METROPOLITAN STATE COLLEGE *of* DENVER
BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Wednesday, May 6, 2009
8:30am – 11:30pm
Tivoli Student Union Room 320
Auraria Campus

AGENDA

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. PRESENTATION OF AWARD TO MARK MARTINEZ

III. EXECUTIVE SESSION

a. **The Board may convene into Executive Session for the purpose of discussing personnel matters in accordance with 24-6-402(3)(b)(I), C.R.S. or to possibly confer with the Board's attorney to receive specific advice on legal questions in accordance with 24-6-402(3)(a)(II), C.R.S.**

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. **Approval of April 1, 2009 Board Meeting Minutes**

V. REPORTS (Optional)

a. **Chair's Report - Chair Adele Phelan**
b. **AHEC Board – Trustee Maria Garcia Berry**
c. **President – Dr. Stephen Jordan**
d. **Legislative Report – Capstone Group, LLC**
e. **Student Government – Student Government Assembly President Andrew Bateman**
f. **Finance Committee – Trustee Ellen Robinson**
g. **Academic and Student Affairs Committee – Trustee Antonio Esquibel**
h. **Public-Private Partnerships – Trustee Dawn Bookhardt**
i. **Foundation Report - Trustee Rob Cohen**
j. **Faculty Senate – Professor Lynn Kaersvang, President**
k. **Council of Chairs – Mr. Greg Watts**
l. **Alumni – Alumni Representative Gerie Grimes**

VI. ACTION ITEMS

The following item is presented by the Office of Administration and Finance:

a. **Hotel/HLC Financing**

VII. CONSENT ITEMS

The following item is presented jointly by the Office of Human Resources, the Office of Academic Affairs and the Handbook Committee:

a. **Handbook For Professional Personnel**

The following item is presented by the Office of Administration and Finance:

b. **Governing Board Fiduciary Oversight regarding the Four State Colleges in Colorado Defined Contribution Pension Plan (DCPP) for Faculty and Administrative Staff**

The following item is presented by the Office of Human Resources:

c. **Personnel Items**

VIII. INFORMATION ITEMS *(Requires no approval by the Board of Trustees):*

The following item is presented by the Office of Administration and Finance:

a. **FY2009-10 Tuition and Fee Assumptions**
b. **FY2009-10 Preliminary Revenue Forecast**

The following item is presented by the Office of Institutional Advancement:

c. **Naming Rights Policy for the Metropolitan State College of Denver**

The following item is presented by the Office of Human Resources:

d. **Additional Personnel Items**

The following item is presented by the Office of the President:

d. **President's Written Report to the Board**

IX. PUBLIC COMMENT

X. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

XI. ADJOURNMENT

AGENDA ITEM: **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

BACKGROUND:

The Board may convene into Executive Session for the purpose of discussing personnel matters in accordance with 24-6-402(3)(b)(I), C.R.S., to possibly confer with the Board's attorney to receive specific advice on legal questions in accordance with 24-6-402(3)(a)(II), C.R.S., and to discuss real estate matters in accordance with 24-6-402(3)(A)(I), CRS.

METROPOLITAN STATE COLLEGE *of* DENVER
BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Wednesday, April 1, 2009
9:00am – 11:30pm
Tivoli Student Union Room 320
Auraria Campus

MINUTES

I. CALL TO ORDER

a. The meeting was called to order at approximately 7:31am.

Trustees Present:
Chair Adele Phelan, Vice Chair Robert Cohen, Trustee Maria Garcia Berry, Trustee Melody Harris, Trustee Michelle Lucero, Trustee Antonio Esquibel, Trustee Ellen Robinson, Trustee Dawn Bookhardt, Trustee Bill Hanzlik, Faculty Trustee Gene Saxe,

Metro State Personnel Present:
Stephen Jordan, President; Lee Combs, General Counsel; Carl Powell, Vice President for Information Technology; Kathy MacKay, Vice President for Student Services; Linda Curran, Interim Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs; Natalie Lutes, Vice President for Administration and Finance; Cathy Lucas, Associate Vice President for Communications; Sandra Haynes, Dean, School of Professional Studies; Kathy Heyl, Assistant Dean, School of Professional Studies; Joan L. Foster, Dean, School of Letters, Arts and Sciences; John Cochran, Dean, School of Business; Lynn Kaersvang, Faculty Senate President; Shirley Price, Executive Assistant to the President; and others.

II. EXECUTIVE SESSION

a. The Board convened into Executive Session from 7:31 to 9:09am.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. Approval of February 4, 2009 Board Meeting Minutes were made with the following correction: the action item regarding tuition equity incorrectly reflected that the motion passed unanimously. There was one dissenting vote. The minutes were **approved** with that correction.

IV. REPORTS (Optional)

a. **Chair's Report - Chair Adele Phelan** informed the Board that a Metro Caucus meeting was held at the legislature on March 31 and the social work department was the focus of the conversation. She also expressed her appreciation for Lynn Kaersvang, Joan Foster and other faculty from the School of Social Work who attended the meeting. Additionally, Chair Phelan and Dr. Jordan made presentations at the House Education Committee meeting on the Master's Degree Program and the bill was voted out of committee unanimously. Chair Phelan also mentioned that the bad news was the State cutting another $50 million which would have a major impact on Metro's budget.

b. **AHEC Board – Trustee Maria Garcia Berry** reported that the AHEC Board did not meet in March and in February they held a 20 minute conference call. She appreciative of the CFOs finally getting the CCHE and the legislature to understand that Metro should not be getting a hit so hard in terms of budget cuts.

c. **President – Dr. Stephen Jordan** reported good news that we continue to see an upsurge in applications to the college. As of March 22nd, our new applications are up 30 percent. Because Metro has been doing so well in terms of the differences in the quality of the applications that we have been receiving, we will not go past 10 percent on the window in terms of new high school applications. For context purposes, earlier newspaper reports showed the University of CO at Boulder and UNC were down while we were up 30 percent overall. One of the issues that the enrollment surge has put on Metro, at the same time that we are going through budget reductions, is a very real concern about Metro's ability to continue to accept students while resources are declining.

   Other items that Metro will be reviewing are whether the College should put in place the restriction that we will not accept any transfers from a community college who have not completed their remediation at the community college before transferring. Also for students wanting to transfer with less than an Associate's degree, should Metro require that they have at least completed their general education component before they transfer so Metro does not find transfer students coming in with a mixture of general education and electives, where the electives may not really apply to what they want to major in.

d. **Legislative Report – Capstone Group, LLC –** Since Christine Staberg's last report to the Board, three Metro State caucus meetings have been held and each time there was an interesting mix of legislators. On average, Metro had between 11 to 14 members of the legislature come by for those three meetings some of whom had not previously attended a caucus. The kind of outreach the caucus meetings represent helps considerably when Metro approaches them later with a key issue concerning the college.

e. **Student Government – Student Government Assembly President Andrew Bateman** reported that Metro held a March to the Capitol that was extraordinarily successful. Approximately 500 students met at the Tivoli Commons and then marched to the Capitol. They obtained the required permits and were escorted by the Police. Most of the students stayed at the Capitol to attend the Associated Students of Colorado event which was in support of Senate Bill 228 to repeal the Arveschoun-Bird provisions. On another topic, elections will be held from April 13th to April 17th. The Student Fee Proposal will be voted on during that election. Metro students are also watching House Bill 1313. This bill would allow students to propose student fees for specific student purposes. It inserts the language that those student fees can be for the purpose of specific issue advocacy. In other words, student fees can be created for political advocacy purposes.

f. **Finance Committee – Trustee Ellen Robinson** commended Vice President Lutes and her group, Dr. Jordan's leadership, and everyone involved with the inordinate amount of time and resources spent in planning for how best to respond to the budget cuts Metro will have to sustain this year and into the future. Trustee Robinson said that we need to continue to send the message that Metro is different. We are the college that educates our students for under $6000 a year right now but this next round of cuts will bring with it significant consequences.

g. **Academic and Student Affairs Committee – Trustee Antonio Esquibel** reported that the Committee met on March 11th and voted on five items, four of which are under the Consent Agenda. The four include a new major and certificate in entrepreneurship; a new industrial design minor; a B.S. of Science in athletic training and a B.A. in speech, language and hearing science. The items were reviewed and approved by the committee to be presented to the Board of Trustees for approval. The other item was a proposal to increase a program fee in the Industrial Design and Hospitality, Tourism, and Events departments. This item was also passed but will be coming for approval at a future Board of Trustee meeting.

h. **Public-Private Partnerships – Trustee Dawn Bookhardt** reported that the Public-Private Partnership committee met March 2nd. There was a considerable discussion of Senate President Peter Groff's legislation regarding tuition flexibility. Stephanie Chichester then presented information regarding college debt capacity. The intercept program and fee for service appropriation was also discussed, and the financial and guaranty options for the hotel and hotel learning center were discussed. As an update regarding the hotel, Trustee Bookhardt reported that a task force meeting would be held the next day to review and discuss the selection of and procedures for selecting a development team. They also discussed neighborhood building one and plans to move forward.

i. **Foundation Report - Trustee Rob Cohen** reported that two major issues will be discussed at the Foundation's next full board meeting on April 14th. The first is the hotel. The Foundation committee is working with the P3 Committee on evaluating ownership options, the risks, and other items associated with the hotel. The other major issue is the Center for Visual Art. The appraisal process is underway on the CVA. The owner and Metro are in the process of negotiating the differences in appraisal with April 14 being that target date for a decision. As a backup plan, negotiations have begun on extending the lease which expires April 15th. Another item that was discussed was the naming rights policy.

j. **Faculty Senate – Professor Lynn Kaersvang, President** stated her appreciation on behalf of the faculty on the amount of work going on at the legislature. It is encouraging to know that Metro has a voice and is being heard. On the other hand, the faculty is deeply concerned about the Tier 1 discussions. She stated that faculty appreciate very much Dr. Jordan's and Dr. Curran' coming to Senate and Executive committees to brief them on the budget-related matters. She asked that the communication continues to be frequent with the faculty so they understand what's going on and how quickly things are moving.

k. **Council of Chairs – Mr. Greg Watts -** (No report)

l. **Alumni – Alumni Representative Gerie Grimes** stated that a full Board meeting will be held on April 7th in conflict with the Roadrunner Scholarship Dinner but both will have representation from the Alumni committee. She commended the Apprentice Challenge contestants for a difficult year but continued that they are doing an outstanding job. The participation has been less than expected. Alumni Rep Grimes urged everyone to participate and support the Apprentice Challenge Finale on May 4th. The Graduation Fair was successful this year with over 400 students in attendance.

V. ACTION ITEMS

The following item(s) are presented by Office of Institutional Advancement:

a. **Approval of the Naming Rights Policy for the Metropolitan State College of Denver**
   i. The policy was **approved** as currently written with the intent that the Foundation Board will make changes that further describe major and minor units. The item will be brought to the next Board of Trustees meeting May 6, 2009 as an Information item.

b. **Approval of Amendment to Memorandum of Agreement with the Metropolitan State College of Denver Alumni Association**
   i. The item was **approved**. The motion **passed** unanimously.

The following item(s) are presented by the Office of Administration and Finance:

c. **FY2009-2010 Base Reductions**
   i. The item was **approved** unanimously regarding the recommendations included Tier 1**.** Recommendations and/or modifications regarding the cuts suggested in Tier 2 and Tier 3 will be presented at the next Board meeting.

The following item(s) are presented by the Office of Human Resources:

d. **Handbook for Professional Personnel, Section IV.G – Faculty Categories**
   i. The item was **approved**. The motion **passed** unanimously.

e. **Handbook Revision Recommendations – Section V, (K through L) and Section VI, (A & B)**
   i. The item was **approved**. The motion **passed** unanimously.

VI. CONSENT ITEMS

The following item(s) are presented by the Office of Academic Affairs:

a. **Proposal for a New Minor and Certificate in Entrepreneurship**
   i. The item was **approved**. The motion **passed** unanimously.

b. **Proposal for a New Industrial Design Minor**
   i. The item was **approved**. The motion **passed** unanimously.

c. **Proposal for a New Bachelor of Science Degree in Athletic Training**
   i. The item was **approved**. The motion **passed** unanimously.

d. **Proposal for a New Bachelor of Arts Degree in Speech, Language, Hearing Sciences**
   i. The item was **approved**. The motion **passed** unanimously.

The following item(s) are presented by the Office of Human Resources:

e. **Personnel Items**
   i. The item was **approved**. The motion **passed** unanimously.

VII. INFORMATION ITEMS *(Requires no approval by the Board of Trustees):*

The following items are presented by the Office of Administration and Finance:

a. **Guidelines for the Development of the FY2009-2010 General Fund Budget**
b. **Student Vote on Student Success Building Bond Fee – Metro Neighborhood**

The following item is presented by the Office of Human Resources:

c. **Personnel Items**

The following item is presented by the Office of the President:

d. **President's Written Report to the Board**

VIII. PUBLIC COMMENT

a. N/A

IX. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

a. There were no requests.

X. ADJOURNMENT

a. The meeting **adjourned** at approximately 11:12am.

AGENDA ITEM: Hotel/HLC Financing

BACKGROUND:

At the April 14, 2009 meeting of the Metropolitan State College of Denver Foundation Board, the board discussed the different financing options for the Hotel and Hotel Learning Center (HLC). This was the culmination of months of evaluation including seeking input from potential developers and industry experts, as well as review of public/private partnerships nationwide. The Foundation Board decided that the best financing option for the building was to have the Metro State Foundation own the building, finance and manage the HLC, and partner with the developer/hotel flag to construct the project and manage the hotel/conference space. This option appears to provide the most protection to the Foundation and the College by ensuring short and long-term control over the project. To receive the optimal investment grade rating, letter of credit and/or bond insurance a backstop guarantee from the College is necessary. There are several different options for providing the backstop guarantee. Once a method is chosen, the final proposal will be brought back to the Trustee Finance Committee and Board for final approval.

RECOMMENDATION:

At the April 28, 2009 Trustee Finance Committee meeting a motion was made and approved to support the concept of the Metro State Board of Trustees guaranteeing the HLC project via a backstop. This approval is subject to the Metro State Board of Trustees review and approval of the final backstop proposal.

