement of the program's fit with the institution's statutory role and mission.

4.01.02 The governing board shall formally notify the Department of its approval of a new or substantively modified degree program immediately following board action. The Department requests that new program proposals be sent by the institution's or system's representative on Academic Council (or their designee) to the Department staff who facilitate Academic Council. Institutions should follow their normal process to ensure compliance with any applicable federal regulations as well as any accreditation requirements.

4.02 Review by the Department

4.02.01 Upon receipt of the notification of the governing board's action, the Department reviews the program for fit with the institution's statutory role and mission; compliance with the 60 credit cap for associate of arts and associate of science degrees or 120 credit cap for baccalaureate degrees [per §23-1-125(1)(a)] unless exempted by the Commission; and alignment with GT Pathways requirements unless a waiver is sought [per 23-1-125(3)]. The Department will respond to the governing board within 30 days of receiving the proposal.

4.02.02 In the case of new educator preparation programs, Department staff shall follow the review process outlined in Commission Policy I, P: Educator Preparation, per §23-1-121, C.R.S.

4.02.03 In the case of Bachelor of Applied Science degrees at one of the campuses within the Colorado Community College System (§23-1-133(1), C.R.S.); Bachelor of Applied Science degrees at Aims Community College (§23-71-102 (1)(b)(II)(A) C.R.S., and §23-1-133(2), C.R.S.); and Bachelor of Science in Nursing degrees at Aims Community College (§23-71-102(1)(b)(II)(B), C.R.S., and §23-1-133(2), C.R.S.), the review process shall be as follows:

- The chief academic officer of the institution or system seeking approval of a BAS or BSN program shall submit a proposal to the Department addressing all of the criteria listed in §23-1-133(1)(a), C.R.S. (for

Colorado Community College System institutions), or in §23-1-133(2)(a), C.R.S. (for Aims Community College), including:

- Data demonstrating sufficient workforce and student demand for the proposed degree program;
 - The regional and professional accreditation requirements for the degree program, if applicable, and evidence that the institution can satisfy those requirements, as appropriate, at both the institutional and program levels;
 - Evidence that providing the degree program is cost-effective for students, for the institution, and for the Colorado Community College System (if applicable);
 - Evidence that the degree program is sufficiently distinguishable from an existing degree program at a state four-year institution provided within the community college's service area, and sufficiently distinguishable from a degree program that had been offered in conjunction with a state four-year institution that is scheduled to be reinstated;
 - Evidence that the degree program could not practically or feasibly be offered through a statewide transfer agreement.
- Upon receipt of the proposal, the Department will consult with all state four-year institutions **located in the proposing institution's service area** regarding any existing similar academic programs offered by the four-year institutions, and any potential opportunities to offer the proposed degree through collaboration or articulation.
 - If the Department determines that the institution's or system's proposal does not meet one or more of the above statutory requirements, the Department will provide a written response identifying the area or areas where the proposal has fallen short. The institution or system may revise and resubmit the proposal for review.
 - **If the Department determines that the institution's or system's proposal does meet the above statutory requirements, the proposal will be sent to members of the Academic Council for consideration of any anticipated systemwide effects of the new degree program. (As the primary stakeholder group for the Department on matters of academic policy and programs, the role of the Academic Council is to advise Department staff and help ensure that appropriate due diligence is conducted with any Commission business related to academic affairs. The Academic Council is an advisory body, and not a decision-making body.)**
 - Members of Academic Council will have no fewer than 30 calendar days (excluding periods of time between academic terms) to review the proposal and provide **written** feedback to the Department, **which will be shared with the proposing institution.**
 - Following the 30-day review period, the proposal will be placed on the agenda for the next meeting of the Academic Council for discussion. At

the meeting, Department staff will summarize the feedback received from institutions on the proposal and provide an opportunity for representatives of the proposing institution or system to respond.

- If there is **no indication** among members of Academic Council that the proposed degree program **could** have negative systemwide effects, the proposal will be placed on the next Commission meeting agenda with a staff recommendation for approval.
- If there is **indication** among members of the Academic Council that the proposed degree program **could** have negative systemwide effects, the institution or system submitting the proposal will be encouraged to resolve any areas of concern. The institution or system may then submit a revised proposal, which will be reviewed by Department staff. **If Department staff determine that the proposing institution has sufficiently addressed concerns raised by members of Academic Council, the proposal will be placed on the next Commission meeting agenda with a staff recommendation for approval. If Department staff determine that the proposing institution has not sufficiently addressed concerns raised by members of Academic Council, or sufficiency is indeterminate,** the revised proposal will be sent to members of Academic Council for another review period of no fewer than 30 days, after which the revised proposal will be placed on the agenda for the next meeting of the Academic Council for discussion, with similar steps taken **as outlined above.**
- If following **a second** round of feedback **there is indication that the proposed degree program could have negative systemwide effects,** the institution or system may request that the proposal be brought to the Commission for discussion. In preparing the agenda item for the Commission, Department staff will summarize all feedback received during the review process and may recommend that the Commission approve or not approve the program. The Commission may choose to act by approving or not approving the program or may request additional information and postpone action to a future meeting.

4.02.04 In the case of baccalaureate degrees at Colorado Mountain College (§23-71-102(1)(b)(I), C.R.S., and (§23-71-133(1), C.R.S.), the review process shall be as follows:

- The chief academic officer of the institution shall submit a proposal to the Department addressing all of the criteria listed in §23-71-133(1), C.R.S., including:
 - Data demonstrating sufficient workforce and student demand for the proposed degree program;
 - The regional and professional accreditation requirements for the degree program, if applicable, and evidence that the institution

- can satisfy those requirements, as appropriate, at both the institutional and program levels;
- Evidence that the institution's provision of the baccalaureate degree program is the most cost-effective way to provide the program within the institution's service area;
- Evidence via a cost-benefit analysis that the institution's proposed baccalaureate degree program will not create a negative impact for the institution or require additional state-appropriated money to operate.
- Upon receipt of the proposal, the Department will consult with all state four-year institutions located in the proposing institution's service area regarding any existing similar academic programs offered by the four-year institutions, and any potential opportunities to offer the proposed degree through collaboration or articulation.
- If the Department determines that the institution's proposal does not meet one or more of the above statutory requirements, the Department will provide a written response identifying the area or areas where the proposal has fallen short. The institution may revise and resubmit the proposal for review.
- If the Department determines that the institution's proposal does meet the above statutory requirements, the proposal will be sent to members of the Academic Council for consideration of any anticipated systemwide effects of the new degree program. (As the primary stakeholder group for the Department on matters of academic policy and programs, the role of the Academic Council is to advise Department staff and help ensure that appropriate due diligence is conducted with any Commission business related to academic affairs. The Academic Council is an advisory body, and not a decision-making body.)
- Members of Academic Council will have no fewer than 30 calendar days (excluding periods of time between academic terms) to review the proposal and provide written feedback to the Department, which will be shared with the proposing institution.
- Following the 30-day review period, the proposal will be placed on the agenda for the next meeting of the Academic Council for discussion. At the meeting, Department staff will summarize the feedback received from institutions on the proposal and provide an opportunity for representatives of the proposing institution or system to respond.
- If there is no indication among members of Academic Council that the proposed degree could have a negative effect on other institutions, the proposal will be placed on the next Commission meeting agenda with a staff recommendation for approval.
- If there is indication among members of the Academic Council that the proposed degree could have a negative effect on other institutions, the proposing institution will be encouraged to resolve any areas of concern with other institutions with Department staff acting as a facilitator of

~~the discussion~~. The institution may submit a revised proposal, which will be reviewed by Department staff. If Department staff determine that the proposing institution has sufficiently addressed concerns raised by members of Academic Council, the proposal will be placed on the next Commission meeting agenda with a staff recommendation for approval. If Department staff determine that the proposing institution has not sufficiently addressed concerns raised by members of Academic Council, or sufficiency is indeterminate, the revised proposal will be sent to members of Academic Council for another review period of no fewer than 30 days, after which the revised proposal will be placed on the agenda for the next meeting of the Academic Council for discussion, with similar steps taken as outlined above.

- If following a second round of feedback the Academic Council there is indication that the proposed degree program could have a negative on other institutions, the proposing institution may request that the proposal be brought to the Commission for discussion. In preparing the agenda item for the Commission, Department staff will summarize all feedback received during the review process and may recommend that the Commission approve or not approve the program. The Commission may choose to act by approving or not approving the program, or may request additional information and postpone action to a future meeting.

4.02.05 In the case of new or substantively modified program proposals that are not subject to the statutory requirements outlined above (which will be the majority of new program proposals), if the Department determines that the proposed program is consistent with an institution's statutory role and mission and meets the other applicable statutory requirements outlined above then the Department shall enter the new or substantively modified program into the Student Unit Record Data System (SURDS) and notify the institution. Following notification to the institution, the new or substantively modified program will be added to the agenda for the next meeting of Academic Council for information purposes.

- If the Department determines that the proposal is not consistent with the institution's statutory role and mission or credit cap and GT Pathways requirements (if applicable), it will so inform the governing board. The Department shall take credit cap and GT Pathways (where applicable) waiver requests to the Commission for action.
- If disagreement on Department staff's determination arises then the review and ensuing discussion shall be elevated to Academic Council for its advice. The Commission shall have final authority as to whether or not the proposed program is approved.

5.00 Non-Substantive Modifications to and Discontinuance of Existing Programs

Following institutional and/or governing board approval, proposals that involve non-substantive modification to or discontinuance of an existing program, must be reported to the Department for appropriate entry in the list of approved programs in SURDS and do not require action by the Commission. Following notification by the institution to the Department, the discontinued or non-substantively modified program will be added to the agenda for the next meeting of the Academic Council for information purposes.

HISTORY: CCHE Agenda Item III, B – November 6, 2014; CCHE Agenda Item III, B – December 4, 2014; CCHE Agenda Item VI, A – October 23, 2017; CCHE Agenda Item V, B - December 7, 2017; CCHE Agenda Item III, E – December 6, 2018; CCHE Agenda Item IV, B – September 5, 2019; **CCHE Agenda Item IV, B – December 5, 2019.**

TOPIC: PROPOSED REVISIONS TO CCHE POLICY, SECTION I PART T:
STUDENT COMPLAINT POLICY

PREPARED BY: HEATHER DELANGE, OFFICE OF PRIVATE POSTSECONDARY
EDUCATION

I. SUMMARY

This discussion item outlines proposed revisions to Commission Policy I, T: Student Complaint Policy. The current language does not outline the process for Coloradans to file a complaint with the Department if the Coloradan is enrolled in an out-of-state institution and receiving online instruction.

