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Summary

State Law requires the California Postsecondary Education Commission to review new public institutions of higher education. The purpose of this review is two-fold: first, to ensure new university and college campuses and off-campus centers develop in accordance with state-wide needs and priorities, and secondly, to make certain State capital outlay funds will be spent wisely.

The Commission’s policies and procedures used in the review of new facilities have evolved with changes in California’s planning environment. Education planners over the last few years have had the daunting challenge of accommodating robust enrollments at a time of diminishing public resources. The Commission responded by promoting greater efficiencies in the planning of new facilities. Examples of recent changes to the review guidelines that advance efficiencies include: priority consideration given to the development of joint-use centers where two or more segments share a facility and to proposals that provide local contributions.

It appears the Commission is achieving its goal of advancing efficiencies in the development of new institutions. A review of recently approved proposals suggests most new facilities will be financed with a combination of both local and state monies. In fact, all community college proposals include a local contribution. A majority of these proposals also illustrate elements of inter-segmental cooperation, particularly with nearby high school districts.

The Commission approved this report at its meeting on June 8, 2004, and it has been added to the Commission’s website: www.cpec.ca.gov. Questions regarding the report should be directed to Gil Velazquez at (916) 322-8018.

Additional copies of this and other Commission reports may also be obtained by e-mail at PublicationRequest@cpec.ca.gov; or by writing the Commission at 1303 J Street, Suite 500, Sacramento, CA 95814-2938; or by telephone at (916) 322-9268.
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Introduction
Section 66903(e) of the California Education requires the California Post-secondary Education Commission to review all new public institutions of higher education prior to their establishment. The purpose of the State’s review process is two-fold: first to ensure that new university and college campuses and off-campus centers develop in accordance with statewide needs and priorities and secondly, to make certain that State capital outlay funds will be spent wisely.

The Commission’s role in overseeing the orderly growth of California’s public higher education can be traced to the inception of the State’s Master Plan for Higher Education. This document assigned to the California Postsecondary Education Commission, and its predecessor, the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, the responsibility for advising the Legislature about the need for new college and university campuses and off-campus centers. While the Governor and the Legislature maintain the ultimate authority to fund such new institutions, they have relied on the Commission’s analyses and recommendations in making such decisions. The Commission’s function as a statewide planning and coordinating agency for higher education makes it uniquely qualified to provide independent analysis of the costs and benefits of proposed projects and it has played an important role in ensuring that new campuses develop as viable, high quality institutions.

This report describes the Commission’s role in approving new public institutions of higher education and discusses the progression of changes in policies and procedures used in the review of proposals for new facilities. It highlights recently approved institutions and discusses inter-segmental coordination and economic efficiencies.

The Review Process
The Commission’s review process not only ensures that new campuses and off-campus centers develop in accordance with statewide needs, but also helps to ensure that State capital outlay funds are wisely spent.

Proposals submitted for review by the Commission involve reviews by system executive offices and State control agencies. Each review plays an important role in ensuring that the proposed institution meets specific needs, will be financially viable, will offer high quality educational services, and will have enrollments sufficient to sustain the project in the long-term.
System executive offices must approve proposals before they are submitted to the Commission. The Commission only reviews proposals that have been endorsed by the system governing body or its executive officer. It is important to note that Commission approval of a new institution creates only an eligibility to compete for State capital outlay funding - not an entitlement - regardless of whether that funding comes from a statewide bond issue, the General Fund, or some other State source.

Prior to 1974, the Commission’s predecessor, the Coordinating Council provided broad advice on long-range planning matters, and "the need for and location of new institutions" of higher education. The Council conducted statewide planning studies, examined enrollment growth and fiscal resources, and suggested not only the number of new campuses that might be required in future years, but also the general locations where they might be built. These statewide planning assessments were contained in a series of reports referred to as the "additional center studies" (CPEC 99-2). The Coordinating Council engaged in this broad, long-range planning responsibility independently of any proposal for a specific new campus or educational center.

When the California Postsecondary Education Commission was established in 1974, the Legislature specified a stronger role for the Commission with regard to its responsibility to advise the governor and the Legislature about the need for and location of new institutions. The intent language of Education Code Section 66904 gave the Commission a stronger role in overseeing the growth of California's public postsecondary institutions and more direct responsibility to review specific proposals from each of the three public systems.

Procedures and policies implementing the Commission’s statutory responsibilities originated some 29 years ago with the adoption of Guidelines for Review of Proposed Campuses and Off-Campus Centers (CPEC 75-4). The 1975 Guidelines articulated for the first time in California’s higher education history a comprehensive planning framework for its three public segments. Segments planning new facilities under these quasi-regulations needed to develop a “Needs Study” that includes such elements as: enrollment demand and the segment’s existing capacity; the consideration of alternatives to establishing a new facility; and an examination of the impact of the proposed facility on nearby institutions, among other requirements. Over the years the Guidelines have undergone six revisions in order to better respond to California’s changing planning environment. Though some revisions included substantive changes, the format of the first version largely remains unchanged. The Commission’s basic assumptions used in developing the guidelines and procedures are outlined; the proposals subject to review are specified; a notification and review schedule is presented; and the content of the “needs studies” is detailed.
By the late 1980s and early 1990s, the State’s growing population and its economic recession exerted pressures on the higher education planning process. It was clear that within the next several decades California’s higher educational physical capacity would need to expand in order to achieve the educational goals envisioned in the State’s Master Plan for Higher Education. The Commission believed, however, that such expansion should proceed in an orderly and efficient manner so that the State’s limited resources would be wisely used. Collectively, these conditions set the stage for the substantive revisions to the guidelines that were enacted in 1990, 1992 and 2002.