AGENDA ITEM: Handbook For Professional Personnel

ISSUE: Report of handbook changes which have occurred since the last Board agenda of April, 2009.

BACKGROUND: Handbook changes which require approval by the Board.

RECOMMENDATION: It is recommended by Metropolitan State College of Denver that the Board of Trustees approve the following changes to the Handbook for Professional Personnel.

AMENDMENTS

Amend Appendix A to add minimum teaching requirements for the Center for Innovation under the field of Entrepreneurship as follows:

Instructor:	B+10 years of experience or M+6 years of experience
Assistant Professor:	ABD
Associate Professor:	D
Professor:	D

The Center for Innovation will be developing its curriculum. It is necessary to establish the minimum teaching requirements, as they have not been in place prior to the Center receiving approval to offer classes in the Fall 2008 semester.

FIELD	INSTRUCTOR	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	PROFESSOR
Accounting	M	M + 5	D; or JD and M	D; or JD and M
Aerospace Science	B + 3 and F AA Certification	M + 4 and FAA Certification	M + 4 and FAA Certification	M + 4 and FAA Certification
African American Studies	M	D	D	D
Anthropology	M	D	D	D
Art (New Media)	B + 3	M (Art) + 6 or MFA	M (Art) + 6 or MFA	M (Art) + 6 or MFA
Art Education	MA + 3; or MFA + 3	MFA + 3; or D + 3	MFA + 6; or D + 6	MFA + 10; or D + 10
Art History	M	D	D	D
Art Studio	M	MFA	MFA	MFA
Biology	M	D	D	D
Chemistry	M	D	D	D
Chicano Studies	M	D	D	D
Communications (Speech, Language, Hearing Sciences)	M	D	D	D
Computer Information Systems	M	ABD	D	D
Computer Science	M	D	D	D
Criminal Justice and Criminology	M + 3	M + 6; or JD + 4; or D + 4	M + 6; or JD + 4; or D + 4	M + 6; or JD + 4; or D + 4
Earth Sciences (Geology and Geography)	M	D	D	D
Economics	M	ABD	D	D
Engineering Technology	M	M + 4; or D	M + 4; or D	M + 4; or D
English (all fields except Creative Writing)	M	D	D	D
English (Creative Writing)	M (English or Dramatic Arts)	MFA or D	MFA or D	MFA or D
Entrepreneurship	*B+10 or M+6*	*ABD*	*D*	*D*
Finance	M	ABD	D	D
Health Care Management	M	ABD	D	D

FIELD	INSTRUCTOR	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	PROFESSOR
Health Education Services (Integrated Therapeutic Practices)	M	M + 4; or ABD	M + 4; or D	M + 4; or D
History	M	D	D	D
Hospitality, Tourism and Events	B + 3	M + 6	M + 6	M + 6
Human Performance & Sport (Adult Fitness and Exercise Science)	M	ABD	D	D
Human Performance & Sport (Athletic Training)	M + NATA BOC Certification	M + NATA BOC Certification + 5; or D + NATA BOC Certification	M + NATA BOC Certification + 5; or D + NATA BOC Certification	M + NATA BOC Certification + 5; or D + NATA BOC Certification
Human Performance & Sport (K-12 Physical Education	M	ABD	D	D
Human Performance & Sport (Sport Industry Operations)	M	ABD	D	D
Human Services (General, Mental Health, Domestic Violence, and High Risk Youth)	M	ABD	D	D
Human Services (Nonprofit Organization Administration)	M	M	M	M
Human Services (Addictions Studies)	M	D; or M + NAADAC + CACIII	D; or M + NAADAC + CACIII	D; or M + NAADAC + CACIII
Industrial Design	B + 2	M + 4	M + 4	M + 4
Journalism	B + 6	M + 6	M + 6	M + 6
Legal Studies (Management)	JD and passed bar exam	JD and passed bar exam, or ABD	JD and passed bar exam, or D	JD and passed bar exam, or D
Management	M	ABD	D.	D
Marketing	M	ABD	D	D
Mathematical Sciences	M	D	D	D
Meteorology	M	D	D	D
Modern Languages	M	D	D	D

FIELD	INSTRUCTOR	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	PROFESSOR
Music (artist performers, conductors and composers)	M; or B + significant local recognition	ABD; or M + significant local recognition	D; or M + significant regional recognition	D; or M + significant national recognition
Music (artist performers, conductors and composers)	M; or B + significant local recognition	ABD; or M + significant local recognition	D; or M + significant regional recognition	D; or M + significant national recognition
Music (except artist performers, conductors and composers)	M	ABD	D	D
Nursing	M + RN	M + RN + 6; or M + RN + 4 + current professional certification; or D + RN	M + RN + 6; or M + RN + 4 + current professional certification; or D + RN	M + RN + 6; or M + RN + 4 + current professional certification; or D + RN
Nutrition	M	ABD	D	D
Philosophy	M	ABD	D	D
Physics	M	D	D	D
Political Science	M	D	D	D
Psychology	M or enrolled in a doctoral program	D	D	D
Radio / TV	B + 5	M + 5	M + 5	M + 5
Reading	M	ABD	D	D
Recreation Professions	M	ABD	D	D
Social Work field coordinator	MSW + 2	MSW + 6	MSW + 6	MSW + 6
Social Work (except field coordinators)	MSW	MSW + ABD	MSW + D	MSW + D
Sociology	M	D	D	D
Speech	M	D	D	D
Teacher Education	M	ABD	D	D
Technical Communications	B + 8	M + 6; or D	M + 6; or D	M + 6; or D
Theatre (relevant work experience must be professional)	M	MFA + 3; or M + 4; or D + 2	MFA + 4; or M + 5; or D + 3	MFA + 5; or M + 6; or D + 4
Women's Studies	M	D	D	D

AGENDA ITEM: Governing Board Fiduciary Oversight regarding the Four State Colleges in Colorado Defined Contribution Pension Plan (DCPP) for Faculty and Administrative Staff

ISSUE:

This informational agenda item presents the second periodic ORP Performance Review Report prepared by an independent retirement plan consultant for the benefit of all Colorado colleges and universities that maintain 401(a) plans. It also discusses the fiduciary oversight responsibilities of the Boards' of Trustees for each of the Four State Colleges in Colorado regarding management of the college's governmental (401a) Defined Contribution Pension Plan (DCPP). This plan is often referred to as the Optional Retirement Plan (ORP), for Faculty and Administrative Staff. The agenda item covers the requirements of the 2004 state legislation that clarified and strengthened the governing board fiduciary oversight responsibilities for management of the Optional Retirement Plan. Lastly, the item includes a discussion of the actions being taken by the Plan Administrators, their staff, and the in-house Associate VP for Retirement Plan Administration to address the findings listed in the consultant's 2008 report.

BACKGROUND:

In 1992, the Colorado Legislature permitted governing boards of state colleges and universities to provide a 401a Optional Retirement Plan (ORP), in lieu of PERA, for their faculty and exempt administrative staff. The original legislation required that each governing board that adopted an ORP: 1) provide for the administration of such optional retirement plans; and 2) designate from time-to-time the company, or companies, from which contracts for such optional retirement plans shall be purchased. This legislation did not clarify the fiduciary oversight responsibilities of governing boards.

From 1992 until the implementation of legislation passed in 2004 (House Bill 04-1007), the Plan Administrators and staff carefully administered the ORP with the assistance and direction from retirement plan attorneys, the Internal Revenue Service guidelines, and staff attorneys from the Colorado Attorney General's office.

House Bill 04-1007 detailed four steps to be followed by each governing board to assure fiduciary oversight. The bill went on to say that as long as the governing boards comply with the four steps, the governing board, its members, agents, employees, and plan administrators shall have no liability whatsoever to participants in the plan.

The four steps outlined in HB 04-1007 that governing boards must follow are:

1. Participants in the plan shall have access to investment alternatives having a range of risk, benefits, and cost.

2. The governing body shall have the ability to monitor the fund sponsor's performance of obligations under any contract related to the plan, including but

not limited to the returns earned on each investment alternative or pool and the total fees and expenses charged.

3. The governing board shall conduct a periodic review of the financial viability and attractiveness of combining any optional retirement plan established by the governing board with the plans of other governing boards established pursuant to this article.

4. The governing board shall periodically review each fund sponsor from which participants may select investment alternatives and compare the sponsor's performance to other sponsors of optional retirement plans available to public employees in the state. Periodic reviews of a fund sponsor may be conducted by a standing committee of the governing board, institutional committee or personnel, or external auditors or benefits consultants as determined by each governing board. A full report by any such committee shall be provided to each member of the governing board. Nothing in this subsection shall prohibit a periodic review from being conducted independently or in cooperation with others.

ACTION TAKEN FOR COMPLIANCE WITH HB 04-1007:

As presented in the first periodic DCPP performance review agenda item in the fall of 2006, the Plan Administrators at each of the Four State Colleges in Colorado, Fort Lewis College, Colorado State University-Fort Collins, Colorado State University-Pueblo, University of Northern Colorado, and the University of Colorado, a state-wide Ad-Hoc Colorado Higher Educational ORP Performance Review Committee was established. The Ad-Hoc committee had representatives from each Colorado college or university that maintained an Optional Retirement Plan. The Ad-Hoc Review Committee has met regularly after the passage of HB 04-1007 to work together on behalf of all the Colorado governing boards in an effort to address the four requirements of fiduciary oversight.

In 2005 the Ad-Hoc Performance Review Committee decided to contract with an independent retirement benefits consulting firm to address steps 1, 2, and 4 that were required by the 2004 legislation. The Ad-Hoc committee discussed step number 3 and concurred that each of the higher education 401(a) retirement plans differed in several ways such as contribution levels, participant eligibility, and whether the plan also made Social Security contributions. Therefore, each plan should continue as a separate IRS approved governmental Defined Contribution Pension Plan.

In early 2005 the Ad-Hoc Committee selected Gallagher Benefit Services, Inc. to perform the work required in steps 1, 2, and 4. The Ad-Hoc committee met with the specialist from Gallagher's Kansas City office several times to clarify the performance review requirements identified by the committee members. The first ORP Performance Report was issued in December 2005 and presented to all Colorado Colleges and Universities that sponsored 401a retirement plans during the 2006 year.

Since the 2004 legislation required that the school's ORP performance be compared to "*other sponsors of Optional Retirement Plans available to public employees in the state*", a new Peer group of "Other Colorado Public ORP's" needed to be established by the independent consultant. This process required much more time and effort than simply going to an established and widely used standard performance category like those used by Morningstar, Inc. After a peer group of "Other Colorado Public ORP's was established, the Gallagher consultant was then able to make comparisons with each of the Fund Sponsors used by the Colorado college and university Optional Retirement Plans. The consultant also analyzed the performance of each fund offered by the Higher Education ORP Fund Sponsors and compared those results to similar funds offered to employees of the "Other Colorado Public ORP peer group".

In July 2007 the state wide Ad-Hoc Colorado Higher Educational ORP Performance Review Committee met and determined that ORP performance reviews should be conducted on a three year cycle. Therefore, the committee contacted Gallagher Benefits Services, Inc. in early 2008 and requested that a second Performance Review be conducted based upon vendor and fund performance as of December 31, 2007. A copy of Gallagher Benefit Services, Inc.'s complete 2008 report is attached for each board member in order to comply with the last requirement listed under step #4 of the 2004 legislation.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND ACTIONS TAKEN FROM THE CONSULTANT'S FINDINGS:

After receipt of the ORP Report from Gallagher Benefit Services, Inc. in November 2008, the Associate VP for Retirement Plan Administration (Tim Greene) shared the findings with the campus Plan Administrators and their staff at each of the Four State Colleges. He also discussed the findings (without sharing the actual document) with representatives of the three Fund Sponsors (TIAA-CREF, Fidelity, and AIG-VALIC). Please reference the "Summary of Findings" section—page 3 and 4. To follow is a listing of the finding and actions that either have been, or will be, taken by the Associate VP and Plan Administrators to address the issues disclosed:

Finding---Most of the investment costs were reduced across the board:
Since the 2005 performance review, TIAA-CREF, Fidelity, and AIG-VALIC reduced the fees assessed in many of the individual fund choices. These reductions are common as asset size increases when economies of scale are attained.

Finding---While there were some organic investment cost reductions, there may be possibilities for further fee reductions, and, while there appears to be some room for cost reductions, the fees for the colleges are generally in line with industry standards:
These two findings were combined for discussion. The Associate VP for Retirement Plan Administration meets regularly with officials from all three vendors to discuss fee assessments and the potential to reduce those costs even further to the participants. AIG-VALIC is close to offering its new Mutual Fund platform to the Four State Colleges in

Colorado and that product should come with lower fees. TIAA-CREF annually reviews their investment fund fee structure and has been lowering fees on several funds each year. It should be noted that the administrative fees for AIG-VALIC are higher than TIAA-CREF and Fidelity because they provide a local investment representative that works in person with their participants.

Finding---The institutions have a large number of investment choices but they now contain investment choices across all categories considered for this study:
Our ORP contracts are with the three more common Fund Sponsors used in higher education nationally. These companies have a proven track record of fund performance and quality service to college and university participants and they also afford the maximum ease of portability for those employees that change jobs. The larger number of investment choices (129) comes from the fact that we contract for "bundled" services. I.e., the three Fund Sponsors offer a package of investment funds that include broad and diversified investment options for our employees. Under a "bundled" approach, we do not select each specific fund for employees to invest their retirement dollars, but rather all funds a vendor offers (TIAA-CREF), or groups of fund offerings (AIG-VALIC) and (Fidelity).