II. BACKGROUND

As part of the triad (US Department of Education, Accreditors and State Agencies) it is the responsibility of state agencies to provide a pathway for students to file grievances if the student cannot find resolution at the institution. Since 2010, the U.S. Department of Education has been working on the State Authorization Rule and defining how states should provide student protection when necessary. The 2016 state authorization regulations published by the U.S. Department of Education in the Federal Register stated that if the state does not have a complaint process that applies to an out-of-state institution providing distance education to students in that state, the institution does not comply with the requirement.

Current Commission policy speaks to a student complaint process for any student attending a Colorado-based institution. The policy is promulgated from CRS §23-2-104, which states the Commission shall specify procedures by which a student or former student of a private college or university or seminary or religious training institution may file a complaint with the department, concerning the institution in which the student is or was enrolled. Pursuant to the statute, the definition of a private college or university/seminary or religious training institution is a postsecondary educational institution doing business or maintaining a place of business in the state of Colorado. Based on this definition, the student complaint process has only applied to students enrolled at Colorado institutions but does not address the issues of those Coloradans who have an issue while attending a non-Colorado institution.

The 2016 State Authorization Rule did not go into effect until May 26, 2019, after the Department lost a challenge to its delay of the rule in federal court. This effective date was confirmed by the Department in its July 22, 2019 announcement.

Then, in Nov. 1, 2019, the federal government released new requirements as part of their recent negotiated rule-making process. The 2019 State Authorization Rule no longer requires states to have a process for its residents attending out-of-state institutions; however, it is important for the

Department to ensure students have a pathway or guidance at the state level for student grievances, regardless of whether it is required at the federal level or not.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

The proposed language discussed in this agenda item provides guidance to students who reside in Colorado in order to file a complaint against an out-of-state institution.

Attachment A shows the proposed addition to the student complaint policy.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

This item is for discussion only; staff will bring an action item to the next CCHE meeting.

STATUTORY AUTHORITY

§23-2-103.1, C.R.S., Administration of article-complaints-injunctive proceedings

(2) (a) The commission shall specify procedures by which a student or former student of a private college or university or seminary or religious training institution may file a complaint with the department concerning the institution in which the student is or was enrolled. If a former student files a complaint, he or she must do so within two years after discontinuing enrollment at the institution. The department may investigate complaints based on a claim of a deceptive trade practice as described in subsection (4) of this section. The department does not have jurisdiction to consider complaints that infringe on the academic freedom or religious freedom of, or question the curriculum content of, a private college or university or seminary or religious training institution; except that the department has jurisdiction to consider a complaint that pertains to the general education core course requirements of a private college or university or seminary or religious training institution, or to any of the specific core courses included in said requirements, if the private college or university or seminary or religious training institution chooses to seek transferability of its general education core courses pursuant to section 23-1-125 (5).

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: CCHE Policy Section I, Part J with proposed changes

Agenda Item V, A

ATTACHMENT A

SECTION I

PART T STUDENT COMPLAINT POLICY

1.0 Introduction

The role of the Colorado Commission on Higher Education, and the Colorado Department of Higher Education acting as its staff, is to act as an ombudsman and advise students on how to follow the policies and procedures for resolving complaints at the institution where they are or were enrolled. In almost every instance, the institution where the student is or was enrolled will determine appropriate action for both the student and the institution. Such decisions by the institution are binding and most often are not subject to further appeal to the Department. Institutions have sole authority over complaints about grades and actions related to student conduct policies. This policy applies to students at public and private institutions of higher education. This policy mandates that each public and private institution define and implement complaint and appeals processes to investigate student complaints and appeals in a fair and expeditious manner. For both public and private institutions that elect to participate in the State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement (SARA), the Department has authority to ensure that participating public and private institutions follow policies and standards for online students outside of Colorado, outlined below in Section 5.00.

2.00 Statutory Authority

Pursuant to Article 34, Title 24, C.R.S., complaints of discrimination based on race, color, religion, creed, national origin, ancestry, sex, physical or mental disability, sexual orientation (incl. transgender status), marital status, and retaliation for engaging in protected activity should be filed with the Colorado Department of Regulatory Agencies (DORA), Division of Civil Rights at www.dora.state.co.us/civil-rights. Also, in cases where the student filing the complaint is also an employee of the institution of higher education and the complaint involves the employer-employee relationship, this may trigger state or federal Whistleblower legislation and will be referred to the Colorado Attorney General's Office and any appropriate federal agency. Similarly, if the student complaint involves disclosures of fraud; violations of laws, regulations, or ethical standards; or misuse of funds in the context of a college- or university- administered federal grant, this may also trigger federal Whistleblower legislation and the Department may report this violation to the grantor.

2.01 Public Institutions of Higher Education

Several sections in statute outline how the public higher education system should be designed to function for the benefit of students who are residents of Colorado. These statutory requirements include (but are not limited to) ensuring that the design of degree programs offer the maximum range of opportunities and

Agenda Item V, A

ATTACHMENT A

assistance to students to complete their courses of study and obtain their degrees in a reasonable amount of time [§23-1-108(13) C.R.S.]; ensuring fair policies for students who transfer coursework between degree programs or between public institutions [§23-5-122 C.R.S.]; and ensuring the requirements in the Student Bill of Rights [§23-1-125 C.R.S.].

Colorado public institutions that choose to participate in SARA and are offering online education to residents of other states are held accountable to SARA requirements and those complaints are subject to investigation by the Department [§23-2-103.1(4)]. In the case of SARA related student complaints, final resolution rests with the state for purposes of adjudication and enforcement. The requirements of SARA are listed in section 5.00.

2.02 Private Institutions of Higher Education

In the case of non-public institutions, the Department is authorized to investigate complaints based on claims of deceptive trade practice as described in §23-2-104(4) C.R.S. and listed in Section 4.05 below. The Department shall not have authority to consider complaints that infringe on the academic freedom, religious freedom, or question the curriculum content of a private college or university, religious training institutions, or seminary, except where the state has that authority, such as with educator preparation programs (§23-1-121, C.R.S.) and voluntary participation in gtPathways [§23-1-125(5), C.R.S.].

Private institutions that choose to participate in SARA and whose main campus or accredited, degree-granting authority is located in Colorado and offer online education to residents of other states are held accountable to SARA requirements and those complaints are subject to investigation by the Department [§23-2-103.1(4)]. In the case of SARA related student complaints, final resolution rests with the state for purposes of adjudication and enforcement. The requirements of SARA are listed in section 5.00.

[3.00 Out-of-State Institutions of Higher education](#)

[3.01 Colorado Revised Statutes contains language for student grievances at those colleges and universities authorized to operate in Colorado. For Colorado residents who are attending an out-of-state institution and are enrolled in an online course or program, there is no specific language. If the online student has an issue with their institution, and the institution is neither located in Colorado nor participates in SARA \(<https://www.nc-sara.org/directory>\), the student is encouraged to first work with the institution and utilize the formal grievance/complaint process found in the institution's student handbook.](#)

Agenda Item V, A

ATTACHMENT A

3.02 If the issue is not addressed after filing a formal complaint with the institution, the student should locate the institution's home state. The home state's higher education agency should be listed in the school's catalog. If it is not, students may use the State Authorization Guide to find the institution's home state and the home state's higher education agency's contact information and reach out to that agency to attempt to resolve the complaint

3.03 The student may file a complaint with the Colorado Department of Higher Education. Out-of-state, online institutions are not listed on the Colorado Department of Higher Education website so students are encouraged to submit a comment to the "send us a comment" section of the website. Please include the name of the student, institution name, and the issue or complaint. Colorado Department of Higher Education staff will work with the student and the appropriate higher education agency to seek resolution of the complaint.

3.04 The above is a *voluntary* process that out-of-state, online schools may opt in to in order to meet the Federal Department of Education's 2016 State Authorization Regulation student complaint process requirement. Each out-of-state, online school must notify the Colorado Department of Higher Education of their intention to opt in to this process on behalf of its students. The Colorado Department of Higher Education will receive student complaints for each such institution, retroactively from March 15, 2019, forward, until such time as the Federal Department of Higher Education's 2016 State Authorization Regulation regarding student complaints is amended or withdrawn.

3.00 Goals and Definitions

3.01 The goal of the Commission's Student Complaint Policy for students in public institutions of higher education is to help students understand their rights under Colorado law described in section 2.01 and to advise students on how to follow their institution's policies and procedures.

3.02 The goal of the Commission's Student Complaint Policy for students in private institutions of higher education is to help students understand their rights under Colorado law described in section 2.02, to advise students on how to follow their institution's policies and procedures, and to uphold statutory goals that prohibit deceptive trade practice.

3.03 Terminology

3.03.01 The "Commission" means the Colorado Commission on Higher Education.

Agenda Item V, A

ATTACHMENT A

- 3.03.02 The “Department” means the Colorado Department of Higher Education, which acts as the staff for the Commission.
- 3.03.03 “Ombudsman” means a person who advises and attempts to help resolve complaints and problems, as between students and a university.
- 3.03.04 The “Institution” means the public, private non-profit, or private for-profit college or university where the student is or was enrolled.
- 3.03.05 A “student complaint” is a grievance filed in writing or online at an institution of higher education, according to the policies of the institution of higher education where the student is or was enrolled, or at the Colorado Department of Higher Education. A givable offense is any alleged action which violates one of the requirements in sections 2.01 and 2.02 of this policy. It should be noted that for complaints that do not involve one of the statutes described in sections 2.01 and 2.02, in almost every instance the institution where the student is enrolled will determine appropriate action for both the student and the institution. Such decisions by the institution are binding and most often are not subject to further appeal to the Commission.
- 3.03.06 A “whistleblower” is a person, usually an employee in a government agency or private enterprise, who makes a report to the public or to those in authority, of mismanagement, corruption, illegality, or some other wrongdoing.
- 3.03.07 State Authorization and Reciprocity Agreement (SARA) is an interstate agreement governing distance education laws for both public and private colleges and is administered through the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. For more information, see <http://www.wiche.edu/sara/>.