Chief among the responses to the challenge of expanding access with diminishing state resources was the Commission’s goal of advancing inter-segmental cooperation. The sharing of resources between the segments, in the view of the Commission, offered a viable policy option for realizing greater efficiencies in expanding the State’s physical capacity. In 1990, the Commission in its long-range planning report -- *Higher Education at the Crossroads: Planning for the Twenty-First Century* (CPEC 90-1) -- strongly encouraged the development of collaborative, joint-use facilities. Two years later, the Commission formalized inter-segmental collaboration by requiring the three public segments to show evidence in their long-range plans of cooperative planning with California’s other public systems and with independent colleges and universities. Proposals would receive priority consideration “provided the systems or institutions involved demonstrated a financial savings or programmatic advantage to the State as a result of the cooperative effort (Guidelines for Review of Proposed University Campuses, Community Colleges, and Educational Centers, CPEC 92-19)”.

Consistent with the revision of the 1992 guidelines, the Commission affirmed its view that pressures of accommodating enrollment growth with limited resources presented an opportunity for the State to encourage and implement cooperative, inter-segmental approaches to providing access to higher education. Today’s guidelines, adopted in April 2002, include an entire stand-alone section devoted to the policies and procedures for the review and approval of joint-use educational centers. This section generally follows the three-stage review process for single-segment educational centers: Preliminary Notice, Letter Of Intent, and a Needs Study. Also included is a preamble articulating the Commission’s goals in advancing joint-use facilities. These include:

- The promotion of seamless system of higher education services;
- The encouragement of capital outlay cost savings;
- The advancement of practices that promote the efficient utilization of physical facilities; and
- The improvement of regional economic development opportunities.
The 2002 revisions to the guidelines also added a requirement for inter-segmental cooperation in its sections that governed University of California (UC) and California State University (CSU) educational centers. Under the 1992 guidelines, educational centers operated by both the UC and CSU were allowed to offer courses and programs only at the upper-division and graduate level. Their respective educational offerings were expanded to include lower-division courses with the adoption of the 2002 changes, but only if such offerings involved community colleges. (For detailed information on these amendments as well as the entire text of the current version of the Guidelines, please refer to Appendix A).

In addition to advancing inter-segmental cooperation, the Commission, in both the 1992 and 2002 revisions, added two other important measures designed to promote greater efficiencies. First, public segments were encouraged to contribute non-state resources to the development of new facilities. This revision assigned a greater priority to proposals that relieved the State of all or part of the financial burden. In addition, the Commission incorporated a stricter adherence to the required enrollment thresholds that specified an enrollment threshold of 500 Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTE) for new community college centers.

As the number of proposals for new community college educational centers increased, the 1992 enrollment threshold language needed further revision. Many proposals included overly optimistic enrollment projections. The Commission, with the support from the Chancellor’s Office of the California Community Colleges, revised its guidelines to specify that the 500 FTEs enrollment threshold must be achieved in the most recent Fall-term prior to Commission approval. Although it is too early to make definitive conclusions about the effects of the stricter enrollment threshold, fewer proposals are likely to be submitted, at least in the short-term.

CPEC Participation in the Planning Process: An Early Approach

The Commission informs the planning process for new facilities long before public segments submit a formal Needs Study. Under the “Preliminary Notice” requirements adopted in April 2002, the public segments notify the Commission of their intent to establish a new facility at the “discussion” stages of the planning process.

This notification schedule allows the Commission to participate in the development of new institution long before segments dedicate significant resources to the planning process. Prior to the Preliminary Notice requirement, the Commission generally received notices of proposed new campuses after suitable sites were already identified through extensive feasibility studies, and in a few instances, after the purchase of land had already occurred. These circumstances make it difficult, if not impossible, for the Commission to effectively discharge its statutory responsibility of reviewing new facilities.

As illustrated by recent experience, the Preliminary Notice can be successful in ensuring the Commission is involved in the early stages of the
development of new facilities. Several months ago, a community college district in complying with the Preliminary Notice, convened a meeting with CPEC staff to discuss its plans for developing several new educational centers over the next five to ten years. Commission staff was able to comment extensively on a number of critical planning issues such as: the methodology for selecting suitable sites; enrollment projections both regionally and locally; the educational needs of the region; and the District’s capital outlay needs and potential funding sources for the proposed centers. Both Commission and District staff agreed this dialogue afforded an opportunity for both parties to deliberate the merits of the plan prior to the District committing significant financial resources to the development of its new centers.

The need to accommodate the surge in enrollment demand has led to an increase in the number of proposals submitted for Commission review. Over the last four years, the Commission reviewed ten proposals, or 71 percent of the proposals reviewed in the entire past decade. By the end of this decade, and because of anticipated enrollment growth, especially at the community colleges, it is likely that the number of proposals submitted for review will reach record levels, far exceeding the number reviewed in each of the last two decades. The following is a summary of the recent proposals the Commission as approved since February 2002.

- **West Hills College at Lemoore**, West Hills Community College District. This new college serves the Central Valley communities of Lemoore and Hanford and will enroll approximately 4,200 students by 2015. Its educational offerings include a full complement of transfer, associate degree and certificated courses and programs, with special emphases on disciplines in demand in the regional economy, such as agriculture, early childhood education, and hotel, restaurant, and casino management.

- **Otay Mesa Higher Education Center**, Southwestern Community College District. This Center serves the ethnically diverse population in the southern San Diego Communities of San Ysidro and Otay Mesa. Academic plans include on-site instructional offerings with San Diego State University in such areas as computer science, teacher education, and business administration.

- **Community Learning Center**, MiraCosta Community College District. The Learning Center targets educational services to Oceanside’s ethnically diverse population. Its curriculum provides an extensive offering in English as a Second Language and basic skills education. Student enrollment is expected to total over 2,000 by 2010.

- **Willow International Center**, State Center Community College District. This Center replaces the small, over-crowed Clovis op-
eral center and will accommodate a portion of the District’s 15,000 additional students it expects to serve by 2015. Communities served by this center include Clovis and other fast-growing northeastern suburbs of Fresno. Educational programs include an extensive offering in expanding health care industry, such as nursing, home health care, pre-pharmacy, and pre-optometry.