Finding---As it was noted in the 2005 ORP Report, AIG-VALIC was collecting more administrative fees than the other vendors. That trend is noted as continuing in this 2008 Report. AIG-VALIC administrative expenses and fees assessed by each fund alternative are discussed in the report:
AIG-VALIC and Fidelity charge an administrative fee. TIAA-CREF does not charge this type of fee. In addition, all three fund sponsors have varying fees assessed for each of the 129 fund alternatives that an employee may select. AIG-VALIC's administrative fee is categorized as a percentage basis of the participants account balance per year while Fidelity charges a fixed annual trustee and custodial fee to each participant. (For additional information on fees assessed see pages 9-12 of the ORP Report.) It should be noted that our ORP fees are comparable to those charged to the Colorado Peer Group. The Associate VP for Retirement Plan Administration continues to work with representatives from all three fund sponsors to determine if the administrative fees and individual fund fees can be lowered. Effective January 1, 2006, AIG-VALIC agreed to lower their administrative fees by 20 basis points and the individual fund investment fees were lowered anywhere from 5 to 50 basis points. In addition, AIG-VALIC is in the process of delivering a new mutual fund product for governmental clients that will have fewer fund choices, but still maintain diverse alternatives, that will have a lower administrative fee structure.

SUMMARY:

After review of the 2008 ORP Report and related individual investment fund performance history statistics, the following points can be made:

The rate of returns on the majority of the funds offered to the employees enrolled in the Four State Colleges in Colorado Defined Contribution Pension Plan continue to be equal to or higher than those investment alternatives available to the Peer comparison group.

The fees assessed plan participants by the all three fund sponsors are varied, but reasonable when compared to those assessed to the Peer comparison group. Fees for AIG-VALIC are somewhat high, but the cost of a local representative that works in person with their clients should be factored in.

The four Plan Administrators, their staff, and the in-house Associate VP for Retirement Plan Administration are working to implement changes recommended in this 2008 ORP Report.

That all four Boards' of Trustees at each of the Four State Colleges in Colorado has reviewed and are in compliance with all four steps identified in HB 04-1007. Therefore, they continue to maintain their fiduciary oversight and management responsibilities regarding the operation of their IRS Qualified Defined Contribution Pension Plan. Therefore, as stated in HB 04-1007, the governing board, its members, agents, employees, and plan administrators, "shall have no liability whatsoever to participants in the plan."

Arthur J Gallagher & Co.

ORP Report

Intended to comply with House Bill 04-1007

FOR

The State Colleges and Universities of Colorado

August 2008

Presented by:

Gallagher Benefit Services, Inc.
6399 S Fiddlers Green Cir
Suite 200
Greenwood Village CO 80111

Contacts:

Matt Annalora
303-889-2774

Source data December 31, 2007

Gallagher Benefit Services, Inc.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

Background

In February 2004, Governor Bill Owens signed House Bill 04-1007. The law's intent is to provide oversight by establishing periodic reviews of the Optional Retirement Plans (ORPs). If the ORPs comply with these oversight standards, the governing board, its members, agents, employees, and plan administrators, "shall have no liability whatsoever to participants in the plan."

In order to comply, all the affected colleges and universities, listed below, established an ad hoc committee. The following institutions represent the committee:

- University of Colorado (CU)
- Colorado State University (CSU)
- University of Northern Colorado (UNC)
- Fort Lewis College
- Colorado State University – Pueblo (CSU – Pueblo)
- The State Colleges
    - Adams State College
    - Mesa State College
    - Metropolitan State College
    - Western State College

The ORPs are defined contribution (DC) retirement plans. In a DC plan, the investment risks and rewards lie with the participants as the participants direct their investment choices through the vendor of the employee's choosing. Both the employee and the employer make a fixed contribution to the employee's account. Each institution has independently contracted with either two or three vendors to provide an ORP option to the employees. Each vendor makes available anywhere from 9 to 159 investment choices to the participants.

A summary of whom each institution contracts with is illustrated below.

Institution	Fund Sponsor				
	TIAA-CREF	VALIC	Fidelity	Vanguard	MetLife
CU	X		X	X	
CSU	X	X	X		
State Colleges	X	X	X		
UNC	X	X			X
Ft. Lewis College	X	X			
CSU - Pueblo	X	X			
Source: Information provided by the higher education institutions.					

Executive Summary

Interpretation of the Law

Based on familiarity and the objective nature of the 2005 ORP study, much of the information, if still relevant, was left intact. In addition, all relevant analytics are updated through 12-31-2007

In order to comply with House Bill 04-1007, the consensus of the committee is that the project should be separated into two phases. The first phase deals with section (d) of the bill and references the fact the Governing Board shall periodically review each vendor and compare performance to other sponsors of Optional Retirement Plans available to public employees in the state. We believe that a valid peer group of employers has been established based on the 2005 ORP study.

The other aspect of the project is preparation of a report detailing the comparison of the peer group investment returns. In this report, each fund will be ranked within its peer group based on:

- 12 month returns
- 3 year returns
- 5 year returns
- 10 year returns
- Expense ratios
- Sharpe ratios
- Manager Tenure

Summary of Findings

Observation Table		
Institution(s)	**Observation**	**Reason/Explanation**
UNC	Through the MetLife purchase of CitiStreet minor changes were made to the investment line-up.	While these funds are now managed by MetLife, their objectives remain intact and the fund expenses were reduced slightly. Also, the Travelers and Citistreet names were dropped.
UNC	MetLife has also made their proprietary product available to UNC.	Although the MetLife product carries lower investment costs and a wider fund selection, utilization rates have been very low.
All	Most of the investment costs were reduced across the board	This is a common trend in the industry as asset size increases, economies of scale are attained

Summary of Findings cont

Observation Table		
Institution(s)	**Observation**	**Reason/Explanation**
CSU State Colleges UNC Ft. Lewis CSU - Pueblo	It was noted in the 2005 ORP study that VALIC was collecting substantially more administrative expenses than any other vendors.	Although there were no material reductions in the general administrative fees, VALIC has made available their mutual fund product to the institutions. This product carries much lower overall investment fees.
CSU State Colleges UNC Ft. Lewis CSU – Pueblo	VALIC did not offer a stable value option	A fixed account is available under the mutual fund platform
All	While there were some organic investment cost reductions, there may be possibilities for further fee reductions.	It may be of value to approach the various vendors to inquire about a fee analysis and review to determine reduction targets.
All	The institutions have a large number of investment choices. In addition more choices have been made available.	Depending on the vendor, the institutions are either allowed to pick the investment offerings or only take what the vendor offers as part of the product.
CSU State Colleges UNC Ft. Lewis CSU – Pueblo	The institutions compared favorably in terms of 5 year investment returns across all categories.	In general the returns were within 1% plus or minus
CSU State Colleges UNC Ft. Lewis CSU – Pueblo	The institutions contained investment choices across all categories considered for this study. The peer group did not have representation in Long Term Bond or World Bond	Having a broad and diverse selection of investment is an indicator of plan quality.
CSU State Colleges UNC Ft. Lewis CSU – Pueblo	While there appears to be some room for cost reductions, the fees for the colleges are generally in line with industry standards.	Pricing is primarily driven by four main factors: Assets, participants, contributions and average account balance. Most companies do not employ automatic price reductions. Therefore it is important to request a pricing review from time to time.
PEER CO Elected Officials	Colorado Elected Officials removed VALIC and added Great-West and Hartford.	The addition of these companies increased fund selection and reduced investment fees

Analysis

Examination of Institutions

In order to complete a valid analysis, it is necessary to review what each institution has in terms of each of their ORP's. Since there can be a number of variances between vendors, it was decided that each vendor's information would be looked at separately. In terms of reviewing the vendors in order to determine how they rank, a number of criteria were looked at. Each vendor was asked to report total assets, total participants and total contributions. A common statistic used by vendors to determine the attractiveness of a plan is a plan's average participant account balance (APB). Below is a series of tables that identify the results of this information.

The first table identifies the number of active accounts by each vendor. It should be noted that this information also includes retirees or terminated employees who have chosen to leave their account balances with the vendors.

	NUMBER OF ACTIVE ACCOUNTS BY VENDOR					
Institution	**TIAA-CREF**	**VALIC**	**Fidelity**	**Vanguard**	**MetLife**	**Total**
CU	11368	N/A	2399	2526	N/A	16,293
CSU	3866	1583	2535	N/A	N/A	7984
State Colleges	1335	240	504	N/A	N/A	2079
UNC	1508	511	N/A	N/A	327*	2346
Ft. Lewis	851	143	N/A	N/A	N/A	994
CSU - Pueblo	1984	364	N/A	N/A	N/A	2348
Total	20,912	2841	5438	2526	327	32,044

Source: Information provided by vendors as of December 31, 2007
*Active account increase attributed to the acquisition of Citistreet by MetLife.

Analysis

Examination of Institutions Continued

The next table reviews the total assets in each plan. Again, the amounts in this table include the assets that retired or terminated employees have left in the plan.

	TOTAL BALANCES FOR ACTIVE ACCOUNTS BY VENDOR					
Institution	**TIAA-CREF**	**VALIC**	**Fidelity**	**Vanguard**	**MetLife**	**Total**
CU	$1,610,538,051	N/A	$127,069,520	$130,786,096	N/A	$1,868,393,667
CSU	$191,648,569	$81,332,131	$136,090,847	N/A	N/A	$409,071,547
State Colleges	$69,052,367	$17,909,181	$28,402,492	N/A	N/A	$115,364,040
UNC	$59,164,645	$17,769,285	N/A	N/A	$3,556,282	$80,490,212
Ft. Lewis	$21,210,106	$2,186,315	N/A	N/A	N/A	$23,396,421
CSU - Pueblo	$21,426,928	$8,548,860	N/A	N/A	N/A	$29,975,788
Total	$1,973,040,666	$127,745,772	$291,562,859	$130,786,096	$3,556,282	2,526,691,675
Source: Information provided by vendors as of December 31, 2007						

The amount of contributions that were sent to each vendor in 2007 was also documented. The results of this information are below.

	ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS FOR ACTIVE EMPLOYEES BY VENDOR					
Institution	**TIAA-CREF***	**VALIC**	**Fidelity**	**Vanguard**	**MetLife**	**Total**
CU	$15,444,306	N/A	$11,648,308	$15,803,503	N/A	$42,896,117
CSU	$19,068,007	$7,323,791	$10,157,274	N/A	N/A	$36,549,072
State Colleges	$5,867,067	$1,356,235	$2,891.788	N/A	N/A	$10,115,090
UNC	$5,085,741	$1,432,229	N/A	N/A	$439,156	$6,957,126
Ft. Lewis	$2,619,117	$290,512	N/A	N/A	N/A	$2,909,629
CSU - Pueblo	$2,188,617	$713,425	N/A	N/A	N/A	$2,902,042
Total	$50,272,855	$11,116,192	$24,697,370	$15,803,503	$439,156	$102,329,076
Source: Information provided by vendors as of December 31, 2007 *Large decreases in annual contributions for TIAA-CREF are attributed to the inclusion of inaccurate data in 2005						

Analysis

Examination of Institutions Continued

The APB is calculated by taking the total dollar amount of plan assets and dividing it by the total number of participants. The APB is a good tool when reviewing other public entity employers that may fall into the peer group. The APB is taken into consideration by a number of vendors when determining pricing. This will be an important piece to take into consideration when reviewing the expenses paid by the plans. Below is a calculation of the APB by each vendor.

	AVERAGE PARTICIPANT BALANCE BY VENDOR					
Institution	**TIAA-CREF**	**VALIC**	**Fidelity**	**Vanguard**	**CitiStreet**	**Total***
CU	$141,673	N/A	$52,968	$51,775	N/A	$81,139
CSU	$49,573	$51,378	$53,685	N/A	N/A	$51,545
State Colleges*	$51,725	$74,622	$56,354	N/A	N/A	$60,900
UNC	$39,234	$34,774	N/A	N/A	$10,875	$28,294
Ft. Lewis	$24,924	$15,289	N/A	N/A	N/A	$20,106
CSU – Pueblo	$10,800	$23,486	N/A	N/A	N/A	$17,143
Average	$52,988	$39,910	$54,336	$51,775	$10,875	$43,355
Source: Information provided by vendors as of December 31, 2007						
*Calculated by dividing each institution's Total Assets by Total Participants						

As you can see, there are some wide variances. Some of the potential explanations for the variances are as follow:

- The vendors that hold a majority of the long tenured employees will have a higher APB.
- Institutions that have experienced high turnover could have lower amounts.
- The representatives the vendors make available to the institutions can impact the popularity of a product.
- Some vendors have been in place longer than others.
- When you compare this information to the peer group, it should be noted that the peer group plans have different contribution rates as part of their plan design.

*It should be noted that part-time faculty are put into PERA and not into the ORP. Therefore, the APB for the four state colleges may report higher than other colleges.

Analysis

Peer Group

Below is a listing of the peer groups we have selected as the comparison group. As House Bill 04-1007 states, this comparison needs to be done within the state of Colorado. A number of public entity employers were contacted to determine if they would fit into the peer group.

Peer Group						
Plan Sponsor	**Plan Type**	**Vendor(s)**	**Assets**	**Participants**	**Contributions**	**APB**
Douglas County*	401(a)	ICMA	$58,415,877	1028	$9,427,583	$56,825
		CCOERA	$6,306,101	241	$0	$26,166
Jefferson County	401(a)	CCOERA	$238,896,000	2790	$22,400,000	$85,626
Larimer County	401(a)	Principal	$102,153,000	1651	$9,000,000	$61,873
Elected Officials Plan	401(a)	ICMA, Hartford, Great-West	$3,352,728 $6,068,418 $4,181,868	311 338 305	$939,097 $1,822,109 $1,587,966	$10,780 $17,954 $13,711
Denver Water Board	401(a)	VALIC	$35,505,368	1003	$4,831,550	$35,399
University of Colorado Hospital	401(a)	Fidelity TIAA-CREF	$55,568,473 $48,462,473	2709 1956	$16,605,564 $6,755,739	$20,513 $24,776

It would be difficult with any peer group to match the educational institutions in terms of assets, participants, and contributions. In terms of APB, total assets and participants, this group appears to be a valid peer group.

*Currently, Douglas County only sends new contributions to ICMA. Because of this, there are many participants who have accounts in both ICMA and CCOERA. Therefore, there was an assumption made by Douglas County in regards to the number of participants.