4.00 Responsibilities Pertaining to Student Complaints

4.01 Responsibilities of the Student

- 4.01.01 To follow the institution’s complaints and appeals procedures within the institution’s required timeframe first and exhaust all opportunities for resolution at the institution. In the case of private institutions, “If a former student files a complaint, he or she must do so within two years after discontinuing enrollment at the institution,” per 23-2-104(2)(a), C.R.S.

Agenda Item V, A

ATTACHMENT A

- 4.01.02 After exhausting all opportunities for resolution at the institution, to file a written complaint with the Department online at <http://higher.colorado.gov/Academics/Complaints/default.html> or via US mail or e-mail and describes: (a) the basis for the complaint; (b) the institution's complaints and appeals process that was followed; and (c) the institution's final decision (including copies of documentation); and (d) the desired resolution.
- 4.01.03 To give the Department written permission to communicate with the institution regarding the complaint, as well as written permission to review any personally-identifiable student education records which may pertain to the subject of the complaint.
- 4.01.04 To be clear about what the complaint is and what resolution is sought.
- 4.01.05 To provide the Department with all requested documentation.

- 4.02 Responsibilities of the Department**
 - 4.02.01 To advise students on how to follow the policies and procedures for resolving complaints at the institution where they are or were enrolled.
 - 4.02.02 To help students understand their rights under Colorado law.
 - 4.02.03 To modify state policies and request that institutions review, and if necessary, modify their policies to try and prevent student problems.
 - 4.02.04 To publicize its complaint policy and to promote the publication of all institutions' complaint and appeal policies.

- 4.03 Responsibilities of the Governing Board of a Public Institution of Higher Education
 - 4.03.01 To ensure that its institution(s) complies with state law and policy regarding appeals, including the intent for students to have a timely and fair hearing.
 - 4.03.02 To adopt student complaint and appeal procedures for its institution(s).

- 4.04 Responsibilities of the Public Institution of Higher Education
 - 4.04.01 To investigate student complaints in a timely and unbiased manner.

Agenda Item V, A

ATTACHMENT A

- 4.04.02 To publish its complaint and appeal procedures in prominent student publications, including, but not limited to the course catalog, student handbook, and its website.

- 4.05 Responsibilities of the Private Institution of Higher Education
 - 4.05.01 To investigate student complaints or appeals in a timely and unbiased manner.

 - 4.05.02 To investigate student complaints filed with the Department that allege an institution violated one of the requirements set forth in section 2.02 of this policy. Pursuant to §23-2-104(4), C.R.S. it is deceptive trade practice for:
 - a. An institution or agent to make or cause to be made any statement or representation, oral, written, or visual, in connection with the offering of educational services if the institution or agent knows or reasonably should have known the statement or representation to be materially false, substantially inaccurate or materially misleading;

 - b. An institution or agent to represent falsely or to deceptively conceal, directly or by implication, through the use of a trade or business name the fact that an institution is a school;

 - c. An institution or agent to adopt a name, trade name, or trademark that represents falsely, directly or by implication, the quality, scope, nature, size, or integrity of the institution or its educational services;

 - d. An institution or agent to intentionally and materially represent falsely, directly or by implication, that student who successfully completes a course or program of instruction may transfer the credits earned to any institution of higher education;

 - e. An institution or agent to intentionally and materially represent falsely, directly or by implication, in its advertising or promotional materials or in any other manner, the size, location, facilities, or equipment of the institution, the number or educational experience qualifications of its faculty, the extent or nature of any accreditation received from any accrediting agency or association;

 - f. An institution or agent to provide prospective students with any testimonials, endorsements, or other information that may materially mislead or deceive prospective students or the public regarding current practices of the institution;

 - g. An agent representing an out-of-state school to represent, directly or by implication, that the school is authorized by the state of Colorado

Agenda Item V, A

ATTACHMENT A

or approved or accredited by an accrediting agency or body when the institution has not been authorized, approved or accredited; and

- h. An institution to designate or refer to its sales representatives by titles that imply the sales representatives have training in academic counseling or advising if they do not.

4.05.03 To investigate complaints violating the requirements set forth in section 5.00 of this policy, for the purposes of SARA.

4.05.04 To publish its complaint and appeal procedures, where to file a complaint with the Colorado Department of Higher Education, contact information for the institution's accrediting agency in prominent student publications, including, but not limited to the course catalog, student handbook, and on its website.

5.00 State Authorization and Reciprocity Agreement (SARA) Requirements

5.01 Consumer protection under SARA means that the home state and any other necessary parties will investigate and resolve claims of any dishonest or fraudulent activity by any provider, including giving false or misleading information to a student. Consumer protection also includes investigating and resolving complaints that an institution is operating a course or program contrary to practices as set forth in the Interregional Guidelines for the Evaluation of Distance Education (C-RAC) guidelines in such a way that a student is harmed. Examples of issues that may arise include, but are not limited to:

5.01.01 Veracity of recruitment and marketing materials;

5.01.02 Accuracy of job placement data;

5.01.03 Accuracy of information about tuition, fees and financial aid;

5.01.04 Complete and correct admission requirements for courses and programs;

5.01.05 Accuracy of information about whether course work meets professional licensing requirements, in SARA Policies and Standards;

5.01.06 Operation of distance education programs consistent with practices expected by institutional and, if applicable, programmatic accreditors, and the C-RAC guidelines for distance education.

5.02 Specifically, the C-RAC guidelines to which participating public and private institutions will be held accountable include:

5.02.01 Online learning is appropriate to the institution's mission and purposes.

5.02.02 The institution's plans for developing, sustaining, and, if appropriate, expanding online learning offerings are integrated into its regular planning and evaluation processes;

Agenda Item V, A

ATTACHMENT A

- 5.02.03 Online learning is incorporated into the institution's systems of governance and academic oversight;
- 5.02.04 Curricula for the institution's online learning offerings are coherent, cohesive, and comparable in academic rigor to programs offered in traditional instructional formats;
- 5.02.05 The institution evaluates the effectiveness of its online learning offerings, including the extent to which the online learning goals are achieved, and uses the results of its evaluations to enhance the attainment of the goals;
- 5.02.06 Faculty responsible for delivering the online learning curricula and evaluating the students' success in achieving the online learning goals are appropriately qualified and effectively supported;
- 5.02.07 The institution provides effective student and academic services to support students enrolled in online learning offerings;
- 5.02.08 The institution provides sufficient resources to support and, if appropriate, expand its online learning offerings; and
- 5.02.09 The institution assures the integrity of its online offerings.

HISTORY: CCHE Agenda Item II, A – November 1, 2012; CCHE Agenda Item III, A – July 25, 2013; CCHE Agenda Item V, C – March 14, 2014; CCHE Agenda Item III, H—April 11, 2014

TOPIC: DEGREE AUTHORIZATION ACT: AMERICAN MANAGEMENT AND TECHNOLOGY SCHOOL – VOLUNTARY RELINQUISHMENT OF PROVISIONAL AUTHORIZATION

PREPARED BY: HEATHER DELANGE, OFFICE OF PRIVATE POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

I. SUMMARY

This discussion item provides an update to the Commission regarding the provisional authorization for American Management and Technology School.

II. BACKGROUND

The Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) has statutory responsibility for administration of Title 23, Article 2 of the Colorado Revised Statutes, commonly referred to as the Degree Authorization Act (DAA). The Act sets out the terms by which the Commission may authorize accredited private colleges and universities, out-of-state public colleges and universities, and seminaries and bible colleges to operate in Colorado.

The DAA outlines the Department's jurisdiction over private education programs available to the residents of the state of Colorado. The DAA establishes standards to (1) prevent misrepresentation, fraud, and collusion in offering educational programs to the public and (2) protect, preserve, foster, and encourage the educational programs offered by private educational institutions, which meet generally recognized criteria of quality and effectiveness as determined through voluntary accreditation.

CCHE policy outlines the various authorization levels for private institutions; a start-up institution must renew annually while making consistent progress toward accreditation. The American Management and Technology School received Provisional Authorization in October 2018. In response to the reminder to apply for renewal, staff received notice from the leaders that they will not be seeking renewal of provisional authorization.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

American Management and Technology School (AMTS) was a new, start-up, institution with provisional authorization desiring to offer online programs from Colorado to students worldwide. Upon responding to the due date for renewal documents, the leadership team at AMTS informed DHE staff of the decision to discontinue the effort.

As a start-up institution, there are several milestones that institutions must meet in order to meet the requirement in continuously progressing toward accreditation. The leadership has informed staff that because the technology programs would need revamping to address the advancements in technology. Continuing with the program curriculum, the students would be learning old and

possibly obsolete technology knowledge. AMTS had not enrolled any students into any program making the decision to relinquish authorization and cease the effort easier.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

This is a discussion item only; staff makes no recommendation at this time.

V. STATUTORY AUTHORITY

C.R.S. §23-2-103.3 Authorization to operate in Colorado – renewal

(7)(a) The Commission shall adopt procedures by which a private college or university or seminary or religious training institution may renew its authorization to operate in Colorado. To renew its authorization to operate in Colorado, a private college or university...shall demonstrate that it continues to meet the minimum operating standards.

TOPIC: DEGREE AUTHORIZATION ACT: CALVARY UNIVERSITY –
REQUEST FOR PROVISIONAL AUTHORIZATION

PREPARED BY: HEATHER DELANGE, OFFICE OF PRIVATE POSTSECONDARY
EDUCATION

I. SUMMARY

This discussion item is the precursor for a future action item recommending provisional authorization for Calvary University to operate as an authorized private, degree-granting institution in Colorado pursuant to the Degree Authorization Act (§23-2-101 et seq.).

II. BACKGROUND

The Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) has statutory responsibility for administration of Title 23, Article 2 of the Colorado Revised Statutes, commonly referred to as the Degree Authorization Act (DAA). The Act sets out the terms by which the Commission may authorize accredited private colleges and universities, out-of-state public colleges and universities, and seminaries and bible colleges to operate in Colorado.

The DAA outlines the Department's jurisdiction over private education programs available to the residents of the state of Colorado. The DAA establishes standards to (1) prevent misrepresentation, fraud, and collusion in offering educational programs to the public and (2) protect, preserve, foster, and encourage the educational programs offered by private educational institutions, which meet generally recognized criteria of quality and effectiveness as determined through voluntary accreditation.