- **California State University Bakersfield, Antelope Valley Center.** Located on the grounds of Antelope Valley Community College, this Center offers upper-division courses in a variety of disciplines, including education credential programs. It is anticipated that its current enrollment of 544 Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES) will increase by 52 percent, or 417 additional FTE students by 2012.

- **Moreno Valley College Community College, Riverside Community College District.** The Moreno Valley College would serve eastern Riverside County and will accommodate more than 9,000 students by 2015, a 90 percent increase in enrollments over the 2002 levels. Its educational programs include a full complement of general education, basic skills, and vocational education with an emphasis on health care disciplines -- nursing assistant, pharmacy technician, and dental hygiene -- and business administration.

- **Norco Community College, Riverside Community College District.** This campus is expected to serve over 11,000 students by 2010, an increase of 26 percent in students over the 2002 level. Specialty programs targeted for this campus include engineering, computer science, information systems, and agriculture sciences.

As illustrated by Display 1, most of the campuses described above include some level of inter-segmental cooperation, and local financial contributions that offset costs otherwise borne by the State. Inter-segmental arrangements, particularly in educational centers that include high schools, generally involve the sharing of classroom space in order to more efficiently expand access to educational services. In a few cases, however, inter-segmental cooperation involves the provision of instructional services.

The Riverside Community College District, for example, operates a “2+2” Program at its recently approved Moreno Valley campus whereby area high school students can complete their last two years of high school at the community college facility. District officials expect to broaden this program by partnering with a local university to allow Moreno Valley community college students to complete their baccalaureate degree on site, effectively creating a “2+2+2” Program.
**Display 1: Commission Approved Facilities for 2002 to May 2004**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Approval Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Sponsoring System</th>
<th>Inter-segmental Arrangements</th>
<th>Economic Efficiencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| West Hills College at Lemoore       | February 2002 | Lemoore  | West Hills Community College District (CCD) | • On-site Charter Elementary School  
• CSU Fresno to deliver instructional services on site | • 100 acres of land donated for site  
• City of Lemoore committed $500,000 for off-site improvements  
• Phase I includes $14.6 million in local funds; state to finance balance of $33.6 million |
| Otay Mesa Higher Education Center   | June 2002     | San Ysidro | Southwestern CCD               | • San Diego State to locate on site  
• Sweetwater Union High School District to locate new high school adjacent to Center | • Phase I includes $25.7 million in local funds; state to finance balance of $38.0 million |
| Community Learning Center           | February 2003 | Oceanside | MiraCosta CCD                  | • Oceanside Unified School District to place a high school on site  
• District working with CSU San Marcos and UC San Diego for possible joint-use initiatives | • Phase I developed entirely with local funds ($8.0 million)  
• Phase II to be financed entirely by Oceanside Unified  
• Phase III to be financed with State funds ($8.0 million) |
| CSU Bakersfield Antelope Valley Educational Center | April 2003 | Lancaster | The California State University | • Center located in Antelope Valley College | • Antelope Valley College offers leased space at nominal costs |
| Willow-International Community College Center | April 2003 | Clovis   | State Center CCD                | • New Clovis High School to built adjacent to Center | • $50 million in local funds, or 44% of total costs ($114.4) will be used for development of first three phases. |
| Moreno Valley Community College     | March 2004    | Moreno Valley | Riverside CCD             | • Campus operates a “middle college high school program” with six feeder high schools | • 132-acre site donated by local rancher  
• Local funds will be used for expansion. Amount not know since its local bond facilities initiative passed several days prior to review of proposal. |
| Norco Community College             | March 2004    | Norco    | Riverside CCD                  | • Corona-Norco School District to house new high school on Norco Campus | • 144-acre site donated by federal government  
• Local funds will be used for expansion. Amount not know since its local bond facilities initiative passed several days prior to review of proposal. |

**Anticipated Programs**

There are five proposals in various stages of development that Commission staff is working on. Display 2 identifies the institutions preparing such proposals along with their stages of development.
**DISPLAY 2  Proposed Off-Campus Centers by System, Type of Facility Proposed and Stages of the Planning Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Type of Facility</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Stage of Planning Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chaffey Community College District</td>
<td>Educational Center</td>
<td>Chino</td>
<td>Needs Study to be presented at June Commission meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clarita Community College District</td>
<td>Educational Center</td>
<td>Santa Clarita</td>
<td>Needs Study to be presented at June Commission meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Rios Community College District</td>
<td>Educational Center</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>Letter of Intent Approved; Completing Needs Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palomar Community College District</td>
<td>Educational Centers (2)</td>
<td>Northern San Diego County (location of sites to be determined at future time)</td>
<td>Preliminary Notice submitted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Introduction

The State of California requires new public institutions of higher education to be reviewed by the California Postsecondary Education Commission prior to their establishment. The purpose of the State’s review process is to help ensure that new university and college campuses and off-campus centers develop in accordance with statewide needs and priorities and to ensure that State capital outlay funds will be wisely spent. California law requires the California Postsecondary Education Commission to advise the Legislature and the governor regarding the need for and location of new public higher education institutions and requires sites for new campuses or educational centers to be recommended by the Commission prior to their acquisition or authorization.

This document establishes the State's process for the review of proposed university campuses, community colleges, and educational centers. The Guidelines for Review of Proposed University Campuses, Community Colleges, and Educational and Joint-Use Centers provides campus planners and executives with a framework for planning new institutions and an outline for the development of proposals requiring review.