Analysis

Summary of Administrative Expenses

One comparison that was completed was an analysis of the administrative expenses that are being paid. Administrative expenses are expenses paid by the plan participants above and beyond the normal expense ratio of the funds. Administrative expenses are collected as a per head charge or on a percentage of assets. A summary of these findings are below.

	Annual Administrative Expense Paid by Participants				
Institution	**TIAA-CREF**	**VALIC**	**Fidelity**	**Vanguard**	**MetLife**
CU	$0	N/A	$0	$8 per participant	N/A
CSU	$0	.55% to 1.05% sep. acct. fee	$13 annual trustee fee	N/A	N/A
State Colleges	$0	.55% to 1.05% sep. acct. fee	$18 annual fee & $13 custodial fee	N/A	N/A
UNC	$0	.55% to 1.05% sep. acct. fee	N/A	N/A	1.25%
Ft. Lewis	$0	.55% to 1.05% sep. acct. fee	N/A	N/A	N/A
CSU – Pueblo	$0	.55% to 1.05% sep. acct. fee	N/A	N/A	N/A
Source: Information provided by vendors as of December 31, 2007					

Analysis

Summary of Administrative Expenses Continued

Below you will see the same analysis of administrative expense information. In the table below, the administrative expenses are being converted into dollars based on the assets in the plan and/or the number of participants in each plan.

	Annual Estimated Administrative Expenses* Paid by Participants				
Institution	**TIAA-CREF**	**VALIC****	**Fidelity**	**Vanguard**	**CitiStreet**
CU	$0	N/A	$0	$20,208	N/A
CSU	$0	$633,170	$32,955	N/A	N/A
State Colleges	$0	$139,423	$15,624	N/A	N/A
UNC	$0	$138,333	N/A	N/A	$44,453
Ft. Lewis	$0	$17,020	N/A	N/A	N/A
CSU – Pueblo	$0	$66,552	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total	$0	$994,500	$48,579	$20,208	$44,453

Source: Information provided by vendors as of December 31, 2007

*Administrative Expenses are any maintenance, trustee, M & E, or other fee charge to the participant as a percentage of assets or as a per head fee. Does not include expense ratio of the underlying funds.

**The linear average of the VALIC Separate Account Fee came to be .7785%. (Expense = Total Assets * .7785%)

Analysis

Summary of Total Expenses

The next review is an analysis of the expense ratio. Since it's very common for expense ratio to subsidize many administrative costs in the retirement plan industry, a final chart is necessary. This chart totals both the administrative expenses and the average expense ratio. Below you will find a chart that summarizes this information for all the institutions.

Summary of Total Plan Expenses				
Institution	**Vendor**	**Expense Ratio***	**Administrative Fees****	**Total**
CU	TIAA-CREF	0.56%	0.00%	0.56%
	Fidelity	0.74%	0.00%	0.74%
	Vanguard	0.30%	0.02%	0.32%
CSU	TIAA-CREF	0.56%	0.00%	0.56%
	VALIC	0.54%	0.78%	1.32%
	Fidelity	0.74%	0.03%	0.77%
State Colleges	TIAA-CREF	0.56%	0.00%	0.56%
	VALIC	0.54%	0.78%	1.32%
	Fidelity	0.71%	0.07%	0.78%
UNC	TIAA-CREF	0.56%	0.00%	0.56%
	VALIC	0.54%	0.78%	1.32%
	MetLife/Citistreet	0.80%	1.25%	2.05%
	MetLife	0.78%	1.15%	1.93%
Ft. Lewis	TIAA-CREF	0.56%	0.00%	0.56%
	VALIC	0.54%	0.78%	1.32%
CSU - Pueblo	TIAA-CREF	0.56%	0.00%	0.56%
	VALIC	0.54%	0.78%	1.32%

Source: Information provided by vendors as of December 31, 2007
* Calculated by taking a linear average of the funds offered on each vendor's platform.
** Calculated by dividing the Annual Estimated Administrative Expense by the Total Assets for each vendor

Below is a ranking of how each of the vendors compare from lowest expenses to highest:

Ranking of Vendor's Total Expenses		
Rank	**Vendor**	**Total Expenses**
1	Vanguard	.32%
2	TIAA-CREF	.56%
3 – 5	Fidelity*	.74% - .78%
6	VALIC	1.32%
7	MetLife	1.93%
8	MetLife Citistreet	2.05%

Analysis

Summary of Peer Group Expenses

Now that the expenses for the institutions have been documented, a comparison to the peer group should be done. Below is a table that identifies the total expense information.

Summary of Total Plan Expenses				
Employer	**Vendor**	**Expense Ratio***	**Administrative Fees****	**Total**
Douglas County	ICMA	0.90%	0.00%	0.90%
	CCOERA***	0.75%	0.25%	1.00%
Jefferson County	CCOERA***	0.75%	0.25%	1.00%
Larimer County	Principal	1.01%	0.00%	1.01%
Elected Officials Plan	ICMA	0.97%	0.55%	1.52%
	Hartford	1.04%	0.00%	1.04%
	Great-West	0.76%	0.00%	0.76%
Denver Water Board	VALIC	0.89%	0.00%	0.89%
University of Colorado Hospital	Fidelity	0.74%	0.01%	0.75%
	TIAA-CREF	0.42%	0.00%	0.42%

Source: Information provided by plan sponsors as of December 31, 2007
* Calculated by taking the linear average of the funds offered on each vendor's platform.
** Calculated by dividing the Annual Estimated Administrative Expense by the Total Assets for each vendor
*** CCOERA reduced administrative fees to .25% on 7-1-05.

Analysis

Summary of Total Investment Choices

Below is a summary of the number of investment choices that are offered to the employees of the institutions versus the peer group. There are studies* that indicate an employee's satisfaction is higher with fewer investment choices rather than more. However it is important to have representation in each investment class.

Summary of Total Investment Choices			
Institution	Vendor	Number of Investment Choices	Total Investment Choices
CU	TIAA-CREF	9	248
	Fidelity	173	
	Vanguard	66	
CSU	TIAA-CREF	9	98
	VALIC	62	
	Fidelity	27	
State Colleges	TIAA-CREF	22	129
	VALIC	62	
	Fidelity	45	
UNC	TIAA-CREF	22	140
	VALIC	62	
	MetLife/CitiStreet	56	
Ft. Lewis	TIAA-CREF	9	71
	VALIC	62	
CSU - Pueblo	TIAA-CREF	9	71
	VALIC	62	
Source: Information provided by vendors as of December 31, 2007			

Summary of Total Investment Choices			
Peer Group	Vendor	Number of Investment Choices	Total Investment Choices
Douglas County	ICMA	48	71
	CCOERA	23	
Jefferson County	CCOERA	23	23
Larimer County	Principal	21	21
Elected Officials Plan	ICMA	48	76
	Hartford	14	
	Great-West	14	
Denver Water Board	VALIC	62	62
University of Colorado Hospital	TIAA-CREF	9	181
	Fidelity	172	
Source: Information provided by Peer Group as of December 31, 2007			

Glossary of Terms

*Studies cited are not included in this report but can be provided upon request.

Annualized Return: Returns for periods longer than one year are expressed as "annualized returns." This is equivalent to the compound rate of return which, over a certain period of time, would produce a fund's total return over that same period.

Average Participant Balance (APB): APB is calculated by taking a plan's total assets and dividing it by the number of participants.

Manager Tenure: The number of years that the current manager has been the portfolio manager of the fund. For funds with more than one manager, the average tenure is shown. If there is only one manager, who has been at the fund for less than six months (and for whom we have biographical information available), a dash will appear. If the fund designates the manager as a Management Team and does not disclose the names of the portfolio manager or co-portfolio managers to Morningstar, Manager Tenure will appear as a dash for the fund.

Morningstar Category: In an effort to distinguish funds by what they own, as well as by their prospectus objectives and styles, Morningstar developed the Morningstar Categories. While the prospectus objective identifies a fund's investment goals based on the wording in the fund prospectus, the Morningstar Category identifies funds based on their actual investment styles as measured by their underlying portfolio holdings (portfolio statistics and compositions over the past three years). If the fund is new and has no portfolio, we (Morningstar) estimate where it will fall before assigning a more permanent category. When necessary, we (Morningstar) may change a category assignment based on current information.

Standard Deviation: A statistical measurement of dispersion about an average, which, for a mutual fund, depicts how widely the returns varied over a certain period of time. Investors use the standard deviation of historical performance to try to predict the range of returns that are most likely for a given fund. When a fund has a high standard deviation, the predicted range of performance is wide, implying greater volatility.

Sharpe Ratio: A risk-adjusted measure developed by Nobel Laureate William Sharpe. It is calculated by using standard deviation and excess return to determine reward per unit of risk. The higher the Sharpe Ratio, the better the fund's historical risk-adjusted performance. The Geometric Sharpe ratio is calculated for the past 3-year period by dividing a fund's annualized excess returns (excess return is measured by taking the funds 3-year return and subtracting a risk-free rate of return) by its annualized standard deviation.

Since this ratio uses standard deviation as its risk measure, it is not appropriately applied when analyzing a fund that is an investor's sole holding. The Sharpe Ratio can be used to compare two funds directly on how much risk a fund had to bear to earn excess return over the risk-free rate.

Glossary of Terms

Expense Ratio: The percentage of fund assets paid for operating expenses and management fees, including 12b-1 fees, administrative fees, and all other asset-based costs incurred by the fund, except brokerage costs. Fund expenses are reflected in the fund's NAV. Sales charges are not included in the expense ratio.

Securities products and services are offered through GBS Retirement Services, Inc., an affiliated subsidiary of Gallagher Benefit Services, Inc. GBS Retirement Services, Inc. is an independent broker-dealer firm and member of the NASD, located at 2 Gannett Drive, White Plains, NY 10604-3404, (914) 696-0631.

Glossary of Morningstar Categories

Conservative Allocation: Conservative-allocation portfolios seek to provide both capital appreciation and income by investing in three major areas: stocks, bonds, and cash. These portfolios tend to hold smaller positions in stocks than moderate-allocation portfolios. These portfolios typically have 20% to 50% of assets in equities and 50% to 80% of assets in fixed income and cash.

Convertibles: Corporate securities that are exchangeable for a set number of another form of security (usually common shares), at a prestated price.

Diversified Pacific-Asia: Diversified Pacific/Asia stock portfolios have a wider investment range than other Asia-oriented portfolios. These portfolios can invest throughout the Pacific Rim, including Australia and New Zealand. As a result, country weightings for these portfolios vary tremendously, though most retain some exposure to Japan and Hong Kong. These portfolios invest at least 70% of total assets in equities and invest at least 75% of stock assets in Pacific countries, including at least 10% in Japan.

Emerging Markets: Diversified emerging-markets portfolios tend to divide their assets among 20 or more nations, although they tend to focus on the emerging markets of Asia and Latin America rather than on those of the Middle East, Africa, or Europe. These portfolios invest at least 70% of total assets in equities and invest at least 50% of stock assets in emerging markets.

European Stock: Europe-stock portfolios invest at least 70% of total assets in equities and invest at least 75% of stock assets in Europe. Most of these portfolios emphasize the region's larger and more developed markets, including Britain, the Netherlands, Germany, France, and Switzerland. Many also invest in the region’s smaller markets, including the emerging markets of eastern Europe.

Foreign Large-Blend: Foreign large-blend portfolios invest in a variety of big international stocks. Most of these portfolios divide their assets among a dozen or more developed markets, including Japan, Britain, France, and Germany. These portfolios primarily invest in stocks that have market caps in the top 70% of each economically integrated market (such as Europe or Asia ex-Japan). The blend style is assigned to portfolios where neither growth nor value characteristics predominate. These portfolios typically will have less than 20% of assets invested in U.S. stocks.

Glossary of Morningstar Categories

Foreign Large-Growth: Foreign large-growth portfolios focus on high-priced growth stocks, mainly outside of the United States. Most of these portfolios divide their assets among a dozen or more developed markets, including Japan, Britain, France, and Germany. These portfolios primarily invest in stocks that have market caps in the top 70% of each economically integrated market (such as Europe or Asia ex-Japan). Growth is defined based on fast growth (high growth rates for earnings, sales, book value, and cash flow) and high valuations (high price ratios and low dividend yields). These portfolios typically will have less than 20% of assets invested in U.S. stocks.

Foreign Large-Value: Foreign large-value portfolios invest mainly in big international stocks that are less expensive or growing more slowly than other large-cap stocks. Most of these portfolios divide their assets among a dozen or more developed markets, including Japan, Britain, France, and Germany. These portfolios primarily invest in stocks that have market caps in the top 70% of each economically integrated market (such as Europe or Asia ex-Japan). Value is defined based on low valuations (low price ratios and high dividend yields) and slow growth (low growth rates for earnings, sales, book value, and cash flow). These portfolios typically will have less than 20% of assets invested in U.S. stocks.

Foreign Small/Mid Growth: Foreign small-/mid-growth portfolios invest in international stocks that are smaller, growing faster, and higher-priced than other stocks. These portfolios primarily invest in stocks that fall in the bottom 30% of each economically integrated market (such as Europe or Asia ex-Japan). Growth is defined based on fast growth (high growth rates for earnings, sales, book value, and cash flow) and high valuations (high price ratios and low dividend yields). These portfolios typically will have less than 20% of assets invested in U.S. stocks.

High-Yield Bond: High-yield bond portfolios concentrate on lower-quality bonds, which are riskier than those of higher-quality companies. These portfolios generally offer higher yields than other types of portfolios, but they are also more vulnerable to economic and credit risk. These portfolios primarily invest in U.S. high-income debt securities where at least 65% or more of bond assets are not rated or are rated by a major agency such as Standard & Poor's or Moody's at the level of BB (considered speculative for taxable bonds) and below.

Intermediate-Term Bond: Intermediate-term bond portfolios invest primarily in corporate and other investment-grade U.S. fixed-income issues and have durations of 3.5 to six years (or, if duration is unavailable, average effective maturities of four to 10 years). These portfolios are less sensitive to interest rates, and therefore less volatile, than portfolios that have longer durations.