Provisional authorization is the authorization level for institutions, new or new to Colorado, which have been evaluated by Department staff under Commission procedures and authorized by the Commission to enroll students, offer instruction, graduate students and award degrees under the condition that the institution is continuously seeking and is making satisfactory progress toward accreditation at the local site. Institutions with provisional authorization are required to renew annually and must receive accreditation at the Colorado site within three years of initial authorization.

Calvary University is a not-for-profit, faith-related institution of higher education located on a former military base in suburban Kansas City, Missouri. Calvary University received authorization from the CCHE to operate as a Religious Training Institution in Fort Morgan, Colorado and is looking to expand the programs offered in Colorado. Calvary University is accredited by the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) and the Association of Biblical Higher Education (ABHE).

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

Calvary University operates as faith-related institution in Missouri and as such offers both religious and secular degree programs. Calvary University received Commission authorization to operate as a religious training institution in Fort Morgan, Colorado in May 2018. As part of the expansion into Fort Morgan, Colorado, Calvary is seeking receive authorization as a private college/university to offer its secular programs, which include bachelor's degrees in education, theatre, music and business as well as master's level degrees in education and organization development.

As required by the Degree Authorization Act, Calvary University submitted the required documents concerning its organization, programs, accreditation and finances. Department staff contracted an evaluation team to review the application materials. The team had binding recommendations which required response from Calvary.

Pursuant to statute, institutions new to Colorado shall execute a bond or other surety instrument to provide indemnification to any student that the Commission finds to have suffered loss of tuition or any fees as a result of any act or practice that is a violation of statute. Calvary University officials have secured the required bond to meet this requirement.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends the Commission approve provisional authorization for Calvary University to operate in Colorado. If it sees fit, the Commission may wish to move this item to the action agenda and approve the recommendation.

STATUTORY AUTHORITY

C.R.S. §23-2-103.3 Authorization to operate in Colorado – renewal

(1) (a) To operate in Colorado, a private college or university shall apply for and receive authorization from the commission. A private college or university shall obtain a separate authorization for each campus, branch, or site that is separately accredited. A private, nonprofit college or university shall submit with its application verification of nonprofit status, including a copy of the institution's tax-exempt certificate issued by the Colorado department of revenue.

(b) After receiving an application, the department shall review the application to determine whether the private college or university is institutionally accredited by a regional or national accrediting body recognized by the United States department of education. The department shall not recommend and the commission shall not approve an application from a private college or university that, in the two years preceding submission of the application, has had its accreditation suspended or withdrawn or has been prohibited from operating in another state or that has substantially the same owners, governing board, or principal officers as a private college or university that, in the two years preceding submission of the application, has had its accreditation suspended or withdrawn or has been prohibited from operating in another state.

(2) To operate in Colorado, a private college or university shall be institutionally accredited on the basis of an on-site review by a regional or national accrediting body recognized by the United States department of education; except that a private college or university may operate for an initial period without accreditation if the commission determines, in accordance with standards established by the commission, that the private college or university is likely to become accredited in a reasonable period of time or is making progress toward accreditation in accordance with the accrediting body's policies. The commission may grant a provisional authorization to a private college or university to operate for an initial period without accreditation. The private college or university shall annually renew its provisional authorization and report annually to the commission concerning the institution's progress in obtaining accreditation.

TOPIC: PROCESS TO REVISE CCHE POLICY I, PART E: DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION

PREPARED BY: DR. CHRIS RASMUSSEN, DIRECTOR OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

I. SUMMARY

This discussion item updates the Commission on efforts to revise CCHE policies in response to House Bill 19-1206 (Concerning Removing Equity Gaps in Higher Education by Ensuring More Students Have Access to Supplemental Academic Instruction) and staff actions to engage stakeholders in the process.

II. BACKGROUND

On April 25, Governor Polis signed into law [HB 19-1206](#) (Higher Education Supplemental Academic Instruction). This was a priority legislative agenda item for the Department with bipartisan sponsorship and support in both the House and Senate. The act amended various parts of state statute, most prominently CRS §23-1-113 and CRS §23-1-113.3, concerning the delivery of basic skills/developmental education courses by state-supported institutions of higher education in Colorado. The act is designed to move institutions away from the use of pre-requisite remedial education courses and toward Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) or other forms of co-requisite remediation (credit-bearing courses or other supports offered in conjunction with a gateway, college-level course). The Act directs the Commission to adopt a developmental education policy that requires public institutions of higher education to maximize the likelihood of student success in gateway courses in math and English.

The key provisions of the act are as follows:

- For institutions authorized to offer developmental education, the act requires that, beginning in the 2022-23 academic year, no more than 10 percent of enrolling students shall be placed into pre-requisite developmental education courses (CRS §23-1-113.3(1)(a)(I)).
- For institutions authorized to offer developmental education, the act requires that, by August 1, 2021, institutions shall have a plan in place to meet this requirement; the act also allows for institutions to request a two-year extension for full implementation (CRS §23-1-113.3(1)(a)(II)).
- The act prohibits the placement of a student into developmental education based on a single instrument or test (CRS §23-1-113(1.5)(a)(I)). It should be noted that the CCHE developmental education policy had already required the use of “multiple measures” to assess and place students into developmental education, and the act provides an additional legislative mandate.
- The act allows institutions to pilot new approaches to developmental education for students who may not benefit from SAI or other forms of co-requisite remediation, and to seek waivers from the commission to expand or duplicate successful pilot projects (CRS §23-1-113.3(1)(a)(III)).

- The act authorizes all four-year institutions to offer SAI—without requiring approval from the commission—to students who need additional supports to be successful in college-level courses (CRS §23-1-113(1.5)(a)(II)).
- The act includes new institutional requirements to “use an evidence-based placement approach to placing students into English as a second language courses” and to maximize the likelihood that English language learners will complete gateway courses in English within three years (CRS §23-1-113(1.5)(a)(I)).
- The act clarifies and adds reporting requirements relating to developmental education and SAI (CRS §23-1-113(1.5)(b); CRS §23-1-113(9)(a)(I); CRS §23-1-113.3(3); CRS §23-1-113.3(4)).

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

In order to accommodate statutory changes, the department will propose a new [Developmental Education policy](#) (Section I, Part E) that will likely incorporate existing elements of the Commission’s [Supplemental Academic Instruction \(SAI\) policy](#) (Section I, Part W). The existing SAI policy is likely to be repealed.

In late July of this year, the Department sent a Dear Colleague letter to all public institutions of higher education identifying the key elements of the act, the statutory requirements of institutions identified in the act, and the Department’s plans for implementation. Since then, Department staff have engaged key stakeholder groups in discussions about policy revisions, including the Academic Council, the General Education Council, the Registrar Council, the Data Advisory Group, and Colorado Community College System Leadership. The staff also created a cross-functional workgroup on implementation of HB19-1206, which is comprised of faculty in English and in math, developmental education experts, academic administrators and policy specialists, registrars, and institutional researchers. This group convened in early November and will convene a second time in mid-December. Additionally, the Department hosted an open stakeholder meeting on December 3 to address specific provisions of HB19-1206 that address English as a Second Language (ESL) students. The open invitation was extended to subject matter experts in ESL instruction, advising, testing, placement, and support services.

The Department plans to bring revised policies to the Commission for discussion at its February meeting, with action at the March CCHE meeting. The following is a summary of the workplan adopted by the Department to ensure that CCHE revised policies are in full compliance with statutory changes

HB19-1206 Workgroup: Areas for Guidance to the Department

Placement Practices – Changes to developmental education placement and implications include:

Change 1: Institutions must place students in a way that maximizes success in gateway math and English within one year.

Implication: The department and the working group must define what it means to maximize success and determine how to track institutional outcomes.

Change 2: Institutions must use multiple measures to place students (new statutory mandate supporting existing CCHE policy).

Implication: Though not a change from current CCHE policy, current reports and data systems do not fully track multiple measures used for placement. Therefore, the department and the working group must define how they will track and report on multiple measures placement.

Change 3: Requires all students enrolled in a program that requires gateway courses in English and Math to complete those courses in their first 30 credits.

Implication: The department and working group must determine how they will define gateway courses and identify programs that require them, and track completion of said courses.

Policy Implementation – Changes to developmental education policy include:

Change 1: Institutions must move more students into Supplemental Academic Instruction; changes the definition of Supplemental Academic Instruction to include both credit-bearing and non-credit-bearing interventions.

Implication: The department and working group must ensure that they can 1) identify SAI/co-requisite courses that include a developmental component; and 2) identify students enrolled in credit-bearing *and* non-credit-bearing SAI.

Change 2: ESL students must be placed in a course or courses designed to maximize their success in gateway English.

Implication: The department and working group must understand variations in English-language fluency/literacy, and practices in ESL course placement and educational interventions that best serve students with different levels of fluency/literacy.

Change 3: Institutions may pilot new approaches to developmental education for students who may not benefit from SAI or other forms of co-requisite remediation, and to seek waivers from the commission to expand or duplicate successful pilot projects

Implication: The department and working group must define how they will monitor the success of pilots and evaluate/manage waiver requests.

Reporting and Accountability – Reporting requirements include:

Requirement 1: Consolidate data on developmental needs of Colorado's high school students into a single report.

Implication: The department began this transition in 2019 and will convene a working group specifically to review the postsecondary report.

Requirement 2: Requires the department to report on gateway course success and overall success of students identified as needing developmental supports.

Implication: The department—in consultation with the working group—will produce a new developmental education report that looks at gateway courses success and graduation rates for students needing developmental education.

Requirement 3: Requires the department to report on the costs of offering supplemental academic instruction.

Implication: The department and working group must define how they will measure the costs of (credit-bearing, non-credit-bearing, or both?) supplemental academic instruction.

Requirement 4: Requires the department to ensure that fewer than 10 percent of enrolling students are placed into pre-requisite developmental education courses that lengthen the time required to complete a degree. This provision was included in the act in recognition that some students do benefit from a traditional, prerequisite approach to developmental education.

Implication: The department must operationalize this threshold and determine the measures used to track students placed into development courses that lengthen the time required to complete a degree.

Technical Changes

Requirement 1: Requires new definitions—or affirmation of statutory definitions—in Commission policy, and alignment of definitions with data reporting requirements.