The Commission's role in overseeing the orderly growth of California's public higher education can be traced to the inception of the State's Master Plan for Higher Education. This document assigned to the California Postsecondary Education Commission, and to its predecessor, the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, the responsibility for advising the Legislature about the need for new college and university campuses and off-campus centers. While the governor and the Legislature maintain the ultimate authority to fund such new institutions, they have relied on the Commission's analysis and recommendations in making such decisions. The Commission's function as a statewide planning and coordinating agency for higher education makes it uniquely qualified to provide independent analysis of the costs and benefits of proposed projects and it has played an important role in ensuring that new campuses develop as viable, high quality institutions.
Section 66903(e) of the California Education Code states that the California Postsecondary Education Commission shall "advise the Legislature and the Governor regarding the need for, and location of, new institutions and campuses of public higher education." Section 66904 of the Education Code expresses the intent of the Legislature that the sites for new institutions or branches of public postsecondary education will not be authorized or acquired unless recommended by the Commission:

It is the intent of the Legislature that sites for new institutions or branches of the University of California and the California State University, and the classes of off-campus centers as the Commission shall determine, shall not be authorized or acquired unless recommended by the Commission.

It is further the intent of the Legislature that California Community Colleges shall not receive State funds for acquisition of sites or construction of new institutions, branches or off-campus centers unless recommended by the Commission. Acquisition or construction of non-State funded community colleges, branches and off-campus centers, and proposals for acquisition or construction shall be reported to and may be reviewed and commented upon by the Commission.

Education Code Section 89002 applies specifically to the California State University (CSU) and specifies that construction of authorized campuses shall commence only upon resolution of the CSU trustees and approval by the California Postsecondary Education Commission.

The review process

The State’s review process not only helps to ensure that new campuses and off-campus centers develop in accordance with statewide needs and segmental long-range planning goals, but also helps to ensure that State capital outlay funds will be wisely spent.

Proposals submitted for review by the Commission also involve review by system executive offices and State control agencies. Each review plays an important role in ensuring that the proposed institution meets specific needs, will be financially viable, will offer high quality educational services, and will have enrollments sufficient to sustain the project in the long-term.

System executive offices must approve proposals before they are submitted to the Commission for review. The Commission will not review proposals that have not been endorsed by the system governing body or its executive. Proposals involving State capital outlay or operating funds also require review by the Department of Finance through the Budget Change Proposal process, although it is important to note that Commission approval of a new institution creates only an eligibility to compete for State capital outlay funding - not an entitlement - regardless of
whether that funding comes from a statewide bond issue, the General Fund, or some other State source. Requests for funding related to planning, developing, or constructing new campuses or educational centers may not be supported by the Department of Finance prior to review by the Commission.

**Brief history of the review process**

The statutes that support the Commission’s guidelines have a long and consistent history dating back to the development of the Master Plan for Higher Education in California in 1960. Section 66903(e) has remained essentially unchanged since the Donahoe Act created the Commission's predecessor agency, the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, in 1961. That legislation gave the Council several specific responsibilities, including the review of new programs, the collection of data and information regarding higher education, and of greatest interest to these guidelines, the regulation of physical growth. In this way, the Legislature could receive advice from the Council - and subsequently the Commission - regarding the expenditure of scarce capital outlay resources.

Prior to 1974, the Coordinating Council provided broad advice on long-range planning matters, and "the need for and location of new institutions" of higher education. The Council conducted statewide planning studies, examined enrollment growth and fiscal resources, and suggested not only the number of new campuses that might be required in future years, but also the general locations where they might be built. These statewide planning assessments were contained in a series of reports referred to as the "additional center studies" (CPEC 99-2). The Coordinating Council engaged in this broad, long-range planning responsibility independently of any proposal for a specific new campus or educational center.

When the California Postsecondary Education Commission was established in 1974, the Legislature specified a stronger role for the Commission with regard to its responsibility to advise the governor and the Legislature about the need for and location of new institutions. The intent language of Education Code Section 66904 gave the Commission a stronger role in overseeing the growth of California's public postsecondary institutions and gave the Commission more direct responsibility to review specific proposals from each of the three public systems.

Since the Donahoe Act was passed, the Commission's quasi-regulatory responsibilities have been formalized by the guidelines contained in this document. These guidelines do not directly affect the Commission's responsibility to review new academic programs, which is often undertaken independently of the review of new institutions.

The Commission first adopted policies relating to the review of proposed campuses and educational centers in 1975. The Commission revised those policies in 1978 and 1982. The most recent revision to those policies occurred in 1992 and is contained in the Commission's publication,
Guidelines for Review of Proposed University Campuses, Community Colleges, and Educational Centers (CPEC, 92-18). The guidelines specify the proposals subject to Commission review, the criteria for reviewing proposals, the schedule to be followed by the three public systems when submitting proposals, and specify the contents required of a Needs Study. The guidelines define the criteria by which Commission staff members analyze new campus proposals, focusing particularly on the issues of enrollment demand, geographic location and access, programmatic alternatives, projected costs, potential impacts on the surrounding community, and neighboring institutions.

Policy assumptions used in developing the guidelines

The following policy assumptions are central to the development of the guidelines that the Commission uses in reviewing proposals for new campuses and educational centers:

1. It is State policy that each resident of California who has the capacity and motivation to benefit from higher education will have the opportunity to enroll in an institution of higher education. The California Community Colleges shall continue to be accessible to all persons at least 18 years of age who can benefit from the instruction offered, regardless of district boundaries. The California State University and the University of California shall continue to be accessible to first-time freshmen among the pool of students eligible according to Master Plan eligibility guidelines. Master Plan guidelines on undergraduate admission priorities will continue to be: (a) continuing undergraduates in good standing; (b) California residents who are successful transfers from California public community colleges; (c) California residents entering at the freshman or sophomore level; and (d) residents of other states or foreign countries.

2. The differentiation of function among the systems with regard to institutional mission shall continue to be as defined by the State's Master Plan for Higher Education.

3. The University of California plans and develops its campuses and off-campus centers on the basis of statewide need.

4. The California State University plans and develops its campuses and off-campus centers on the basis of statewide needs and special regional considerations.

5. The California Community Colleges plan and develop their campuses and off-campus centers on the basis of local needs.

6. Planned enrollment capacities are established for and observed by all campuses of public postsecondary education. These capacities are determined on the basis of statewide and institutional economies, community and campus environment, physical limitations on campus size, program requirements and student enrollment levels, and internal or-
ganization. Planned enrollment capacities are established by the governing boards of community college districts (and reviewed by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges), the Trustees of the California State University, and the Regents of the University of California.