Glossary of Morningstar Categories

Intermediate-Term Government Bond: Intermediate-government portfolios have at least 90% of their bond holdings in bonds backed by the U.S. government or by government-linked agencies. This backing minimizes the credit risk of these portfolios, as the U.S. government is unlikely to default on its debt. These portfolios have durations between 3.5 and six years (or, if duration is unavailable, average effective maturities between four and 10 years). Consequently, the group's performance--and its level of volatility--tends to fall between that of the short government and long government bond categories.

Large Blend: Large-blend portfolios are fairly representative of the overall U.S. stock market in size, growth rates, and price. Stocks in the top 70% of the capitalization of the U.S. equity market are defined as large-cap. The blend style is assigned to portfolios where neither growth nor value characteristics predominate. These portfolios tend to invest across the spectrum of U.S. industries, and owing to their broad exposure, the portfolios' returns are often similar to those of the S&P 500 Index.

Large Growth: Large-growth portfolios invest in big U.S. companies that are projected to grow faster than other large-cap stocks. Stocks in the top 70% of the capitalization of the U.S. equity market are defined as large-cap. Growth is defined based on fast growth (high growth rates for earnings, sales, book value, and cash flow) and high valuations (high price ratios and low dividend yields). Most of these portfolios focus on companies in rapidly expanding industries.

Large Value: Large-value portfolios invest primarily in big U.S. companies that are less expensive or growing more slowly than other large-cap stocks. Stocks in the top 70% of the capitalization of the U.S. equity market are defined as large-cap. Value is defined based on low valuations (low price ratios and high dividend yields) and slow growth (low growth rates for earnings, sales, book value, and cash flow).

Long-Term Bond: Long-term bond portfolios invest primarily in corporate and other investment-grade U.S. fixed-income issues and have durations of more than six years (or, if duration is unavailable, average effective maturities greater than 10 years). Due to their long durations, these portfolios are exposed to greater interest rate risk.

Glossary of Morningstar Categories

Long-Term Government: Long-government portfolios have at least 90% of their bond holdings invested in bonds backed by the U.S. government or by government-linked agencies. This backing minimizes the credit risk of these portfolios, as the U.S. government is unlikely to default on its debt. They are not risk free, though. Because these portfolios have durations of more than six years (or, if duration is unavailable, average effective maturities greater than 10 years), they are more sensitive to interest rates, and thus riskier, than portfolios that have shorter durations.

Mid-Cap Blend: The typical mid-cap blend portfolio invests in U.S. stocks of various sizes and styles, giving it a middle-of-the-road profile. Most shy away from high-priced growth stocks, but aren't so price-conscious that they land in value territory. The U.S. mid-cap range for market capitalization typically falls between $1 billion-$8 billion and represents 20% of the total capitalization of the U.S. equity market. The blend style is assigned to portfolios where neither growth nor value characteristics predominate.

Mid-Cap Growth: Some mid-cap growth portfolios invest in stocks of all sizes, thus leading to a mid-cap profile, but others focus on midsize companies. Mid-cap growth portfolios target U.S. firms that are projected to grow faster than other mid-cap stocks, therefore commanding relatively higher prices. The U.S. mid-cap range for market capitalization typically falls between $1 billion-$8 billion and represents 20% of the total capitalization of the U.S. equity market. Growth is defined based on fast growth (high growth rates for earnings, sales, book value, and cash flow) and high valuations (high price ratios and low dividend yields).

Mid-Cap Value: Some mid-cap value portfolios focus on medium-size companies while others land here because they own a mix of small-, mid-, and large-cap stocks. All look for U.S. stocks that are less expensive or growing more slowly than the market. The U.S. mid-cap range for market capitalization typically falls between $1 billion-$8 billion and represents 20% of the total capitalization of the U.S. equity market. Value is defined based on low valuations (low price ratios and high dividend yields) and slow growth (low growth rates for earnings, sales, book value, and cash flow).

Moderate Allocation: Moderate-allocation portfolios seek to provide both capital appreciation and income by investing in three major areas: stocks, bonds, and cash. These portfolios tend to hold larger positions in stocks than conservative-allocation portfolios. These portfolios typically have 50% to 70% of assets in equities and the remainder in fixed income and cash.

Glossary of Morningstar Categories

Multi-Sector Bond: Multisector bond portfolios seek income by diversifying their assets among several fixed-income sectors, usually U.S. government obligations, U.S. corporate bonds, foreign bonds, and high-yield U.S. debt securities. These portfolios typically hold 35% to 65% of bond assets in securities that are not rated or are rated by a major agency such as Standard & Poor's or Moody's at the level of BB (considered speculative for taxable bonds) and below.

Short-Term Bond: Short-term bond portfolios invest primarily in corporate and other investment-grade U.S. fixed-income issues and have durations of one to 3.5 years (or, if duration is unavailable, average effective maturities of one to four years). These portfolios are attractive to fairly conservative investors, because they are less sensitive to interest rates than portfolios with longer durations.

Short-Term Government Bond: Short-government portfolios have at least 90% of their bond holdings in bonds backed by the U.S. government or by government-linked agencies. This backing minimizes the credit risk of these portfolios, as the U.S. government is unlikely to default on its debt. These portfolios have durations between one and 3.5 years (or, if duration is unavailable, average effective maturities between one and four years), so they have relatively less sensitivity to interest rates, and thus low risk potential.

Small Blend: Small-blend portfolios favor U.S. firms at the smaller end of the market-capitalization range. Some aim to own an array of value and growth stocks while others employ a discipline that leads to holdings with valuations and growth rates close to the small-cap averages. Stocks in the bottom 10% of the capitalization of the U.S. equity market are defined as small-cap. The blend style is assigned to portfolios where neither growth nor value characteristics predominate.

Small Growth: Small-growth portfolios focus on faster-growing companies whose shares are at the lower end of the market-capitalization range. These portfolios tend to favor companies in up-and-coming industries or young firms in their early growth stages. Because these businesses are fast-growing and often richly valued, their stocks tend to be volatile. Stocks in the bottom 10% of the capitalization of the U.S. equity market are defined as small-cap. Growth is defined based on fast growth (high growth rates for earnings, sales, book value, and cash flow) and high valuations (high price ratios and low dividend yields).

Small Value: Small-value portfolios invest in small U.S. companies with valuations and growth rates below other small-cap peers. Stocks in the bottom 10% of the capitalization of the U.S. equity market are defined as small-cap. Value is defined based on low valuations (low price ratios and high dividend yields) and slow growth (low growth rates for earnings, sales, book value, and cash flow).

Glossary of Morningstar Categories

Speciality-Communications: Specialty-communications portfolios concentrate on telecommunications and media companies of various kinds. Most buy some combination of cable television, wireless-communications, and communications-equipment firms as well as traditional phone companies. A few favor entertainment firms, mainly broadcasters, film studios, publishers, and on-line service providers.

Speciality-Financial: Specialty-financial portfolios seek capital appreciation by investing primarily in equity securities of U.S. or non-U.S. financial-services companies, including banks, brokerage firms, insurance companies, and consumer credit providers.

Speciality-Health: Specialty-health portfolios focus on the medical and health-care industries. Most invest in a range of companies, buying everything from pharmaceutical and medical-device makers to HMOs, hospitals, and nursing homes. A few portfolios concentrate on just one industry segment, such as service providers or biotechnology firms.

Speciality-Natural Resources: Specialty-natural resources portfolios focus on commodity-based industries such as energy, chemicals, minerals, and forest products in the U.S. or outside of the U.S. Some portfolios invest across this spectrum to offer broad natural resources exposure. Others concentrate heavily or even exclusively in specific industries including energy or forest products.

Speciality-Precious Metals: Specialty-precious metals portfolios focus on mining stocks, though some do own small amounts of gold bullion. Most portfolios concentrate on gold-mining stocks, but some have significant exposure to silver-, platinum-, and base-metal-mining stocks as well. Precious-metals companies are typically based in North America, Australia, or South Africa.

Speciality-Real Estate: Specialty-real estate portfolios invest primarily in real-estate investment trusts (REITs) of various types. REITs are companies that develop and manage real-estate properties. There are several different types of REITs, including apartment, factory-outlet, health-care, hotel, industrial, mortgage, office, and shopping center REITs. Some portfolios in this category also invest in real-estate operating companies.

Speciality-Technology: Specialty-technology portfolios buy high-tech businesses in the U.S. or outside of the U.S. Most concentrate on computer, semiconductor, software, networking, and Internet stocks. A few also buy medical-device and biotechnology stocks and some concentrate on a single technology industry.

Glossary of Morningstar Categories

Speciality-Utilities: Specialty-utilities portfolios seek capital appreciation by investing primarily in equity securities of U.S. or non-U.S. public utilities including electric, gas, and telephone-service providers.

Stable Value: Stable-value portfolios seek to provide income while preventing price fluctuations. The most common stable-value portfolios invest in a diversified portfolio of bonds and enter into wrapper agreements with financial companies to guarantee against fluctuations in their share prices. These wrapper agreements typically provide price stability on a day-to-day basis, thereby insulating each portfolio's net asset value from interest-rate volatility. Therefore, their true overall durations are effectively zero.

World Allocation: World-allocation portfolios seek to provide both capital appreciation and income by investing in three major areas: stocks, bonds, and cash. While these portfolios do explore the whole world, most of them focus on the U.S., Canada, Japan, and the larger markets in Europe. It is rare for such portfolios to invest more than 10% of their assets in emerging markets. These portfolios typically have at least 10% of assets in bonds, less than 70% of assets in stocks, and at least 40% of assets in non-U.S. stocks or bonds.

World Bond: World bond portfolios invest 40% or more of their assets in foreign bonds. Some world bond portfolios follow a conservative approach, favoring high-quality bonds from developed markets. Others are more adventurous, and own some lower-quality bonds from developed or emerging markets. Some portfolios invest exclusively outside the U.S., while others regularly invest in both U.S. and non-U.S. bonds.

World Stock: World-stock portfolios have few geographical limitations. It is common for these portfolios to invest the majority of their assets in the U.S., Europe, and Japan, with the remainder divided among the globe’s smaller markets. These portfolios typically have 20%-60% of assets in U.S. stocks.

AGENDA ITEM: Personnel

ISSUE: Report of personnel actions which have occurred since the last Board agenda of April, 2009.

BACKGROUND: Personnel actions which require approval by the Board.

RECOMMENDATION: It is recommended by Metropolitan State College of Denver that the Board of Trustees approve the following appointments.

PROMOTIONS

Dr. Ashby Butnor, (FROM Visiting Instructor TO Visiting Assistant Professor of Philosophy), $43,139.00, Effective April 1, 2009. (TEMPORARY/FACULTY)

AGENDA ITEM: FY2009-10 TUITION AND FEE ASSUMPTIONS

Consistent with the Trustee Policy Manual Section 4.2, the Board of Trustees has responsibility and authority to set fees in accordance with policies established by the Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) and the Legislature.

The following is provided for informational purposes. Staff will present the complete tuition and fee agenda item to the Board at the June 3, 2009 meeting for approval.

ANALYSIS:

Attached are the preliminary tuition and fee schedules for FY2010. Attachment (a) presents the proposed tuition increases for resident and non-residents. Attachment (b) presents the proposed fee schedule. Attachment (c) presents a summary of the dollar and percentage change of tuition and fees from FY2008 to FY2009. Attachment (d) presents the total student tuition and fees.

Tuition Rates
A proposed Tuition Rate increase of 9% for both resident and non-resident students has been used in Attachments a, c, d1, and d2. Note that the 9% increase also applies for Extended Campus and Accelerated Nursing programs.

Student Fees
There is a proposed 3.9% increase, which is reflective of the Consumer Price Index percentage increase used for Tabor calculations, which has been applied to the Athletics, Student Affairs, IT, and Health fees. Additionally, this increase will be applied to the Internet class fee. The application of this increase is in accordance with Colorado Statute and does not require student vote approval.

The Student Facility Bond fee has a proposed 1.5% increase. Also, an increase of 19.6% has been applied to the RTD Bus Pass as approved by student vote in April 2009. Additionally, the Clean Energy fee increase was approved in September 2007 to increase by a dollar each spring semester up to a total of $5. This fee will increase by $1.00 to $5.00 in spring semester 2010.

The Metro State Bond Fee was approved by student vote in April 2009. Seventy percent of this new fee will be used to support the debt service for the construction of the new Student Success Building, twenty percent will be used for classroom and lab equipment, and ten percent of the fee will support scholarships. The fee will be assessed at $5.25 for per credit hour.

The allocation proposals from the student affairs fee funded program directors were presented to the Student Affairs Board (SAB). The SAB deliberated on the proposals and have made recommendations on allocations for the various programs to the Vice President of Student Services. The allocations will be presented to the Finance Committee at the May 19th Finance Committee.

Program Fees

Program fees will be presented at the May 19th Finance Committee and then be forwarded to the Board at the June 3rd meeting for approval.

Student Health Insurance

The 2009-2010 student health insurance renewal process for the coming year was recently completed. After a lengthy negotiation, the college was able to successfully negotiate the health insurance renewal at a zero percent increase. The rate will continue to be $665 per semester.