Implication: Terms to be defined or affirmed include “gateway course”, “supplemental academic instruction”, “academic support”, “co-requisite remediation”, “modified co-requisite supports”, “transfer-level course”, and “pilot program”.

Requirement 2: Requires determining criteria and an application process for 1) extensions for submission of institutional plans; 2) implementation of pilot projects.

Implication: This will be addressed following Commission approval of revised policies, and no later than the end of the 2019-2020 academic year.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

Discussion item only – no recommendations for Commission action.

V. STATUTORY AUTHORITY

C.R.S. §23-1-113

Commission directive – admission standards for baccalaureate and graduate institutions of higher education – policy – report – definitions.

...

(1.5) (a) (I) The commission shall establish and the governing boards shall implement a policy pursuant to section 23-1-113.3 to identify matriculated students who need additional supports to be successful in gateway courses in English and mathematics and standards and procedures whereby

state institutions of higher education may offer supplemental academic instruction or developmental education courses as provided in section 23-1-113.3. The commission's policy must prohibit the placement of a student in developmental education courses based on a single instrument or test and must be designed to maximize the likelihood that a student will complete gateway courses in English and mathematics within one year. In addition, the commission's policy must require state institutions to use an evidence-based placement approach to placing students into English as a second language courses, and placement of these students must be designed to maximize the likelihood that a student placed in English as a second language courses will complete gateway courses in English within three years. The commission, in consultation with the governing boards, shall ensure that the policy aligns with the admission policy adopted pursuant to subsection (1) of this section. In identifying the standards for developmental education, the commission may differentiate requirements for mathematics based on the prerequisite skills needed for required courses within a student's declared program of study.

(II) As part of the policy established pursuant to this subsection (1.5)(a), all state institutions of higher education are authorized to provide supplemental academic instruction even if the institution is not authorized to provide developmental education courses pursuant to section 23-1-113.3. The institution may receive stipend payments from the state pursuant to section 23-18-202 on behalf of an eligible undergraduate student, as defined in section 23-18-102 (5), who is enrolled in a college-level course that includes supplemental academic instruction or co-requisite support or who is enrolled in a pilot program pursuant to section 23-1-113.3 (1)(a)(III).

(b) Each governing board shall adopt policies and procedures that are aligned with the policy established by the commission pursuant to subsection (1.5)(a) of this section and that ensure that, to the extent required by the commission policy, each matriculated student who may need additional supports to be successful in gateway courses in English and mathematics has access to supplemental academic instruction. The institution that enrolls the student shall select which measures to use from among those that meet the standards established in the commission policy. The commission, in consultation with the governing boards, shall collect information regarding the measures used by the institutions for placement to help analyze the data reported pursuant to subsection (9) of this section and by section 23-1-113.3 (4).

(c) All students enrolled in programs that require gateway courses in English and mathematics at state institutions of higher education should complete gateway courses by the time the student completes thirty college-level credit hours.

...

(9) (a) Notwithstanding section 24-1-136 (11)(a)(I) to the contrary, on or before February 15, 2012, and on or before April 15 each year thereafter, the department of higher education shall submit to the state board of education, the department of education, and the education committees of the house of representatives and the senate, or any successor committees, a report, subject to available data, for the high school graduating classes of the preceding six academic years concerning:

(I) The need for additional supports for students to be successful in gateway courses in English and mathematics, the subject for which the students are identified as needing additional supports to be successful in gateway courses, and student success in gateway courses;

(II) First-year college grades; and

(III) Types of academic certificates and degrees attained at all postsecondary institutions in Colorado and the United States.

...

(11) As used in this section, unless the context otherwise requires:

(a) "Academic skills courses" means courses that teach the basic academic skills necessary to succeed at a postsecondary institution.

(b) "Developmental education courses" means courses that are prerequisites to the level of work expected at a postsecondary institution and include academic skills courses and preparatory courses.

(b.5) "Gateway course" means the first college-level course in English or mathematics that is approved for statewide transfer pursuant to section 23-1-125 (3) and that a student takes to fulfill the English or mathematics requirement for the student's program of study.

(c) "National assessment test scores" include, but are not limited to, ACT test scores and SAT test scores.

(d) "Preparatory courses" means courses designed for students who demonstrate a deficient skill level in the general competencies necessary to succeed in a standard postsecondary curriculum and include but are not limited to reading courses that focus on nontechnical vocabulary, word identification, and reading of everyday material; writing courses that focus primarily on grammar, usage, punctuation, and effective sentences and paragraphs; and mathematics courses primarily covering concepts introduced in elementary and intermediate algebra and geometry.

(e)

(I) "Supplemental academic instruction" means academic support models that use peer or instructor study sessions or individualized in-class academic support to improve student learning, retention, or success. "Supplemental academic instruction" also includes co-requisite and modified co-requisite supports. "Supplemental academic instruction" does not include prerequisite developmental education courses.

(II) As referenced in subsection (11)(e)(I) of this section, co-requisite or modified co-requisite supports are designed for students identified as needing additional supports to be successful in college-level gateway courses. Co-requisite models pair a transfer-level course with a support course, extending the instructional time through additional lecture or lab hours, or require students to participate in academic support services in mathematics, English, or writing.

C.R.S. §23-1-133.3

Commission directive – developmental education courses – report.

(1) (a) (I) As part of the policy adopted by the commission pursuant to section 23-1-113 (1.5)(a), the commission shall adopt and the governing boards shall implement standards and procedures whereby state institutions of higher education may offer developmental education courses, as defined in section 23-1-113 (11)(b), pursuant to this section, as prerequisites to a gateway course in English and mathematics, as defined in section 23-1-113 (11)(b.5). Beginning in the 2022-23 academic year, no more than ten percent of students enrolling in a state institution of higher education shall be enrolled directly into a developmental education course, as defined in section 23-1-113 (11)(b), that is prerequisite to a gateway course in English or mathematics if the developmental education course lengthens the student's time to degree beyond the time it would take the student to complete the degree if the student had enrolled directly into a gateway course.

(II) On or before August 1, 2021, each state institution of higher education authorized pursuant to subsection (2)(a) of this section to offer developmental education courses, as defined in section 23-1-113 (11)(b), shall have a plan in place to meet the requirements described in subsection (1)(a)(I) of this section. The commission's standards and procedures must allow an institution of higher education to request an extension from the commission of up to two years to meet the requirements described in subsection (1)(a)(I) of this section, upon demonstrating exceptional circumstances.

(III) The commission's standards and procedures adopted pursuant to subsection (1)(a)(I) of this section must allow state institutions of higher education serving groups of students who are not successful in supplemental academic instruction to pilot different approaches that are more successful for those students and to request a waiver from the commission's standards and procedures in order to duplicate or expand successful approaches.

(2) (a) Subject to the provisions of this section, Adams state university, Colorado Mesa university, Western Colorado university in Chaffee and Gunnison counties, any local community college, and any community college governed by the state board for community colleges and occupational education may offer developmental education courses, as defined in section 23-1-113 (11)(b), and receive stipend payments from the state on behalf of eligible undergraduate students, as defined in section 23-18-102 (5).

(b) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (5) of this section, any state institution of higher education not specified in subsection (2)(a) of this section is prohibited from offering a developmental education course, unless the course is offered by contract through any of the institutions of higher education specified in subsection (2)(a) of this section.

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (2)(b) of this section, Metropolitan state university of Denver and the university of Colorado at Denver are prohibited from offering developmental education courses.

(3) Each state institution of higher education shall track all students who are identified as needing additional supports to be successful in gateway courses in English or mathematics pursuant to section 23-1-113 (1.5) in order to determine whether those students successfully complete requirements for graduation.

(4) (a) Notwithstanding section 24-1-136 (11)(a)(I) to the contrary, the department shall transmit annually to the education committees of the senate and the house of representatives, or any successor committees, the joint budget committee, the commission, and the department of education an analysis of the data:

(I) Regarding students who are identified as needing additional supports to be successful in gateway courses in English and mathematics, pursuant to section 23-1-113 (1.5), and who receive supplemental academic instruction or are enrolled in developmental education courses; and

(II) Regarding the costs of providing supplemental academic instruction or developmental education courses pursuant to section 23-1-113 (1.5) and whether students who receive supplemental academic instruction or complete developmental education courses successfully complete the requirements for graduation.

(b) (Deleted by amendment, L. 2019.)

(5) Any state institution of higher education not specified in subsection (2)(a) of this section offering a developmental education course on a cash-funded basis shall report annually to the department the same data that is required to be compiled and tracked pursuant to subsection (3) of this section.

(5.5) The institution and the department shall report the information specified in subsections (3) and (4) of this section on an individual student basis, using each student's unique student identifier.

(6) For purposes of this section, "local community college" includes Aims community college and Colorado mountain college.

TOPIC: FUNDING ALLOCATION FORMULA UPDATE

PREPARED BY: JASON SCHROCK, CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER; EMILY BURNS,
SENIOR FINANCE ANALYST; EMMA FEDORCHUK, BUDGET
AND FINANCE ANALYST

I. SUMMARY

This discussion item is to provide an update on the funding formula revision.

II. BACKGROUND

The Department submitted a report on the funding formula as required by SB 19-095 on November 12 (Attachment A). The report discusses the formula review process over the past several months and recommendations for the formula. The recommendation includes the formula structure that staff has developed over the past several months, which is intended to allocate 10% of base funding and all new funding with the intention of increasing the amount of base funding allocated over time to ultimately reach 100% of funding. The recommendation states that further development of the formula is necessary to allocate increasing portions of base funding over time.

The Commission adopted a resolution on the formula at its meeting on October 24, 2019. The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas, The Commission is required to provide a funding allocation formula recommendation by November 1, 2019;

Whereas, additional time is required by the Commission to finalize such a formula, however, the Commission is supportive of a principle-based approach consistent with the Master Plan.

Now therefore, it is resolved by the Commission that:

- a. The Commission supports an allocation formula this is consistent with the Master Plan and values completions, equity and graduation rates, and improvements in those rates.
- b. That such final formula has predictability and reliability for institutions, families and students and drive affordability.