7. California’s independent institutions, while not directly affected by the guidelines, are considered an integral component of California’s system of higher education and offer a viable educational opportunity for many Californians.

8. Needs Studies developed pursuant to Letters of Intent submitted to the Commission prior to April 10, 2002, shall be prepared in accordance with the informational requirements specified in the August 1992 edition of the *Guidelines for Review of Proposed University Campuses, Community Colleges, and Educational and Joint-Use Centers*.

As used in these guidelines, "institution" refers to an educational center, a community college, a university campus, or a joint-use educational center but not an off-campus center operation or a joint-use center operation. Once approved by the Commission, institutions are eligible to compete for State capital outlay funding through the State’s budget change proposal process. For the purposes of these guidelines, the following definitions shall apply:

**Grandfathered Institution (all systems)**: A “Grandfathered Institution” is a community college, a university campus, or an educational center operated by a community college district, the California State University, or the University of California that has been formerly recognized by the Commission as an approved location in previously published reports. Each grandfathered location must have continuously enrolled students since its approval by the Commission. Locations approved by the Commission prior to the effective date of these guidelines shall continue to be eligible for State capital outlay funding.

**Off-campus Center Operation (all systems)**: An off-campus operation is an enterprise, operated away from a community college or university campus established to meet the educational needs of a local population, which offers postsecondary education courses supported by State funds, but which serves a student population of less than 500 Fall-Term FTES at a single location.

**Educational Center (California Community Colleges)**: An educational center is a Commission approved off-campus operation owned or leased by the parent district and administered by a parent community college. An educational center offers instructional programs leading (but not limited to) to certificates or degrees conferred by the parent institution. An approved educational center must enroll a minimum of 500 Fall term FTES in the most recently completed Fall-term prior to the approval of
the Commission and maintain an on-site administration (typically headed by a dean or director, but not a president, chancellor, or superintendent).

The Commission recognizes community college educational centers offering both credit and noncredit instructional programs that advance the State’s economic development and accordingly, community college districts may seek approval of such educational centers if they serve the required enrollment levels specified above. The noncredit instructional services provided at such educational centers must be consistent with the authorized instructional offerings specified in the California Education Code Sections 70900 through 78271 and Sections 78400 through 88551. Community college educational centers offering only community services courses as defined in Section 78300 of the California Education Code shall not qualify for Commission review.

*Education Center (The California State University)*: An educational center is an off-campus enterprise owned or leased by the Trustees and administered by a parent State University campus. An educational center will normally offer courses and programs only at the upper-division and/or graduate levels, however the center may offer lower division courses under exceptional circumstances, and only in collaboration with a community college, or by special permission of the Commission. Certificates or degrees earned must be conferred by the parent institution. An educational center must enroll a minimum of 500 Fall-term FTES and maintain an on-site administration (typically headed by a dean or director, but not by a president). Educational operations in other countries, states, and the District of Columbia shall not be regarded as educational centers for the purposes of these guidelines, unless State funding is used.

*Education Center (University of California)*: An educational center is an off-campus enterprise owned or leased by the Regents and administered by a parent University campus. The center will normally offer courses and programs only at the upper division and/or graduate levels, but may offer lower division courses under exceptional circumstances, and only in collaboration with a community college, or by special permission of the Commission. An educational center must enroll a minimum of 500 Fall-Term FTES and maintain an on-site administration (typically headed by a dean or director, but not by a chancellor). Certificates or degrees earned must be conferred by the parent institution. Organized Research Units (ORU’s) and the Northern and Southern Regional Library Facilities shall not be regarded as educational centers. Educational operations in other countries, states, and the District of Columbia shall not be regarded as educational centers unless State funding is used.

*Community College (California Community Colleges)*: A regionally accredited, degree and certificate granting institution offering a full complement of lower-division programs and services, usually at a single campus location owned by the district. A community college must enroll a minimum of 1,000 Fall-term FTES in the most recently completed Fall-
term prior to the approval by the Commission. A community college that has been converted from an educational center must have 1,000 Fall-term FTES. A community college must have its own freestanding administration headed by a President and support services, and be capable of passing accreditation by its fifth year of operation.

**University Campus (University of California and The California State University):** A regionally accredited, degree-granting institution offering a full complement of services and programs at the lower division, upper division, and graduate levels, usually at a single campus location owned by the Regents or the Trustees. A university campus must enroll a minimum of 3,000 Fall-Term FTES within five years of the date classes are first offered if it is a new institution. A university campus that has been converted from an educational center must have 3,000 FTES within five years of the opening date. A university campus will have its own freestanding administration headed by a president or chancellor.

**Joint-use Center Operation (all systems):** A joint-use center operation is an enterprise operated away from a community college or university campus where facilities and operations are shared by two or more of the following segments: California Community Colleges, the California State University, the University of California, California public high schools, and Independent California Colleges and Universities. A joint-use center operation serves the educational needs of a local population and enrolls a student population of less than 500 Fall-term FTES. Joint-use center operations may be established on sites operated by participating segments. For example, a California State University campus may construct or remodel facilities at a site operated by a community college for purposes of establishing a joint-use center operation.

Joint-use center operations shall not be subject to review by the Commission. However, a joint-use center operation that enrolls more than 200 Fall-term FTES must submit a Preliminary Notice as defined on page 34 of the Guidelines.

**Joint-use Educational Center:** A public higher education enterprise where facilities and operations are shared by two or more of the following segments: California Community Colleges, The California State University, the University of California, California public high schools, and Independent California Colleges and Universities. A joint-use educational center may seek programs of study that are subject to all normal review processes of the California Postsecondary Education Commission. Joint-use educational centers may be owned or leased, but administrative responsibility must be exercised by one of the three public systems of higher education. Regardless of operational control, a joint-use educational center must enroll a minimum of 500 Fall-term FTES in the most recently completed Fall-term prior to the approval by the Commission.
### Projects subject to Commission review

The following transactions are subject to review by the Commission:

- Proposals for establishing a new university or community college campus
- Proposals for converting an educational center to a university or community college campus
- Proposals for establishing a university or community college educational center
- Proposals for converting an off-campus operation to an educational center
- Proposals for joint-use educational centers.