Metropolitan State College of Denver **a.**
Proposed Tuition Schedule for Fall 2009 and Spring 2010

RESIDENT					
Credit Hours	AY2009 Rates	9.0% Increase	Proposed AY2010 Rate	% Change	*Incremental Change*
1	$ 108.95	$9.80	$118.75	9.00%	
2	217.90	$19.60	$237.50	9.00%	*$118.75*
3	326.85	$29.40	$356.25	9.00%	*$118.75*
4	435.80	$39.20	$475.00	9.00%	*$118.75*
5	544.75	$49.00	$593.75	9.00%	*$118.75*
6	653.70	$58.80	$712.50	9.00%	*$118.75*
7	762.65	$68.60	$831.25	9.00%	*$118.75*
8	871.60	$78.40	$950.00	9.00%	*$118.75*
9	980.55	$88.20	$1,068.75	9.00%	*$118.75*
10	1,089.50	$98.00	$1,187.50	9.00%	*$118.75*
11	1,198.45	$107.80	$1,306.25	9.00%	*$118.75*
12	1,307.40	$117.60	$1,425.00	9.00%	*$118.75*
13	1,307.40	$117.60	$1,425.00	9.00%	*$0.00*
14	1,307.40	$117.60	$1,425.00	9.00%	*$0.00*
15	1,307.40	$117.60	$1,425.00	9.00%	*$0.00*
16	1,307.40	$117.60	$1,425.00	9.00%	*$0.00*
17	1,307.40	$117.60	$1,425.00	9.00%	*$0.00*
18	1,307.40	$117.60	$1,425.00	9.00%	*$0.00*
19	1,416.35	$127.40	$1,543.75	9.00%	*$118.75*

NONRESIDENT					
Credit Hours	AY2009 Rates	9.0% Increase	Proposed AY2010 Rate	% Change	*Incremental Change*
1	$ 471.80	$42.50	$514.30	9.00%	
2	943.60	$85.00	$1,028.60	9.00%	*$514.30*
3	1,415.40	$127.50	$1,542.90	9.00%	*$514.30*
4	1,887.20	$170.00	$2,057.20	9.00%	*$514.30*
5	2,359.00	$212.50	$2,571.50	9.00%	*$514.30*
6	2,830.80	$255.00	$3,085.80	9.00%	*$514.30*
7	3,302.60	$297.50	$3,600.10	9.00%	*$514.30*
8	3,774.40	$340.00	$4,114.40	9.00%	*$514.30*
9	4,246.20	$382.50	$4,628.70	9.00%	*$514.30*
10	4,718.00	$425.00	$5,143.00	9.00%	*$514.30*
11	5,189.80	$467.50	$5,657.30	9.00%	*$514.30*
12	5,661.60	$510.00	$6,171.60	9.00%	*$514.30*
13	5,661.60	$510.00	$6,171.60	9.00%	*$0.00*
14	5,661.60	$510.00	$6,171.60	9.00%	*$0.00*
15	5,661.60	$510.00	$6,171.60	9.00%	*$0.00*
16	5,661.60	$510.00	$6,171.60	9.00%	*$0.00*
17	5,661.60	$510.00	$6,171.60	9.00%	*$0.00*
18	5,661.60	$510.00	$6,171.60	9.00%	*$0.00*
19	6,133.40	$552.50	$6,685.90	9.00%	*$514.30*

Metropolitan State College of Denver **b.**
Proposed Fee Schedule
FY2009 to FY2010 Fees

		3.9% Increase				0%		1.5% Incr	NEW	33.30%	19.6% Incr	Summary
Credit Hours	FY2009 Fees (a)	Health Services	Student Affairs Fee	Information Technology	Athletics	Registr Fee	Immuniz Fee	Student Facilities Bond Fee (a)	Metro Bond Fee (b)	Clean Energy (c)	RTD Bus Pass	Preliminary FY2010 Fees
1	195.67	31.22	38.22	18.29	29.53	4.09	2.00	37.23	5.25	4.00	46.00	215.91
2	195.67	31.22	38.22	18.29	29.53	4.09	2.00	37.23	10.50	4.00	46.00	221.16
3	195.67	31.22	38.22	18.29	29.53	4.09	2.00	37.23	15.75	4.00	46.00	226.41
4	222.44	31.22	38.22	36.56	29.53	4.09	2.00	46.55	21.00	4.00	46.00	259.25
5	222.44	31.22	38.22	36.56	29.53	4.09	2.00	46.55	26.25	4.00	46.00	264.50
6	244.93	31.22	61.59	36.56	29.53	4.09	2.00	46.55	31.50	4.00	46.00	293.12
7	273.72	31.22	61.59	54.84	29.53	4.09	2.00	57.92	36.75	4.00	46.00	328.02
8	273.72	31.22	61.59	54.84	29.53	4.09	2.00	57.92	42.00	4.00	46.00	333.27
9	273.72	31.22	61.59	54.84	29.53	4.09	2.00	57.92	47.25	4.00	46.00	338.52
10	295.71	31.22	61.59	77.69	29.53	4.09	2.00	57.92	52.50	4.00	46.00	366.62
11	295.71	31.22	61.59	77.69	29.53	4.09	2.00	57.92	57.75	4.00	46.00	371.87
12	313.04	31.22	61.59	77.69	29.53	4.09	2.00	75.51	63.00	4.00	46.00	394.71
13	313.04	31.22	61.59	77.69	29.53	4.09	2.00	75.51	63.00	4.00	46.00	394.71
14	313.04	31.22	61.59	77.69	29.53	4.09	2.00	75.51	63.00	4.00	46.00	394.71
15	313.04	31.22	61.59	77.69	29.53	4.09	2.00	75.51	63.00	4.00	46.00	394.71
16	327.72	31.22	61.59	92.94	29.53	4.09	2.00	75.51	63.00	4.00	46.00	409.96
17	327.72	31.22	61.59	92.94	29.53	4.09	2.00	75.51	63.00	4.00	46.00	409.96
18	327.72	31.22	61.59	92.94	29.53	4.09	2.00	75.51	63.00	4.00	46.00	409.96

(a) Average per headcount from $58 to $59.10
(b) Of the total $5.25 per credit hour fee (up to 12 credit hours), $3.67 will go to capital, $1.05 will go to scholarships, and $.53 will go to equipment classroom enhancement.
(c) Includes $1 Clean Energy fee increase approved effective Spring Semester 2009. The Fee will increase by $1 to $5 effective Spring Semester 2010. This column represents the fees as of Fall 2009
(d) The online fee is not listed in this schedule, but is also proposed to increase by 3.9% from $23 per credit hour to $23.89 per credit hour.

c.

Metropolitan State College of Denver
Proposed Change Tuition and Fee
Effective Fall 2009
9% Resident & Non Resident Tuition Increase
With 3.9% CPI Increase on Athletics, IT, Student Affairs, and Health Fees for CPI

	Resident Tuition				**Student Fees**				**Total Cost Resident**			
Credit Hours	Fall 2009	9% Incr Fall 2010	Dollar Change	Percent Change	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Dollar Change	Percent Change	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Dollar Change	Percent Change
1	108.95	118.75	9.80	9.0%	195.67	215.91	20.24	10.3%	304.62	334.66	30.04	9.9%
2	217.90	237.50	19.60	9.0%	195.67	221.16	25.49	13.0%	413.57	458.66	45.09	10.9%
3	326.85	356.25	29.40	9.0%	195.67	226.41	30.74	15.7%	522.52	582.66	60.14	11.5%
4	435.80	475.00	39.20	9.0%	222.44	259.25	36.81	16.5%	658.24	734.25	76.01	11.5%
5	544.75	593.75	49.00	9.0%	222.44	264.50	42.06	18.9%	767.19	858.25	91.06	11.9%
6	653.70	712.50	58.80	9.0%	244.93	293.12	48.19	19.7%	898.63	1,005.62	106.99	11.9%
7	762.65	831.25	68.60	9.0%	273.72	328.02	54.30	19.8%	1,036.37	1,159.27	122.90	11.9%
8	871.60	950.00	78.40	9.0%	273.72	333.27	59.55	21.8%	1,145.32	1,283.27	137.95	12.0%
9	980.55	1,068.75	88.20	9.0%	273.72	338.52	64.80	23.7%	1,254.27	1,407.27	153.00	12.2%
10	1,089.50	1,187.50	98.00	9.0%	295.71	366.62	70.91	24.0%	1,385.21	1,554.12	168.91	12.2%
11	1,198.45	1,306.25	107.80	9.0%	295.71	371.87	76.16	25.8%	1,494.16	1,678.12	183.96	12.3%
12	1,307.40	1,425.00	117.60	9.0%	313.04	394.71	81.67	26.1%	1,620.44	1,819.71	199.27	12.3%
13	1,307.40	1,425.00	117.60	9.0%	313.04	394.71	81.67	26.1%	1,620.44	1,819.71	199.27	12.3%
14	1,307.40	1,425.00	117.60	9.0%	313.04	394.71	81.67	26.1%	1,620.44	1,819.71	199.27	12.3%
15	1,307.40	1,425.00	117.60	9.0%	313.04	394.71	81.67	26.1%	1,620.44	1,819.71	199.27	12.3%
16	1,307.40	1,425.00	117.60	9.0%	327.72	409.96	82.24	25.1%	1,635.12	1,834.96	199.84	12.2%
17	1,307.40	1,425.00	117.60	9.0%	327.72	409.96	82.24	25.1%	1,635.12	1,834.96	199.84	12.2%
18	1,307.40	1,425.00	117.60	9.0%	327.72	409.96	82.24	25.1%	1,635.12	1,834.96	199.84	12.2%

Resident Tuition is shown net of COF Stipend

	Non-Resident Tuition				**Student Fees**				**Total Cost Non-Resident**			
Credit Hours	Fall 2009	9% Incr Fall 2010	Dollar Change	Percent Change	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Dollar Change	Percent Change	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Dollar Change	Percent Change
1	471.80	514.30	42.50	9.0%	195.67	215.91	20.24	10.3%	667.47	730.21	62.74	9.4%
2	943.60	1,028.60	85.00	9.0%	195.67	221.16	25.49	13.0%	1,139.27	1,249.76	110.49	9.7%
3	1,415.40	1,542.90	127.50	9.0%	195.67	226.41	30.74	15.7%	1,611.07	1,769.31	158.24	9.8%
4	1,887.20	2,057.20	170.00	9.0%	222.44	259.25	36.81	16.5%	2,109.64	2,316.45	206.81	9.8%
5	2,359.00	2,571.50	212.50	9.0%	222.44	264.50	42.06	18.9%	2,581.44	2,836.00	254.56	9.9%
6	2,830.80	3,085.80	255.00	9.0%	244.93	293.12	48.19	19.7%	3,075.73	3,378.92	303.19	9.9%
7	3,302.60	3,600.10	297.50	9.0%	273.72	328.02	54.30	19.8%	3,576.32	3,928.12	351.80	9.8%
8	3,774.40	4,114.40	340.00	9.0%	273.72	333.27	59.55	21.8%	4,048.12	4,447.67	399.55	9.9%
9	4,246.20	4,628.70	382.50	9.0%	273.72	338.52	64.80	23.7%	4,519.92	4,967.22	447.30	9.9%
10	4,718.00	5,143.00	425.00	9.0%	295.71	366.62	70.91	24.0%	5,013.71	5,509.62	495.91	9.9%
11	5,189.80	5,657.30	467.50	9.0%	295.71	371.87	76.16	25.8%	5,485.51	6,029.17	543.66	9.9%
12	5,661.60	6,171.60	510.00	9.0%	313.04	394.71	81.67	26.1%	5,974.64	6,566.31	591.67	9.9%
13	5,661.60	6,171.60	510.00	9.0%	313.04	394.71	81.67	26.1%	5,974.64	6,566.31	591.67	9.9%
14	5,661.60	6,171.60	510.00	9.0%	313.04	394.71	81.67	26.1%	5,974.64	6,566.31	591.67	9.9%
15	5,661.60	6,171.60	510.00	9.0%	313.04	394.71	81.67	26.1%	5,974.64	6,566.31	591.67	9.9%
16	5,661.60	6,171.60	510.00	9.0%	327.72	409.96	82.24	25.1%	5,989.32	6,581.56	592.24	9.9%
17	5,661.60	6,171.60	510.00	9.0%	327.72	409.96	82.24	25.1%	5,989.32	6,581.56	592.24	9.9%
18	5,661.60	6,171.60	510.00	9.0%	327.72	409.96	82.24	25.1%	5,989.32	6,581.56	592.24	9.9%

Academic Year (Fall and Spring) at 15 Credit Hours

Resident	2,614.80	2,850.00	235.20	9.0%	626.08	789.42	163.34	26.1%	3,240.88	3,639.42	398.54	12.3%
Nonresident	11,323.20	12,343.20	1,020.00	9.0%	626.08	789.42	163.34	26.1%	11,949.28	13,132.62	1,183.34	9.9%

Metropolitan State College of Denver
Proposed Tuition and Fee Schedule
Fall 2009 and Spring 2010
9% Resident & Non Resident Tuition Increase
With 3.9% CPI Increase on Athletics, IT, Student Affairs, and Health Fees for CPI

RESIDENT

Credit Hours	Student's Share of Tuition	Health Services	Immuniz. Fee	Student Facilities Bond Fee	Student Affairs Fee	Intercollegiate Athletics	Information Technology	Registration Fee	RTD Bus Pass	Metro Bond Fee	Clean Energy Fee	Total
1	118.75	31.22	2.00	37.23	38.22	29.53	18.29	4.09	46.00	5.25	4.00	334.58
2	237.50	31.22	2.00	37.23	38.22	29.53	18.29	4.09	46.00	10.50	4.00	458.58
3	356.25	31.22	2.00	37.23	38.22	29.53	18.29	4.09	46.00	15.75	4.00	582.58
4	475.00	31.22	2.00	46.55	38.22	29.53	36.56	4.09	46.00	21.00	4.00	734.17
5	593.75	31.22	2.00	46.55	38.22	29.53	36.56	4.09	46.00	26.25	4.00	858.17
6	712.50	31.22	2.00	46.55	61.59	29.53	36.56	4.09	46.00	31.50	4.00	1,005.54
7	831.25	31.22	2.00	57.92	61.59	29.53	54.84	4.09	46.00	36.75	4.00	1,159.19
8	950.00	31.22	2.00	57.92	61.59	29.53	54.84	4.09	46.00	42.00	4.00	1,283.19
9	1,068.75	31.22	2.00	57.92	61.59	29.53	54.84	4.09	46.00	47.25	4.00	1,407.19
10	1,187.50	31.22	2.00	57.92	61.59	29.53	77.69	4.09	46.00	52.50	4.00	1,554.04
11	1,306.25	31.22	2.00	57.92	61.59	29.53	77.69	4.09	46.00	57.75	4.00	1,678.04
12	1,425.00	31.22	2.00	75.51	61.59	29.53	77.69	4.09	46.00	63.00	4.00	1,819.63
13	1,425.00	31.22	2.00	75.51	61.59	29.53	77.69	4.09	46.00	63.00	4.00	1,819.63
14	1,425.00	31.22	2.00	75.51	61.59	29.53	77.69	4.09	46.00	63.00	4.00	1,819.63
15	1,425.00	31.22	2.00	75.51	61.59	29.53	77.69	4.09	46.00	63.00	4.00	1,819.63
16	1,425.00	31.22	2.00	75.51	61.59	29.53	92.94	4.09	46.00	63.00	4.00	1,834.88
17	1,425.00	31.22	2.00	75.51	61.59	29.53	92.94	4.09	46.00	63.00	4.00	1,834.88
18	1,425.00	31.22	2.00	75.51	61.59	29.53	92.94	4.09	46.00	63.00	4.00	1,834.88