III. STAFF ANALYSIS

An update on the funding formula work will be shared and discussed at the meeting, including next steps in the development of the formula. Staff has had further discussions with the Governor's office regarding the formula since the October 24 Commission meeting. As stated above, further evaluation of the formula is necessary to allocate increasing portions of base funding and ensure stability in funding to the state's widely varying institutions. Staff is working

on new components to the formula but does not have anything finalized at this time; however, staff will discuss some of the working concepts.

It is both the Department's and Governor's office's goal to ensure that the further development of the formula will involve collaboration with all stakeholders, including the Commission and the state's higher education institutions, and be aligned with the following core principles:

- **Simplicity and Transparency:** The formula must be understandable so that policymakers, institutions, and the public can clearly understand what outcomes and activities drive funding changes; the Department has strived to ensure that a new formula is simpler and more predictable without the need to have guardrails and ongoing adjustments that add complexity.
- **Master Plan Alignment:** The formula must be clearly tied to the Master Plan
- **Outcomes-Based:** The formula must provide incentives for institutions to improve their performance over time to lead to stronger outcomes for Colorado students
- **Volume Mitigation:** Smaller institutions should have the same ability to succeed in the formula based on outcomes as larger institutions.

There is no specific timeline for completion of the new formula, but it is hoped that the formula can be finalized during the 2020 legislative session. Legislation will need to be introduced in the legislative session in order to enact the statutory changes needed to implement the formula.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Commission provide feedback regarding the future development of the formula.

V. STATUTORY AUTHORITY

23-18-306 Duties and powers of the commission – department - role and mission factors and performance metrics - consultation with interested parties - facilitator - reports - definition – repeal

(5.5) (a) Commencing in 2019 and every five years thereafter, the commission shall review the funding formula established pursuant to this section and, by November 1, 2019, and November 1 every five years thereafter, submit a report to the governor, the joint budget committee of the general assembly, and the education committees of the senate and the house of representatives, or any successor committees, containing changes to the funding formula and any recommendations for legislative changes.

(b) In conducting the review required by subsection (5.5)(a) of this section, the commission and the department shall:

- (I) Convene one or more meetings with interested parties to discuss the existing funding model and to learn of issues raised by the interested parties;
- (II) Conduct an analysis of the issues identified by interested parties and possible solutions;
- (III) Engage directly with the institutions to strive for consensus among the institutions on any proposed changes; and

(IV) If applicable, develop a set of changes to recommend to the governor and committees of the general assembly.

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 24-1-136 (11)(a)(I), the reporting requirement pursuant to this subsection (5.5) continues indefinitely.

(5.5) (a) Commencing in 2019 and every five years thereafter, the commission shall review the funding formula established pursuant to this section and, by November 1, 2019, and November 1 every five years thereafter, submit a report to the governor, the joint budget committee of the general assembly, and the education committees of the senate and the house of representatives, or any successor committees, containing changes to the funding formula and any recommendations for legislative changes.

(b) In conducting the review required by subsection (5.5)(a) of this section, the commission and the department shall:

(I) Convene one or more meetings with interested parties to discuss the existing funding model and to learn of issues raised by the interested parties;

(II) Conduct an analysis of the issues identified by interested parties and possible solutions;

(III) Engage directly with the institutions to strive for consensus among the institutions on any proposed changes; and

(IV) If applicable, develop a set of changes to recommend to the governor and committees of the general assembly.

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 24-1-136 (11)(a)(I), the reporting requirement pursuant to this subsection (5.5) continues indefinitely.

ATTACHMENTS:

ATTACHMENT A: SB 19-095 Report for the Higher Education Funding Allocation Formula



SB 19-095 Report for the Higher Education Funding Allocation Formula

The Department of Higher Education (the Department) and the Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE, the Commission) have conducted a review, as required by SB 19-095, of the higher education funding allocation formula established pursuant to House Bill 14-1319.

This report is being submitted to the Joint Budget Committee and House and Senate Education Committees as required by the legislation.

PROCESS FOR REVIEW AND FEEDBACK ON EXISTING FORMULA

The Department engaged interested parties as part of the review process, including the state's public higher education institutions, to discuss how the formula could be updated to better align with the newly updated higher education Master Plan, meet access and equity needs, and incent performance for the benefit of Colorado students – while still providing stability for our institutions. Department staff also engaged with other states that have implemented funding allocation formulas, as well as with researchers who study the impact of outcomes-based funding allocation formulas. Furthermore, a working group of Commissioners was formed and met on a regular basis to discuss how the formula could be updated. These meetings were open to the public and regularly attended by representatives from the public institutions of higher education.

Prior to the passage of SB 19-095, the Commission expressed interest in engaging in a holistic review of the funding allocation formula, given that it had been in place for 5 years and the statutory “guardrails” that had been put in place to stabilize institutional allocations over time were scheduled to come off; the complexity of the formula; adjustments that have been made to the formula over time to ensure it provided a stable level of funding to institutions; and, the needed alignment with the Commission's Master Plan, *Colorado Rises* – which identifies four strategic goals for higher education in Colorado:

1. Increasing credential completion;
2. Erasing equity gaps;
3. Improving student success; and;
4. Investing in affordability and innovation.

In addition, the Commission believes the existing formula does not sufficiently address Colorado's significant attainment gap among low-income, first-generation, and traditionally underserved students.

Concerns interested parties raised included:

1. How the formula's complexity prevents clear alignment with the goals of the higher education Master Plan;
2. The formula is too volume-driven, to the point that smaller institutions' outcomes in the formula can be eclipsed by the outcomes of the larger institutions.
3. How can the formula prevent the need for “guardrails” over time by ensuring the formula is simple and understandable, without creating major instability in allocations for institutions?
4. What is an appropriate level of base funding for each of the state's higher education institutions? The Department has contracted with a third-party research organization to conduct an evaluation to inform a

meaningful, rational methodology to assess the base funding amounts for institutions and how those amounts may need to be adjusted.

The review process helped focus the Department, the Commission, and stakeholders on seeking alignment with the following core principles:

- **Simplicity and Transparency** - the formula must be understandable so that policymakers, institutions, and the public can clearly understand what outcomes and activities drive funding changes; the Department has strived to ensure that a new formula is simpler and more predictable without the need to have guardrails and ongoing adjustments that add complexity.
- **Master Plan Alignment** - the formula must be clearly tied to the Master Plan
- **Outcomes-Based** - the formula must provide incentives for institutions to improve their performance over time to lead to stronger outcomes for Colorado students
- **Volume Mitigation** - smaller institutions should have the same ability to succeed in the formula based on outcomes as larger institutions.

RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO FORMULA

The Department and the Commission developed, considered, and evaluated multiple formula concepts. The final structure agreed upon meets the principles above and would allocate 10% of the FY 2019-20 operational funding as well as all new funding, with the intention of increasing the amount of base funding allocated over time to ultimately reach 100% of funding through the new formula.

The new structure would allocate state investment as follows:

- **40% to Operational Support** - adjusted for geographical location
- **30% to Equity and Enrollment** – distribution based on enrollment of target populations in Master Plan
- **20% for Overall Completions** - weighted by type and field, with an additional bump for target populations in Master Plan
- **10% for Graduation Rate** – incenting timely completion

See Appendix A for a detailed description of the structure of the proposed new formula components.

In addition, the Department recommends the School of Mines be treated as a Specialty Education Program (SEP) moving forward, but reserves the ability to further evaluate how this institution and the other SEPs (UC Health Science Center and CSU Veterinary Medicine) could or should be further incorporated into the formula's performance incentives in the future.

The recommendation for Mines to be treated as an SEP is based on the following factors:

- The highly specialized nature of Mines' programs at both the undergraduate and graduate levels;
- In the 2018-19 academic year, 84% of baccalaureate degrees Mines awarded to resident students were classified as engineering degrees;
- Mines is recognized as a specialized program in both its establishing statute and current law related to the funding allocation model; and,
- 100% of the operating funding dollars they receive from the state are used for student wraparound services. Mines has committed to maintaining this provision and working with the Department moving forward in addressing how to erase equity gaps at their school.

COMMISSION RESOLUTION

The Colorado Commission on Higher Education adopted a resolution on the formula at their October 24, 2019 meeting. The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas, The Commission is required to provide a funding allocation formula recommendation by November 1, 2019;

Whereas, additional time is required by the Commission to finalize such a formula, however, the Commission is supportive of a principle-based approach consistent with the Master Plan.

Now therefore, it is resolved by the Commission that:

- a. The Commission supports an allocation formula this is consistent with the Master Plan and values completions, equity and graduation rates, and improvements in those rates.
- b. That such final formula has predictability and reliability for institutions, families and students and drive affordability

NEXT STEPS

The Department requests legislation be introduced in the 2020 legislative session in order to enact the statutory changes needed to implement the proposed funding allocation formula. In addition, further evaluation of the formula is necessary to allocate increasing portions of base funding, beyond the 10 percent in the first year, to ensure stability in funding to the state's widely varying institutions.

The Department and the Commission will continue to engage stakeholders, with the core principles outlined above in mind, to further refine the formula structure and metrics. Furthermore, the Department hopes to work closely with your committees to champion this important work for Colorado students and get the necessary legislation enacted.

##

If you should have any questions, please contact Chloe Mugg, Legislative Liaison for the Department of Higher Education, (913) 744-8714 or chloe.mugg@dhe.state.co.us

Proposed New Funding Allocation Formula | FY 2020-2021

Annual State Appropriations

Funding Through Allocation Formula

Any new money plus 10% of base funding from FY 19-20

Includes Adams, Colorado Mesa, CCCS, CU System, CSU System, Fort Lewis, MSU Denver, UNC, Western

Increase to SEPs/LDCs/ATCs

Overall percentage increase in given fiscal year

SEP: Specialty education program
LDC: Local district college
ATC: Area technical college

Our Vision

CDHE aims to incrementally increase the amount of base funding (prior year's appropriation) each year until 100% of money awarded to institutions is allocated through the formula. *Future revisions to the formula may be necessary to allocate more base funding.*

SEPs: Colorado School of Mines, CU Anschutz School of Medicine, CSU Veterinary Teaching Hospital
LDCs: Colorado Mountain College, Aims Community College
ATCs: Emily Griffith Technical College, Technical College of the Rockies, Pickens Technical College



40% Operational Support

An across-the-board percentage increase adjusted based on geography

Additional funding recognizes the unique needs of varying geographic locations. Weights exclude higher education systems (Colorado Community College System, CU System, CSU System).