The Commission may review and comment on other projects consistent with its overall State planning and coordination role.

### Stages in the review process

The Commission's review process is organized in three phases. The first occurs when an institution or system advises the Commission, through a "Preliminary Notice" that it is engaging a planning process that may include the development of one or more institutions in specified regions. The second occurs when the system notifies the Commission of a specific need for and intention to expand educational services in a given area. This "Letter of Intent" stage permits the Commission to recommend against a proposal or provide advice before the system engages in significant planning and development activities and signals the point at which systems may be eligible to compete for funding to assist in programmatic planning efforts. The third stage of the review process involves a "Needs Study", in which the system submits a formal proposal that provides findings from a comprehensive needs analysis for the project.

At the conclusion of the review process, the Commission forwards its recommendations to the Office of the Governor, the Legislature, and the system executive office.
2 New University or Community College Campuses

The process for each public higher education system to establish a new university or community college campus, as defined in the definitions section of the guidelines, is as follows:

1. Preliminary Notice

At such time as a public higher education system, including a community college district, begins a planning process to establish a new community college or university campus, the governing board of the system or district shall forward to the Commission a Preliminary Notice of the planning activities. This Preliminary Notice shall indicate:

- The general location of the proposed new institution,
- The type of institution under consideration and the estimated timeframe for its development,
- The estimated enrollment of the institution at its opening and within five years of operation,
- A tentative five-year capital outlay plan, and
- A copy of the agenda item wherein the new site is discussed by the local district (California Community College) or statewide governing board (University of California or California State University), if any.

A Preliminary Notice represents an informational process, and does not require formal consideration or approval by the Commission.

2. Letter of Intent

New University of California or State University Campuses

Not less than five years prior to the time it expects its first capital outlay appropriation for the new university campus, the University of California Regents or the California State University Trustees should submit a Letter of Intent meeting the requirements below, to the Commission (with copies to the Department of Finance, the Demographic Research Unit, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst).

A complete Letter of Intent for a new university campus must contain the following information:
♦ A preliminary 10-year enrollment projection (headcount and FTES) for the new university campus (from the campus’s opening date), developed by the systemwide central office. The systemwide central office may seek the advice of the Demographic Research Unit (DRU) in developing the projection, but DRU approval is not required at this stage.

♦ The geographic location of the proposed campus in terms as specific as possible. A brief description of each site under consideration should be included.

♦ The identification of neighboring public and independent institutions in the area in which the proposed university campus is to be located.

♦ Maps of the area in which the proposed university campus is to be located, indicating population densities, topography, road and highway configurations, airports and any other features of interest.

♦ A time schedule for development of the campus, including preliminary dates and enrollment levels at the opening, intermediate, and final build out stages.

♦ A tentative five-year capital outlay budget beginning with the date of the first capital outlay appropriation.

♦ A copy of the resolution by the Regents or the Trustees authorizing the new campus.

The Executive Director of the Commission shall respond to the chief executive officer, in writing, no later than 60 days following submission of a complete Letter of Intent to the Commission. The Executive Director may raise concerns about shortcomings or limitations in the Letter of Intent that need to be addressed in the planning process. If the plans appear to be reasonable, the Commission's Executive Director will advise the systemwide chief executive officer to proceed with development plans.

New California Community Colleges:

A Letter of Intent provides an overview of the district plans regarding a new community college and explains, in general terms, how the facility’s programs and services relate to other approved locations in the district. Not less than two years before it expects its first capital outlay appropriation for a new community college, the community college district should submit a Letter of Intent meeting the requirements below, to the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges (with copies to the Commission, Department of Finance, the Demographic Research Unit, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst). Upon completing its review, the Board of Governors, or the Chancellor, if so delegated by the Board, will forward its recommendation to the Commission, with copies to the Department of Finance and the Legislative Analyst. The Commission will not act on a Letter of Intent submitted by a local community college
district prior to its approval by the Board of Governors or the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges.

A Letter of Intent for a new community college must contain the following information:

♦ A preliminary 10-year enrollment projection of enrollment headcount and FTES attendance for the new community college (from the college's opening date), developed by the district and/or the Chancellor's Office. The district and/or the Chancellor's Office is encouraged to seek the advice of the Demographic Research Unit (DRU) in developing the projection, but DRU approval is not required at this stage.

♦ The geographic location of the new community college in terms as specific as possible. A brief description of each site under consideration should be included.

♦ The identification of neighboring public and independent institutions in the area in which the proposed community college is to be located.

♦ Maps of the area in which the proposed new community college is to be located, indicating population densities, topography, road and highway configurations, airports, and any other features of interest.

♦ A time schedule for development of the new community college, including preliminary dates and enrollment levels at the opening, intermediate, and final build out stages.

♦ A copy of the district's most recent five-year capital construction plan.

♦ A tentative five-year capital outlay budget starting on the date of the first capital outlay appropriation (State and local).

♦ A copy of the resolution by the district governing board authorizing the new community college.

The Commission Executive Director shall respond to the Chancellor, in writing, no later than 60 days following submission of the completed Letter of Intent to the Commission. The Commission Executive Director may in this process raise concerns about shortcomings or limitations in the Letter of Intent that need to be addressed in the planning process. If the plans appear to be reasonable, the Commission's Executive Director will advise the Chancellor that the district should move forward with further development plans.
3. Needs Study

The purpose of a Needs Study is to demonstrate need for the proposed college or university campus at the location identified. A Needs Study is considered complete only when it fully addresses each of the criteria listed below.