NONRESIDENT

Credit Hours	Student's Share of Tuition	Health Services	Immuniz. Fee	Student Facilities Bond Fee	Student Affairs Fee	Intercollegiate Athletics	Information Technology	Registration Fee	RTD Bus Pass	Metro Bond Fee	Clean Energy Fee	Total
1	514.30	31.22	2.00	37.23	38.22	29.53	18.29	4.09	46.00	5.25	4.00	730.13
2	1,028.60	31.22	2.00	37.23	38.22	29.53	18.29	4.09	46.00	10.50	4.00	1,249.68
3	1,542.90	31.22	2.00	37.23	38.22	29.53	18.29	4.09	46.00	15.75	4.00	1,769.23
4	2,057.20	31.22	2.00	46.55	38.22	29.53	36.56	4.09	46.00	21.00	4.00	2,316.37
5	2,571.50	31.22	2.00	46.55	38.22	29.53	36.56	4.09	46.00	26.25	4.00	2,835.92
6	3,085.80	31.22	2.00	46.55	61.59	29.53	36.56	4.09	46.00	31.50	4.00	3,378.84
7	3,600.10	31.22	2.00	57.92	61.59	29.53	54.84	4.09	46.00	36.75	4.00	3,928.04
8	4,114.40	31.22	2.00	57.92	61.59	29.53	54.84	4.09	46.00	42.00	4.00	4,447.59
9	4,628.70	31.22	2.00	57.92	61.59	29.53	54.84	4.09	46.00	47.25	4.00	4,967.14
10	5,143.00	31.22	2.00	57.92	61.59	29.53	77.69	4.09	46.00	52.50	4.00	5,509.54
11	5,657.30	31.22	2.00	57.92	61.59	29.53	77.69	4.09	46.00	57.75	4.00	6,029.09
12	6,171.60	31.22	2.00	75.51	61.59	29.53	77.69	4.09	46.00	63.00	4.00	6,566.23
13	6,171.60	31.22	2.00	75.51	61.59	29.53	77.69	4.09	46.00	63.00	4.00	6,566.23
14	6,171.60	31.22	2.00	75.51	61.59	29.53	77.69	4.09	46.00	63.00	4.00	6,566.23
15	6,171.60	31.22	2.00	75.51	61.59	29.53	77.69	4.09	46.00	63.00	4.00	6,566.23
16	6,171.60	31.22	2.00	75.51	61.59	29.53	92.94	4.09	46.00	63.00	4.00	6,581.48
17	6,171.60	31.22	2.00	75.51	61.59	29.53	92.94	4.09	46.00	63.00	4.00	6,581.48
18	6,171.60	31.22	2.00	75.51	61.59	29.53	92.94	4.09	46.00	63.00	4.00	6,581.48

Administration and Finance, 5/6/09

AGENDA ITEM: FY2009-10 Preliminary Revenue Forecast

BACKGROUND:

Following is an overview of the preliminary FY2010 revenue forecast. The forecast includes a reduction of base state funding support to the FY2005-06 level which includes:

- COF Stipend
  - Reducing the COF stipend rate to $2,040 for a full time student or $68 per credit hour (this is a reduction of $24 per credit hour or $720 for a full time student).
  - Total estimated COF enrollment is 15,996 which equates to expected stipend revenue of $32.6 million.
- Fee-for-service of $7.1 million

The COF stipend and fee-for-service allocations are base funds. Federal one-time stimulus funds of $9.9 million will be allocated to 'backfill' our general fund support, keeping our total funding at the FY08-09 level.

Tuition

- The college plans to increase both resident and non-resident tuition by 9 percent. This will result in an additional $4.7 million in tuition revenues using flat enrollment.
- If enrollment growth projections of 6 percent for residents and 10 percent for non-residents are realized, the college would receive an additional $3.7 million in tuition revenue.

Metropolitan State College of Denver
FY2009-10 Budget

			BASE			NON-BASE	
			General Fund	Tuition	Total Base	Federal Stimulus	Total
1	A.	FY08-09 Estimated Budget	49,713,412	52,215,637	101,929,049		101,929,049
2		4-10-09 (share of $150.7M)	(9,934,844)		(9,934,844)		(9,934,844)
3		State Backfill (onetime)			0	9,934,844	9,934,844
4		Revised FY08-09 Appropriation	39,778,568	52,215,637	91,994,205	9,934,844	101,929,049
5							
6	B.	FY2009-10 Budget (without Growth)	39,778,568	52,215,637	91,994,205		91,994,205
7		State Backfill (onetime)			0	9,934,844	9,934,844
8		**Subtotal, FY09-10 Budget**	39,778,568	52,215,637	91,994,205	9,934,844	101,929,049
9		New Funds					0
10		Tuition Increase, 9% Res and NR		4,699,407	4,699,407		4,699,407
11		**Proposed FY2009-10 Budget**	39,778,568	56,915,044	96,693,612	9,934,844	106,628,456
12							0
13	**C.**	**BASE Change w/o growth FY09 to FY10**	**(9,934,844)**	**4,699,407**	**(5,235,437)**	**9,934,844**	4,699,407
14							
15	D.	Tier Reductions					
16		Implement Tier I Reductions as approved			4,962,091		
17		Implement Tier II Reductions as approved			1,477,648		
18		Implement Tier III Reductions as approved			3,165,176		
19							
20	E.	Available for FY09-10 Distribution			4,369,478	9,934,844	14,304,322
21							
22							
23	F.	Additional Revenue Sources					
24		a. Growth					
25		Resident 6% Res, 10% Non-Resident (JBC est)			3,677,368		
26							
27		b. Estimated Prior Year FB FY09 to FY10			6,500,000		

AGENDA ITEM:

Naming Rights Policy for the Metropolitan State College of Denver

ISSUE:

The Foundation Board believes it is essential that Metro State's fundraising efforts include naming rights and has endorsed this policy.

BACKGROUND:

The policy was approved by the Board of Trustees at their April 1st meeting, with some clarification of the authority to accept a naming opportunity. These changes provide more clarity about the Board of Trustees' decision-making authority and definition regarding major and minor units.

INFORMATION:

The following Naming Rights Policy is presented to the Board of Trustees as information.

Naming Rights Policy

Date of Commencement: <<DATE>>

This policy relates to programs and facilities solely funded by Metropolitan State College of Denver and should be read in conjunction with the Metropolitan State College of Denver Foundation, Inc. "Gift Acceptance & Investment Policy Guidelines" and "Policy on Sponsorships"[1] and with the Auraria Higher Education Center (AHEC) campus-wide policies regarding the naming of shared facilities, areas and spaces as developed by the Policy Development and Shared Operations Committee (PODSOC).[2]

I. Introduction

In fulfilling its mission, the College receives support from individuals, corporations, foundations, nonprofit organizations and other donors.

Support in the form of donations allows the College to minimize its dependence upon public funding, and to maximize its autonomy through the creation of its own wealth.

Provision for naming rights enables the College to:

- honor those who have rendered outstanding service to the institution; and/or
- recognize those who make a prominent and/or permanent investment in the College through donations.

Naming rights may be offered to those whose service and/or generosity to the College:

- advance the academic mission of the College;
- are consistent with the core values of the College;
- further the capacity of the College to meet its objectives; and
- enhance the growth and reputation of the College.

Naming rights may be granted in relation to:

- the name of a building;
- part of a building;
- a complex;
- facilities;
- an academic position;
- an academic program;
- a lecture or series of lectures;
- a scholarship;
- a prize or award; and
- other options.

---

[1] In development
[2] Also in development

II. Aims of the Policy

The Policy on Naming Rights:

- supports the development of an active culture of recognition;
- provides a comprehensive framework within which to administer naming rights;
- provides incentives for companies, individuals and other donors to support the College; and
- recognizes that the taxation status of a donation directly affects an entity's entitlement to, or qualification for, naming rights.

III. Eligible Parties

Financial Contributors

The College may at any time receive and consider an approach from any source to make a donation in exchange for naming rights.

Entities who support the College through donations are entitled to negotiate naming rights.

All financial contributions are not automatically designated for a naming opportunity.

Honoring Service to the College

The decision to honor exceptional service is entirely at the discretion of the College.

In rare, and outstanding cases, the College may name a physical structure whether a complete building or part of a building, complex or other facility, an academic program or position, a scholarship, award, prize or other approved option in honor of an individual who has rendered extraordinary service.

Consideration of such an honor will not normally occur until at least two years have elapsed following the person's last involvement with the College.

IV. Authority

All proposed honorary names of facilities, properties or College units (except "Minor Facilities" as defined below) owned and operated by the College must be reviewed and approved by the Board of Trustees, Metropolitan State College of Denver before announced to the public. The decision to grant recognition is committed to the exclusive discretion of the Trustees and, in approved cases, the President of the College.

"Major Units" include large sections of campus, entire buildings, wings of buildings, schools, departments, centers, institutes, plazas, atriums, theaters, large lecture or performance facilities, streets, faculty positions and other options as defined and determined by the Board of Trustees.

"Minor Units" are to be defined and determined by the Board of Trustees and may include smaller campus areas or sections of facilities (e.g., individual rooms, laboratories, small open spaces, ~~streets,~~ structures, physical features, etc.), programs, lectures, scholarships, awards and prizes and other similar options ~~as defined and determined by the Board of Trustees~~.

.

Once a Minor Unit has been determined as such by the Trustees, ~~Naming of Minor Units~~naming may be approved by the College president and does not require Board of Trustee approval.

V. Responsibility for Implementation

The president of the College and the Vice President for Institutional Advancement are responsible for implementing the Board of Trustees' decisions in conformance with this policy.

VI. Naming Conventions

Naming of Building, Parts of Buildings, Complexes and other Facilities

A building, part of a building, complex or other facility may be supported in whole or in part through funds received as donations.

Proposals will be assessed on an individual basis and the entitlement to naming rights determined accordingly.

A building, part of a building, complex or other facility may be named for a donor for a minimum donation as determined by the Board of Trustees.

When considering the naming a building, part of a building, complex or other facility, the value of the gift in relation to the capital cost of the structure should be considered. Generally, naming rights will only be considered if the value of gift covers a substantial portion of the initial cost or, in the case of an existing structure or area, a substantial portion of the insurable value. Normally, meeting more than half of the capital cost of a building, part of a building, complex or other facility may warrant consideration of granting naming rights to a donor.

The duration of the recognition - whether in perpetuity or for a named period - will be determined by the College in consultation with the donor or a designated trustee of the donor at the time of the donation.

An appropriate plaque will acknowledge the donation.

Naming of Academic Positions, Programs, Lectures, Scholarships, Awards and Prizes and other Options

Academic positions, programs, lectures, scholarships, awards and prizes and other options may be funded in whole or in part through funds received as donations.

Proposals will be assessed on an individual basis and the entitlement to naming rights determined accordingly.

Academic positions, programs, lectures, scholarships, awards and prizes and other options may be named for a donor for a minimum donation as determined by the Board of Trustees.

Generally, a faculty position may be named in honor of a donor who has contributed all or a substantial part of the full costs relating to its establishment, and will contribute sufficient recurrent or endowed funding to maintain the position or substantially maintain the position for at least ten years.

Generally, if the cost of an academic program, award, prize, lecture or a series of lectures is met by a donor, consideration will be given to naming the academic program, award, prize, lecture or series of lectures after the donor as long as full funding for the academic program, award, prize, lecture or a series of lectures is maintained.

The duration of the recognition - whether in perpetuity or for a named period - will be determined by the College in consultation with the donor or a designated trustee of the donor at the time of the donation.

VII. Rescinding Recognition

If, in the Board of Trustee's majority opinion, consonant with generally accepted legal principles, the recognized benefactor is no longer in alignment with the College's mission and fundamental values, the Board of Trustees reserves the right to rescind the recognition.

Where the name of a corporate entity is used, the period of naming will be limited to the life of the corporate entity.

The College reserves the right to demolish, retrofit, add to or maintain the named area as the College's property and programming needs evolve.

The College may entertain the donor's request to change the original recognition naming, at the cost of the donor, when there has been a change in ownership, change in business name or cessation of business.

VIII. Agreements

Once a naming rights scenario is developed and mutually accepted, an agreement must be created that states:

- the amount donated;
- the balance to be donated; ~~and~~
- the terms of payments;
- the nature and duration of recognition
- the terms and procedures for rescission of recognition

and includes:

- the signature of donor; and
- the signature of the College's president and the Metropolitan State College of Denver Foundation's board chair and executive director.

No permanent signage shall be put into place until 100 percent of the funds are received by the College, and all pledges must be paid within five years from the initial pledge date.

The naming right's agreement is considered a legal document and the College reserves the right to use legal methods to collect on a donor's commitment.

AGENDA ITEM: Personnel

ISSUE: Report of personnel actions which have occurred since the last Board agenda of April, 2009.

BACKGROUND: Appointments, resignations, retirements, terminations and contract non-renewals which are delegated to the President and do not require approval by the Board.

INFORMATION: The following personnel items are presented to the Board of Trustees as information.

APPOINTMENTS

Ms. Catherine Midgett, Mathematics Learning Specialist (TRIO Grant-Temporary Appointment), $35,000.00, Effective April 20, 2009.