GEOGRAPHIC WEIGHTS

Remote or Distant Town
1.75



Small City
1.60



Midsize City
1.45



Large City
1.30



30% Equity and Enrollment

Funding based on enrollment of target populations identified in the CCHE Master Plan

NUMBER OF PELL-ELIGIBLE and URM STUDENTS

Institutions receive more funding based on:

- Percentage of Pell and URM students enrolled
- Percentage of Pell and URM populations relative to statewide student population

UNDERREPRESENTED MINORITY (URM) STUDENTS INCLUDE

American Indian or Alaska Native
Two or more races

Hispanic
Black

CDHE anticipates adding a **first-generation** category to this metric upon standardizing a data collection process with institutional research offices.



20% Completions

Rewards for graduating students with additional weights for credential level, field and student demographics

CREDENTIALS ARE MULTIPLIED BY

1 Type Certificate: 0.25
Associates: 0.5
Baccalaureate: 1
Graduate Certificate: 0.25
Master's/Specialist/Doctoral: 1.25

2 Field STEM-Health: 1.5
Educator Preparation: 1.5
All other: 1



STUDENT DEMOGRAPHICS

After accounting for credential type and field, students are counted again if they are Pell Grant-eligible and/or belong to an underrepresented group. Students who belong to both demographic groups are counted three times.



- Pell Grant-eligible
- URM



10% Graduation Rate

Incenting timely completion

In order to incent lower time to degree for students, this metric rewards institutions based on three factors:

- Their graduation rate
- Their graduation rate compared to that of their peer institutions
- For those institutions that are improving, their improvement compared to their peers

These three factors are combined to make a score, per institution.

TIME-TO-CREDENTIAL METRICS



This methodology is used for both 100% of time and 150% of time to graduation. Of the 10% of funding allocated through this metric, 5% is used for 100% of time scores and 5% is used for 150% of time scores.

	100%	150%	
Associate Degree:	Two years	Three years	
Bachelor Degree:	Four years	Six years	

COLORADO COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION - BYLAWS

Section 1. Organization and Meetings

- 1.1 **Organization:** Pursuant to C.R.S. §23-1-102, the Commission shall consist of eleven members appointed by the Governor with the consent of the Senate. The members of the Commission are selected on the basis of their knowledge of and interest in higher education and shall serve for four-year terms. No member of the Commission may serve more than two consecutive full four-year terms.
- 1.2 **Officers:** Pursuant to C.R.S. §23-1-110, the officers of the Commission shall be the Chair and Vice Chair. The Secretary shall be the Executive Director of the Commission and the Department and is a non-voting member of the Commission. The Governor appoints, with the consent of the Senate, the Executive Director to serve as the executive officer of the Commission and the Department.
- 1.3 All officers shall be elected at the May meeting of the Commission to serve a term of one year, except the Secretary whose term shall be coterminous with his or her term as Executive Director. Any member may nominate themselves or another member to be chair or vice-chair. Members will vote on each position; if there is more than one nomination the vote will be conducted by private ballot to be counted by the Secretary. Officers shall be limited to two consecutive terms, unless an exception is approved by a vote of more than 60 percent of the Commission. When possible, a Commissioner is encouraged to serve as vice-chair prior to becoming chair.
- 1.4 **Regular Meetings of the Commission:** The Commission shall adopt at the October Commission meeting a schedule of regular meetings of the Commission for the following calendar year.
- 1.3 **Notice of Meetings:** Any meetings at which the adoption of any proposed policy, position, resolution, rule, regulation, or formal action occurs or at which a majority or quorum of the body is in attendance, or is expected to be in attendance, shall be held only after full and timely notice to the public. In addition to any other means selected by the Commission for giving notice to the public, the Commission shall post notice of its meetings at the office of the Colorado Department of Higher Education located at 1560 Broadway, Suite 1600, Denver, Colorado 80202 and on the Colorado Department of Higher Education website. Notices shall be posted no less than two days prior to the holding of the meeting. The posting shall include specific agenda information where possible.
- 1.4 **Special Meetings:** Special meetings of the Commission may be held at the call of the Chair on two days' notice, or at the request of five members of the Commission who may petition the Chair to call such a meeting. Notice of special meetings shall be made electronically or by telephone and posted at the office and on the website of the Colorado

Department of Higher Education no less than two days prior to the meeting date.

- 1.5 **Conduct of Meetings:** The Chair shall preside at all meetings at which he or she is present. In the Chair's absence, the Vice Chair shall preside, and in the event both are absent, those present shall elect a presiding officer. All meetings shall be conducted in accordance with all State laws and regulations. The parliamentary rules contained in Robert's Rules of Order, latest revision, shall govern in all cases to which they are applicable, except as modified herein.
- 1.6 **Attendance at Meetings:** The term of any member of the Commission who misses more than two consecutive regular Commission meetings without good cause, as determined by the Chair, shall be terminated and his successor appointed in the manner provided for appointments under C.R.S. §23-1-102.
- 1.7 **Preparation of Agenda:** Meeting agendas shall be prepared by the Executive Director of the Department. A monthly agenda call will be scheduled with the Chair, Vice Chair, and Executive Director, or his or her designee, to discuss and approve the proposed agenda. At a regular or special meeting, an item of business may be considered for addition to the agenda by a majority vote of the Commissioners present.
- 1.8 **Minutes of the Commission:** The Secretary shall maintain an accurate set of minutes of Commission meetings, which shall include a complete record of all actions taken by the Commission. Such minutes shall constitute a permanent record. After the minutes of each meeting are completed they shall be reviewed by the Commission and, after approval, posted on the CCHE website and made available to the public for inspection upon written request.
- 1.9 **Standing Committees:** The Commission may create standing or ad hoc committees comprised of Commissioners to research and make recommendations on specific issues for the full Commission to consider and act on.

Section 2. Duties and Responsibilities of Officers

- 2.1 **Chair of the Commission:** The Chair of the Commission shall preside at meetings of the Commission at which he or she is in attendance.
- 2.2 **Vice Chair of the Commission:** The Vice Chair shall perform all duties of the Chair in the Chair's absence.
- 2.3 **The Secretary/Executive Director of the Commission:** In addition to performing those duties established by law, the Executive Director of the Commission and Department shall: (a) serve as the Secretary of the Commission, (b) meet with the officers and staff of institutions of higher learning as the needs dictate for a mutual discussion of the matters affecting the responsibilities of the Commission, (c) meet with appropriate state and federal groups and/or officials on matters pertaining to the Commission, (d) meet with appropriate committees of the General Assembly on matters pertaining to the

Commission's responsibilities, (e) appoint such professional staff as in his or her judgment are required and are within the budget approved by the Commission and for which funds are available, (f) prepare an annual operating budget and work program for approval by the Commission, (g) implement the policies of the Commission and communicate those policies to interested parties as appropriate.

Section 3. The Advisory Committee

3.1 There is hereby established an advisory committee pursuant to C.R.S. §23-1- 103).

Advisory Committee Members: The advisory committee shall consist of not less than thirteen members, to be designated as follows:

(a) Six members shall be appointed from the General Assembly, including three senators, two of whom shall be from the majority party, appointed by the President of the Senate and one of who shall be from the minority party appointed by the Minority Leader of the Senate, and three representatives, two of whom shall be from the majority party, appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and one of who shall be from the minority party appointed by the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives. Said six members shall be appointed for terms of two years or for the same terms to which they were elected to the general assembly, whichever is the lesser. Successors shall be appointed in the same manner as the original members;

(b) One member shall be selected and designated by the Commission, as recommended by the Colorado Faculty Advisory Council, to represent the faculty in the state;

(c) One member shall be selected and designated by the Commission, as recommended by the Student Affairs Council, to represent the students in the state for a term of one year, commencing on July 1 of the year appointed;

(d) One member shall be selected and designated by the Commission who is a parent of a student enrolled in a state supported institution of higher education in Colorado to represent the parents of students for a term of two years, commencing on July 1 of the year appointed.

(e) Not more than four additional members representing educational or other groups may be selected and designated by the Commission to serve on the advisory committee.

The Commission has designated the four additional advisory committee members to represent:

- Chief Academic Officers of Colorado's state supported institutions of higher education, as recommended by the Colorado Academic Council;
- Chief Financial Officers of Colorado's state supported institutions of higher education, as recommended by the, as recommended by the Chief Financial Officers group;

- Independent Higher Education Institutions in Colorado (Colorado College, Regis, and Denver University), as recommended by the Independent Higher Education Council; and,
- The K-12 system, as recommended by the Colorado Department of Education.

All such appointments shall be for a term of two years, commencing on July 1 of the year appointed.

- 3.2 Notice and Agendas: All members of the advisory committee shall receive agendas and background material and be notified of all public meetings of the Commission and shall be invited to attend for the purpose of suggesting solutions for the problems and needs of higher education and maintaining liaison with the general assembly.
- 3.3 Recommendations of the Advisory Committee: The members of the advisory committee shall have full opportunity to present their views on any matter before the Commission.

Section 4. Change in Bylaws

- 4.1 Bylaws shall be subject to amendment at any meeting of the Commission provided any such proposed change is listed on the agenda in accordance with the procedure outlined in Section 1.5 Notice of Meetings. Bylaw changes must be approved by a majority of the Commission.