3.1 General Description and Overview

An opening section that includes: A general description of the proposal, a physical description of the site, and a social and demographic analysis of the surrounding area. Data describing the socioeconomic profile of the area or region should be included, with income levels and racial/ethnic categorizations provided. Inclusion of various descriptive charts, tables, or other displays is encouraged.

3.2 Enrollment projections

♦ Enrollment projections must be sufficient to justify the establishment of the new campus. For a proposed new community college or university campus, enrollment projections for the first ten years of operation (from opening date) must be provided.

♦ The Demographic Research Unit (DRU) of the Department of Finance must approve enrollment projections. As the designated demographic agency for the State, the DRU has the statutory responsibility for preparing systemwide enrollment projections. For a proposed new institution, the DRU will approve all projections of undergraduate enrollment developed by a systemwide central office of one of the public systems or by the community college district proposing the new institution. Enrollment projections developed by a local community college district must be approved by the Chancellor's Office. Upon request, the DRU shall provide the system with advice and instructions on the preparation of enrollment projections.

♦ Undergraduate enrollment and attendance projections for a new institution shall be presented in terms of Fall-Term headcount and Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES). Enrollment projections for California Community Colleges should also include Weekly Student Contact Hours (WSCH) and WSCH per headcount student.

♦ A discussion of the extent to which, in quantitative terms, the proposed campus will increase systemwide or district capacity and help meet statewide and regional enrollment demand.

♦ Graduate and professional student enrollment projections shall be prepared by the system office proposing the new institution. In preparing these projections, the specific methodology and/or ra-
tionale generating the projections, an analysis of supply and demand for graduate education, and the need for new graduate and professional degrees must be provided.

♦ For a new University of California campus, statewide enrollment projected for the University should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing University campuses and educational centers. If the statewide enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity for the University system, compelling statewide needs for the establishment of the new university campus must be demonstrated.

♦ For a new California State University campus, statewide enrollment projected for the State University system should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing State University campuses and educational centers. If the statewide enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity for the system, compelling regional needs must be demonstrated.

♦ For a new community college campus, enrollment projected for the district proposing the college should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing district colleges and centers. Compelling regional or local need must be demonstrated if the district enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing district colleges or centers.

3.3 Alternatives

♦ Proposals for new institutions should address at least the following:

(1) the impact of not establishing a new campus;
(2) the possibility of establishing an educational center instead of a university or college campus;
(3) the expansion of existing institutions within the region;
(4) the increased utilization of existing institutions, particularly in the afternoons and evenings, and during the summer months;
(5) the shared use of existing or new facilities and programs with other postsecondary education institutions, in the same or other public systems or independent institutions;
(6) the use of nontraditional instructional delivery modes such as television, computerized instruction, instruction over the Internet, and other "distributed education" modes and techniques; and
(7) financing the institution through private fund raising or donations of land or facilities.
♦ A cost-benefit analysis of alternative sites, including a consideration of alternative sites for the new institution, must be articulated and documented. This criterion may be satisfied by the Environmental Impact Report, provided it contains a comprehensive analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of alternative sites. Overall, the proposal must demonstrate substantial analytical integrity with regard to the site selection process.

♦ Where a four-year system, or a community college district, already owns - or will have received as a donation - the site on which a new institution is proposed to be located, and has not considered other sites, a strong justification for "sole-sourcing" the site in question must be included. Options to be discussed should include the sale of a donated site, with the resulting revenue used to purchase a better site, or an alternative delivery system such as a collaboration with another public or private institution or organization.

3.4 Academic Planning and Program Justification

♦ The proposal must include a preliminary description of the proposed academic degree programs, along with a description of the proposed academic organizational structure. This description must demonstrate conformity with the Commission's academic program review guidelines and with such State goals as access, quality, intersegmental cooperation, and the diversification of students, faculty, administration, and staff.

♦ The Needs Study must show evidence of a process leading to full institutional accreditation by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) and provide an estimated timeline for attaining accreditation by WASC within a reasonable period of time following the opening of the campus.

3.5 Student Services and Outreach

The proposal for the new institution must include a description of the student services planned for the new campus including student financial aid, advising, counseling, testing, tutoring, educational opportunity programs, compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, and outreach services to historically underrepresented groups and how these programs will be sustained over time.

3.6 Support and Capital Outlay Budget Projections

♦ The proposal must include a 10-year capital outlay projection that includes the total Assigned Square Feet (ASF) anticipated to be
required for each year of the projection period, with estimates of the average cost per ASF.

♦ The proposal must include a five-year projection of anticipated support costs including administration, academic programs (including occupational/vocational as appropriate), academic support, and other standard expense elements.

3.7 Geographic and Physical Accessibility

♦ The proposal must include a plan for student, faculty, and staff transportation to the proposed campus and compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act. Reasonable commuting times must be demonstrated.

♦ Plans for student and faculty housing, including projections of needed on-campus residential facilities should be included if appropriate.

3.8 Effects on Other Institutions

♦ The proposal must provide evidence that other systems, institutions, and the community in which the new institution is to be located were consulted during the planning process, especially at the time that alternatives to expansion were explored. Strong local, regional, and/or statewide interest in the proposed facility must be demonstrated by letters of support from responsible agencies, groups, and individuals.

♦ The proposal must identify the potential impact of the new facility on existing and projected enrollments in neighboring institutions of its own and other systems.

♦ The establishment of a new community college must not reduce existing and projected enrollments in adjacent community colleges either within the district proposing the new community college, or in adjacent districts, to a level that will damage their economy of operation, or create excess enrollment capacity at these institutions, or lead to an unnecessary duplication of programs.

3.9 Environmental Impact

The proposal must show evidence that the system or district is engaged in a process leading to an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), pursuant to Section 21080.09 of the Public Resources Code. The proposal must include a discussion of any potentially significant environmental effects of the proposed campus. The proposal must include
a discussion of the seismic and safety conditions of the site and the site-specific and cumulative impacts of full build-out of the proposed campus. Upon request, the system governing board shall provide the Postsecondary Education Commission with detailed sections of the Draft or Final EIR.