Dr. Luis Torres, (FROM Interim Deputy Provost TO Deputy Provost), $120,000.00, Effective June 1, 2009. (ADMINISTRATIVE)

RESIGNATIONS

Ms. Carolyn Brislen, Student System IT Specialist, Effective April 17, 2009.

RETIREMENTS

Dr. Lynde O. Gilliam, Professor of Economics, Effective June 30, 2009.

Dr. Bruce Morgenegg, Chair - Professor of Human Performance and Sport, Effective August 1, 2009.

TERMINATIONS

Ms. Paige Van Vliet, Assistant to the Vice President of Student Services, Effective April 3, 2009.

CONTRACT NON-RENEWALS

Mr. Stephen Gonzales, Internal Auditor, Effective June 30, 2009.

President's Written Report to the Board

Applications up

The impact of the state's fiscal situation on enrollment at Metro State remains to be seen, according to Associate Vice President of Enrollment Services Judi Diaz Bonacquisti.

"We did an extensive push (this year) to change the culture from late registration to earlier," Diaz Bonacquisti says, one that appears to have been successful. More students are applying and registering earlier; applications from new students were up 46 percent, as of April 1, compared to the same time last year. However, Diaz Bonacquisti says, these numbers don't necessarily indicate that the College will see an increase in enrollment of this magnitude in the fall. "We're still at half the total number of students applying as we had last year," she says.

In the face of Colorado's economic situation and the legislature's potential drastic cuts to higher education funding, the usual strategy of using previous trends to predict future enrollment that has generally worked in the past is no longer applicable, according to Diaz Bonacquisti. Metro State's relatively low tuition, compared to other four-year colleges in the state, might mean that more students elect to enroll here. Also, the economic downturn might mean that more adults displaced in the workplace come to the College to change careers or enhance their academic credentials. But tuition increases could dampen applications as well.

"We have a *de facto* cap on enrollment, in a sense, already," Diaz Bonacquisti says, based on the space and resources available. For instance, students who are late to register are often left with fewer options for taking classes at times that are convenient for them. In the end, Diaz Bonacquisti says the College will always consider "what's the right number of students we can accommodate at Metro State, given the budget situation."

New dugouts, announcer's booth make softball field a winner

The Metro State women's softball team now has a solid home-field foundation and newfound electricity. Thanks to the generosity of Haselden / Barton Malow and Encore Electric, Inc., two of the companies working on the Auraria Science Building expansion project, the softball fields at Auraria are now equipped with two dugouts and an announcer's booth. Haselden / Barton Malow donated the materials and construction of the structures and Encore Electric, Inc. ran the electricity lines.

Men's basketball player earns All-America honors

Metro State men's basketball player Jesse Wagstaff was named to the Division II second team All-America in addition to being named on the Daktronics third All-America team. Wagstaff is only the ninth player in the history of Metro State to earn All-America honors.

Nuggets honor McDermott

Metro State Athletic Director Joan McDermott was honored at a Denver Nuggets game for having been named the 2008 AstroTurf Athletic Director of the Year for NCAA Division II's West Region by the National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics (NACDA).

"I was really honored that the Nuggets organization chose to recognize me," says McDermott. "We've been able to partner with them on various events, such as the open scrimmage, where 1,800 DPS students come to our gym and watch the Nuggets practice. It's a very beneficial relationship."

The award was created to honor intercollegiate directors of athletics for their commitment and administrative excellence within a campus and/or college community environment. There are just four award winners in all of Division II.

During McDermott's more than 10 years at Metro State, the Roadrunners have won 25 Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference regular season championships and 25 additional conference tournament titles. She headed the department during NCAA championships in 2000 and 2002 in men's basketball and 2004 and 2006 in women's soccer. McDermott currently serves on the NCAA Division II Membership Committee and the NCAA Task Force for Family Balance.

In 2006-07, Metro State won its first-ever RMAC All-Sports/Wells Fargo Cup, awarded to the conference's most successful athletic program over an entire year. This year, the Roadrunners are currently in 15th place nationally in the Learfield Sports Directors' Cup after the winter season. The Sports Directors' Cup is awarded to the most successful Division II program in the country. This past fall, Metro State was one of two schools in the nation to have all five of its fall sports qualify for NCAA postseason play.

Spring sports also are enjoying success. Currently, the College's new softball team is crushing the competition in the NCAA Division II. They are ranked No. 1 in the Central Region and are No. 10 nationally as determined by the NCAA Division II Softball Committee and the National Fastpitch Coaches Association NFCA poll. And track athlete Anthony Luna brought the first-ever national championship in track to Metro State, winning the 800m race at the NCAA Division II Indoor Championships in March.

STEPS re-upped with $1.4 million grant

The 10-year-old Strides Toward Encouraging Professions in Science (STEPS) program, received a five-year, $1.4 million renewal grant from the National Institute of General Medical Sciences and the National Center for Health Disparities, both programs of the National Institutes of Health.

"With this new grant we are expanding our services in a number of ways, including providing supplemental instruction classes for any student in the sciences at Community College of Aurora and Community College of Denver, not just those in the STEPS program," says STEPS Director and Metro State Assistant Professor of Chemistry Rosie Walker. "These sessions provide an extra weekly study group guided by an upper-level student that will directly support what is being taught in specific classes. This should help students improve their grades and also gain a firmer grasp on basic concepts they will need throughout their scientific education.

Over the course of the last three-year grant cycle, STEPS has assisted 32 students, 62 percent of whom continued on to four-year degrees, 25 percent of those at Metro State.

To participate in STEPS, students must be U.S. citizens or permanent residents who are part of an underrepresented minority population in the sciences, and currently enrolled at the CCA or CCD. They must also have an indication of interest and ability in science and science-related courses.

Student health insurance premiums to remain at current levels

As colleges find themselves increasingly considering such unpalatable alternatives as raising tuition or cutting faculty to address the state's higher-education funding crisis, Metro State students have one piece of good news: no increase next year in their health insurance premiums.

Thanks to the advocacy of Health Center Director Steve Monaco, Metro State was able to avert a proposed 12 percent increase in the rates. Monaco negotiated with United Healthcare, the College's insurance carrier, over several weeks, pointing out how much profit the carrier had made from its partnership with Metro State.

In a letter to the carrier, Monaco wrote the following:

"(I)t is the school's desire in these difficult economic times that United Healthcare see themselves as a partner with Metro and give the school no increase in premium, based on the profits the carrier has attained in the recent past. In this way the College can be an advocate for the students, many of whom have lost jobs and depend on Metro to help them retool for the future and help reduce the financial pressures of paying the required medical insurance premium…(T)he College is clear that it does not intend to fund any insurance carrier beyond what is a reasonable profit threshold. The College wants the carrier to be successful financially, but not at the excess expense of their students…"

"Given the economic times we are in, this is great news," Monaco said of the maintenance of current premium levels. "Nor is it the industry norm, by a long shot."

The Metropolitan a winner regionally, competes nationally
Congratulations to the staff of ***The Metropolitan*** student newspaper on their recent awards from the Society of Professional Journalists:

- 1st in region for best all around weekly
- 2nd in photo illustration
- 3rd in news photography
- 2nd in feature writing
- 3rd in breaking news photography
- 3rd in in-depth reporting

The Met competed against 3,600 other regional school papers, and having won first place for best all around weekly, will compete in the nationals.

School of Business honors outstanding students
Several students have been honored with Outstanding Student Awards in the School of Business.
Vanya Pashaliyska, a dual management and marketing major, won the overall award.
The following students won departmental awards:

- Nathan King and Clair Revenig – accounting winners
- Michael McAdams and Christopher Toscano – computer information systems
- Hugo Valdez – economics
- William Gorsuch – finance
- Johnathan Born and Andrea Roy – management
- Christopher Cordova and Nicole Jiles – marketing (Nicole Jiles is also a valued member of the President's Office staff, serving as a student employee)

Honors Program spreads hope
Metro State's Honors Program recently spread hope to those in need by donating Hope Totes filled with personal-care items. "Service to the community is an important component of the Honors Program," says Amy Eckert, co-associate director.

Students from across all disciplinary areas collected shampoo, deodorant, toothbrushes, combs and other items and filled totes that were donated to the Denver Rescue Mission. Honors students assembled 31 hope totes and donated hundreds of additional items. "To be honest, I am not sure how many people contributed items for the totes. There were lots of donations that were dropped off anonymously," Eckert says.

Student Election Results, Legislative approval for buildings
Metro State students voted 53 percent to 39 percent (with 8 percent abstaining) to approve the fee, which will be assessed based on the number of credit hours a student is taking. It will also increase incrementally each year, so that current students will not be burdened by the more substantial fee just before graduating.

"I want to thank all the students who voted for taking the time to make their voices heard," says President Stephen Jordan. "I'm grateful that our students understood that the Student Success Building will be of great value not only to future students, but to them, as graduates, since it will enhance Metro State's visibility and reputation. It will truly infuse even more value into their degree from Metro State."

In a related development, construction of the Student Success Building has been approved by the legislature's Capitol Development Committee. Any building to be constructed on public property falls under the purview of the CDC, whether public funds will be used or not. The CDC also approved the Hotel Learning Center, planned for the southeast corner of Auraria and Speer Boulevards. The building will be a partnership between Metro State and a private corporation. When completed, it will be one of only 11 such facilities in the country and the only one located in an urban hub. "Both these buildings represent tangible strides toward national preeminence and will mark significant accomplishments in Metro State's history" says President Stephen Jordan.

In other results of last week's election, <u>Andrew Bateman has been reelected SGA president.</u> Bateman has been a strong advocate for Metro State's top initiatives, including the Student Success Building, the Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) and master's programs.

<u>C.J. Garbo was elected vice president.</u> The two SACAB representatives are Michelle Sprowl and Hannah Kaufman.

A new student trustee to the Board of Trustees has also been elected. Kailei Higginson is a junior majoring in political science.

Town Hall meeting on budget May 7
President Stephen Jordan will hold a second town hall meeting regarding the College budget on Thursday, May 7, 8:30-10 a.m., in the King Center Concert Hall.

Following the format of the February meeting, Jordan will give a power-point presentation on where the Metro State budget stands this year and next, with the infusion of one-time federal stimulus money. He also will discuss what $10 million in reductions will mean going forward as the College must plan to do business differently.

The meeting will begin with coffee from 8:30-9 a.m., followed by Jordan's presentation. The meeting will wrap up with a question-and-answer session until 10 a.m.

Provost Search brings four finalists to campus

On Monday April 27th, the first two finalists, Neil Matthews from Louisiana State University and Mike Miller from Minnesota State University-Mankato, came to Metro State and met separately with vice presidents, faculty senators and department chairs, administrators and classified staff, academic affairs staff, and other faculty and student groups. They also presented their overall ideas and strategic approach in an open forum.

In separate meetings with the Faculty Senate and the Council of Chairs, Matthews and Miller highlighted their own academic careers, both having been faculty members and chaired their respective departments.

The second two of the four finalists for the position of provost and vice president for academic affairs will be on campus Monday, May 4, to meet with the College's various constituent groups. The candidates are Vicki L. Golich, Ph.D. Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, California State University San Marcos, 2004 – Present, and Peter E. Millet, Ph.D., HSP Dean, College of Education, Tennessee State University, 2004 – Present.

"We had good turnouts at the sessions for our first two candidates and I encourage members of the Metro State community to take the time to visit with these two finalists and provide your feed back as well," said Institutional Advancement Vice President Carrie Besnette, chair of the Provost Search Committee.

First Year Success Program aims to increase retention, graduation rates

Metro State is renewing its commitment to meeting the needs of incoming freshmen with a re-energized First Year Success Program. President Stephen Jordan and a number of other key administrators held a luncheon April 24 in the Tivoli Student Union to stress the importance of the College making the transition from high school to Metro State as smooth as possible for students. Providing first-time-to-college students an environment of academic and social support, he says, is at the heart of Metro State's priorities.

"I do not believe there is anything that we are doing at our College right now that is more important than improving the retention, and ultimately the graduation rates, of the students that are coming to us as freshmen," Jordan said.

Beginning this fall, the First Year Success Program will seek to serve 400 traditional-aged college students through 20 cohorts of 20 students each. The goal, over the next few years, is to prepare the College with the space, personnel and budgetary resources to serve every incoming freshman through the retention program.

Jordan broadly outlined his philosophy on how he and his administration will seek to accomplish the task. "We are going to need to 'right size,'" he said. "We're going to have to set some priorities about what is most important to this College."

"We have understood from day one that you can't have a goal of every freshman being part of a learning community if you don't have any space," said Jordan. " ... Two and a half years from now, [Metro State will have enough space so that] it is realistic that we can have first-year success for every freshman."

Ultimately, Jordan says he hopes the College community is able to look back five to 10 years from now and see retention rates at 75 percent or better and graduation rates rising towards 60 percent. To strive for less, he says, is an unacceptable scenario.

"First-year success is going to be a core element of what we're going to be committed to [in the future]," said Jordan. "We must all be dedicated to changing the results and the outcomes for our students. There is too much at stake for our community for us not to do that."

Four departments receive first-ever assessment excellence awards

As part of the ongoing move toward more college-wide assessment of student learning, four academic departments were presented with awards earlier this month for their efforts and achievement in program assessment. Industrial Design received the assessment excellence award; African and African American Studies, Management and Women Studies each received assessment achievement awards for progress in assessment. Each department received $500 and a framed certificate.

"These folks are taking program assessment seriously and that's why they're being honored," said Sheila Thompson, director of student learning assessment and chair of the Institutional Assessment Committee, which presented the awards. "They're using the information they gather through program assessment to improve their curricula and programs, which ultimately improves student learning."

The committee decided to award in two categories, one recognizing excellence already attained and one acknowledging progress. The assessment excellence award is based on a Metro State peer review of assessment reports. Instituted three years ago, the peer review is performed in the fall by faculty members, some on the assessment committee and some not, who evaluate a program's assessment using a standard set of questions. To receive an excellence award, a program must receive an overall peer review rating of "Exemplary." A program or department is only eligible to receive this award once. The assessment achievement award is based on nominations from deans, associate deans and the peer reviewers, and recognizes progress in program assessment activities since the previous year.