HISTORY: Adopted on September 10, 1965. Amended January 14, 1966; February 25, 1972; June 1, 1978; July 1, 1993; October 7, 2004; May 6, 2011; CCHE Agenda March 3, 2017 Item V; April 5, 2019



COLORADO COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

- Chair Tom McGimpsey (*R-2nd Congressional District*) 1st term ends June 2021
- Vice Chair Vanecia Kerr (*D- 6th Congressional District*) 1st term ends June 2018
- Commissioner Paul Berrick Abramson (*U-7th Congressional District*) 1st term ends July 2023
- Commissioner Mary Beth Buescher (*D-3rd Congressional District*) 1st term ends June 2020
- Commissioner Luis Colón (*R-4th Congressional District*) 2nd term ends June 2021
- Commissioner Cassie Gannett (*U-5th Congressional District*) 1st term ends June 2020
- Commissioner Sarah Hughes (*D-3rd Congressional District*) 1st term ends July 2023
- Commissioner Charlotte Olena (*D-1st Congressional District*) 1st term ends July 2023
- Commissioner Brittany Stich (*D-1st Congressional District*) 1st term ends July 2022
- Commissioner Steven Trujillo (*D-3rd Congressional District*) 1st term ends July 2023
- Commissioner Eric Tucker (*U-5th Congressional District*) 1st term ends July 2023

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Legislative Advisors

- Representative Julie McCluskie, *House Majority Appointment*
- Representative Cathy Kipp, *House Majority Appointment*
- Representative Kevin Van Winkle, *House Minority Appointment*
- Senator Nancy Todd, *Senate Majority Appointment*
- Senator Tammy Story, *Senate Majority Appointment*
- Senator Paul Lundeen, *Senate Minority Appointment*

Subject Matter Advisors

- Mr. Wayne Artis, *Faculty Representative*
- Mark Cavanaugh, *IHEC Representative*
- Mr. Brad Baca, *Institutional Finance Representative*
- Dr. Rick Miranda, *Academic Council Representative*
- Ms. Misti Ruthven, *K-12 Representative*
- Ms. Christina Powell, *Parent Representative*





INSTITUTION AND SYSTEM LEADERS

<u>INSTITUTION</u>	<u>CEO</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>
Adams State University	Dr. Cheryl Lovell, President	Alamosa
Aims Community College	Dr. Leah Bornstein, President	Greeley
Community College System	Joe Garcia, Chancellor	Denver
Arapahoe CC	Dr. Diana Doyle, President	Littleton
Colorado Northwestern CC	Ron Granger, President	Rangely
CC of Aurora	Dr. Betsy Oudenhoven, President	Aurora
CC of Denver	Dr. Everette Freeman, President	Denver
Front Range CC	Andy Dorsey, President	Westminster
Lamar CC	Dr. Linda Lujan, President	Lamar
Morgan CC	Dr. Curt Freed, President	Ft. Morgan
Northeastern JC	Jay Lee, President	Sterling
Otero JC	Jim Rizzuto, President	La Junta
Pikes Peak CC	Dr. Lance Bolton, President	Colorado Springs
Pueblo CC	Dr. Patty Erjavec, President	Pueblo
Red Rocks CC	Dr. Michele Haney, President	Lakewood
Trinidad State JC	Dr. Carmen Simone, President	Trinidad
Colorado Mesa University	Tim Foster, President	Grand Junction
Colorado Mountain College	Dr. Carrie Besnette Hauser, President	Glenwood Springs
Colorado School of Mines	Paul Johnson, President	Golden
Colorado State System	Dr. Tony Frank, Chancellor	Denver
CSU-Ft Collins	Dr. Joyce McConnell, President	Fort Collins
CSU-Pueblo	Dr. Timothy Mottet, President	Pueblo
CSU-Global Campus	Dr. Becky Takeda-Tinker, President	Greenwood Village
CU System	Mark Kennedy, President	Denver
CU – Boulder	Dr. Philip DiStefano, Chancellor	Boulder
UCCS	Dr. Venkat Reddy, Chancellor	Colorado Springs
UCD	Dr. Dorothy Horrell, Chancellor	Denver
UC-Anschutz	Don Elliman, Chancellor	Aurora, Denver
Emily Griffith Technical College	Stephanie Donner, Executive Director	Denver
Ft. Lewis College	Dr. Tom Stritikus, President	Durango
Metropolitan State University of Denver	Janine Davidson, President	Denver



Pickens Technical College	Teina McConnell, Executive Director	Aurora
Technical College of the Rockies	Michael Klouser, Director	Delta
University of Northern Colorado	Dr. Andy Feinstein, President	Greeley
Western State Colorado University	Dr. Gregory Salsbury, President	Gunnison

Higher Education Glossary

529 Savings Plan - 529 plans are more than just savings accounts. These state-sponsored college savings plans were established by the federal government in Section 529 of the Internal Revenue Code to encourage families to save more for college. They offer unique state and federal tax benefits you can't get from other ways to save, making them one of the best ways to save for college.

Accuplacer - A suite of computer-adaptive placement tests that are used as assessment tools at institutions to evaluate the level of course work for a student. Students measured as needing additional course work will be assigned to remediation.

Admission Standard - includes both Freshman and Transfer standard. The freshman standard applies to all in-state and out-of-state new freshmen applicants and to transfer applicants with 12 or fewer college credit hours, except freshmen and transfer applicants who meet one of the admissions standards index exemptions. The transfer standard applies to all degree-seeking undergraduate transfer applicants with more than 12 college credit hours who do not meet one of the exemptions

Admission Window - Defined in Admission policy, "The maximum allowable percentage of admitted students who are not required to meet the CCHE admission standards within a specific fiscal year is referred to as the admissions window. Separate windows exist for the freshmen and transfer standards. The allowable percentage is determined by the Commission." The percentages vary by institution.

CAP4K - SB08-212, Preschool to Postsecondary Education Alignment Act; Colorado Achievement Plan for Kids.

CHEA - Council for Higher Education Accreditation. As described on their website, CHEA is "A national advocate and institutional voice for self-regulation of academic quality through accreditation, CHEA is an association of 3,000 degree-granting colleges and universities and recognizes 60 institutional and programmatic accrediting organizations."

CIP - Classification of Instructional Program; The purpose of which is to provide a taxonomic scheme that will support the accurate tracking, assessment, and reporting of fields of study and program completions activity. (Relevant in Role & Mission)

CLEP - College Level Examination Program; Earn college credit for passing a subject specific examination.

COA - Cost of Attendance; in the context of financial aid, it is an estimate of what it will reasonably cost the student to attend a given institution for a given period of time.

Concurrent Enrollment – A high school student enrolled for one or more classes at a college or university in addition to high school courses.

Dually Enrolled - A student enrolled at two institutions at the same time. This may affect enrollment reports when both institutions count that student as enrolled.

EFC - Expected Family Contribution; in the context of financial aid, it is calculated by a federally-approved formula that accounts for income, assets, number of family members attending college, and other information.

FAFSA - Free Application for Federal Student Aid. This is a free service provided by the Federal government under the Department of Education and students are not charged to complete/file the FAFSA.

FAP – Financial Aid Plan (HESP specific)

FERPA - Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, view federal website. The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) (20 U.S.C. § 1232g; 34 CFR Part 99) is a Federal law that protects the privacy of student education records. The law applies to all schools that receive funds under an applicable program of the U.S. Department of Education.

FFS – Fee-For-Service Contracts; A portion of the College Opportunity Fund program in addition to COF stipends, this contract provides funding to certain higher education institutions to supplement high cost programs and purchase additional services (such as graduate programs).

Floor - In reference to the admission window, the floor is the minimum requirements for admission without requiring an exception of some kind. This usually coincides with the Index score.

FTE - Full-time Equivalent; a way to measure a student's academic enrollment activity at an educational institution. An FTE of 1.0 means that the student is equivalent to full-time enrollment, or 30 credit hours per academic year for an undergraduate student.

GEARUP - Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs; A Federal discretionary grant program designed to increase the number of low-income students who are prepared to enter and succeed in postsecondary education.

Guaranteed Transfer, GT Pathways - gtPATHWAYS applies to all Colorado public institutions of higher education, and there are more than 900 lower-division general education courses in 20 subject areas approved for guaranteed transfer. Courses are approved at least twice per academic and calendar year and apply the next semester immediately following their approval.

HB 1023 - In most cases, refers to HB 06S-1023, which declares "It is the public policy of the state of Colorado that all persons eighteen years of age or older shall provide proof that they are lawfully present in the United States prior to receipt of certain public benefits."

HB 1024 - In most cases, refers to HB 06-1024, which declares "On or before September 1, 2006, each governing board of a state institution of higher education shall submit to the Colorado commission on higher education and the education committees of the senate and the house of representatives, or any successor committees, a report regarding underserved students".

HB 1057 - In most cases, refers to HB 05-1057, which declares "a college preparation program operating within the school district that the college preparation program shall provide to the Colorado commission on higher education, on or before December 31 of each school year, a report specifying each student, by unique identifying number."

HEAR - Higher Education Admission Requirements, 2008-2010.

Index, Index Score - This index score is a quantitative evaluation that is part of a larger student application evaluation. The score is generated from academic achievement (GPA or High School Rank) and college placement tests (ACT or SAT). You can calculate your index score online. Index varies by institution depending on that institutions selection criteria.

IPEDS - Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System; Run by NCES, this system collects statistical data and information on postsecondary institutions. The Colorado Department of Higher Education submits aggregated data on public institutions to IPEDS.

Need - In the context of student financial aid, Need is calculated by the difference between the COA (Cost of Attendance) and the EFC (Expected Family Contribution)

NCATE - National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education; NCATE is the profession's mechanism to help establish high quality teacher preparation.

NCLB - No Child Left Behind; The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) -- the main federal law affecting education from kindergarten through high school.

PSEO - Post Secondary Enrollment Option; A program that offers concurrent enrollment in college courses while in high school.

PWR - Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness; Definition was created during the SB08-212 CAP4K meetings.

QIS - Quality Indicator System; Implemented in HB96-1219, the specific quality indicators involved in QIS are similar to those used in the variety of quality indicator systems found in other states: graduation rates, freshmen retention and persistence rates, passing scores or rates on tests and licensure examinations, undergraduate class size, faculty teaching workload rates, and institutional support/administrative expenditures.

REP - Regional Education Provider; Colorado Statute authorizes Adams State College, Fort Lewis College, Mesa State College and Western State College to function as regional

educational providers and “have as their primary goal the assessment of regional educational needs...”
Regional education providers focus their attention on a certain geographical area.

SB 3 – In most cases refers to SB10-003, the Higher Education Flexibility Bill.

SB 212 - In most cases, refers to HB 08-212, the CAP4K legislation.

SBE - State Board of Education; As described on their website, "Members of the Colorado State Board of Education are charged by the Colorado Constitution with the general supervision of the public schools. They have numerous powers and duties specified in state law. Individuals are elected on a partisan basis to serve six-year terms without pay."

SFSF – State Fiscal Stabilization Fund; A component of the ARRA legislation and funding.

SURDS - Student Unit Record Data System

WICHE - Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education; A regional research and policy organization that assists students, policymakers, educators, and institutional, business and community leaders. WICHE states include: Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.

WUE - Western Undergraduate Exchange Program, managed by WICHE