3.10 Economic Efficiency

The Commission encourages economic efficiency and gives priority to new institutions where the State of California is relieved of all or part of the financial burden. When such proposals include gifts of land, construction costs, or equipment, a higher priority shall be granted to such projects than to projects where all costs are born by the State, assuming all other criteria listed above are satisfied. A similar priority shall be given to collaborative efforts in underserved regional areas of the State as determined by the Commission.

The Commission Executive Director shall certify to the system chief executive officer, in writing and within 60 days, that it is complete, or that it requires further input, elaboration, or adjustment. If it is incomplete, the Commission Executive Director shall indicate the specific deficiencies involved. When the Commission Executive Director has certified that all necessary materials for the Needs Study have been received, the Commission has 12 months to take final action to approve or disapprove the new institution.

Once the Commission has taken action on the proposal, its Executive Director will notify the system executive officer, appropriate legislative committee chairs, the Department of Finance, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst.
The Conversion of an Educational Center to a University or Community College Campus

E DUCATIONAL CENTERS generally offer a limited complement of academic programs that serve the needs of a community. Many student services, such as outreach efforts, disability support services, counseling, etc., are not fully supported. At lower enrollment levels, there are usually too few students to generate enough demand for these services. As enrollment levels increase, however, demand for support services and expanded academic programs also increase. The conversion of an educational center to a university or community college campus usually occurs at a point in time in which there is sufficient demand to justify the expansion of educational and support services, and enrollments are adequate to support the costs of a freestanding administration.

The process for each public higher education system to convert an educational center to a university or community college campus is as follows:

1. **Preliminary Notice**

At such time as a public higher education system, including a community college district, begins a planning process to establish a new community college or university campus, the governing board of the system or district shall forward to the Commission a Preliminary Notice of the planning activities. This Preliminary Notice shall indicate:

- The general location of the proposed new institution,
- The type of institution under consideration and the estimated timeframe for its development,
- The estimated enrollment of the institution at its opening and within five years of operation,
- A tentative five-year capital outlay plan, and
- A copy of the agenda item wherein the new site is discussed by the local district (California Community College) or statewide governing board (University of California or California State University), if any.

A Preliminary Notice represents an informational process, and does not require formal consideration or approval by the Commission.
2. Letter of Intent

*University of California or State University:*

Not less than three years prior to the time it expects to convert an educational center to a university campus, the University of California Regents or the California State University Trustees should submit to the Commission (with copies to the Department of Finance, the Demographic Research Unit, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst) a Letter of Intent.

The Letter of Intent for the conversion of an educational center to a university campus should contain the following information:

- A 10-year enrollment history (headcount and FTES) of the educational center, or the complete enrollment history, if the center has been in operation for less than 10 years.

- A preliminary 10-year enrollment projection (headcount and FTES) for the new campus (from the campus's opening date), developed by the system office. The system office may seek the advice of the Demographic Research Unit (DRU) in developing the projection, but Unit approval is not required at this stage.

- Maps of the area in which the proposed university campus is to be located, indicating population densities, topography, road and highway configurations and any other features of interest.

- A time schedule for converting the educational center and for developing the new university campus, including preliminary dates and enrollment levels at the opening, intermediate, and final build out stages.

- A tentative five-year capital outlay budget starting on the date of the first capital outlay appropriation for the new university campus.

- The identification of neighboring public and independent institutions in the area in which the proposed university is to be located.

- A copy of the resolution by the Regents or the Trustees authorizing conversion of the educational center to a university campus.

The Commission Executive Director shall respond to the chief executive officer, in writing, no later than 60 days following submission of the completed Letter of Intent to the Commission.

The Commission's Executive Director will advise the system chief executive officer to move forward with site acquisition or to develop plans. The Commission Executive Director may in this process raise concerns about shortcomings or limitations in the Letter of Intent that need to be addressed in the planning process. If the Commission Executive Director is unable to approve the Letter of Intent as submitted, he or she shall indicate to the chief executive officer the specific reasons why the Letter of
Intent is incomplete prior to notifying the Department of Finance and the Office of the Legislative Analyst.

**California Community Colleges:**

Not less than two years prior to the time it expects to convert an educational center to a community college campus, a district should submit a Letter of Intent (with copies to the Commission, Department of Finance, the Demographic Research Unit, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst) to the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges. Upon completing its review, the Board of Governors, or the Chancellor, if so delegated by the Board, will forward its recommendation to the Postsecondary Education Commission. The Commission will act on a Letter of Intent only after it has been approved by Board of Governors or the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges.

The Letter of Intent to convert an educational center to a community college campus should contain the following information:

- A 10-year enrollment and attendance history (headcount and FTES) of the educational center, or the complete enrollment history, if the center has been in operation for less than 10 years.
- A preliminary 10-year enrollment and attendance projection (headcount and FTES) for the proposed campus (from the campus’s opening date), developed by the district or the Chancellor’s Office. The Chancellor’s Office may seek the advice of the Demographic Research Unit (DRU) in developing the projection.
- Maps of the area of the proposed campus indicating population densities, topography, and road and highway configurations and any other features of interest.
- A time schedule for converting the educational center and for developing the campus, including preliminary dates and enrollment levels at the opening, intermediate, and final build out stages.
- A tentative five-year capital outlay budget starting on the date of the first capital outlay appropriation for the proposed campus.
- The identification of neighboring public and independent institutions in the area in which the proposed campus is to be located.
- A copy of the letter from the Chancellor’s Office approving the Letter of Intent.

The Commission Executive Director shall respond to the Chancellor, in writing, no later than 60 days following submission of the completed Letter of Intent to the Commission. If the plans appear to be reasonable, the Commission’s Executive Director will advise the Chancellor to move forward with site acquisition or further development plans. The Commission Executive Director may in this process raise concerns about short-
comings or limitations in the Letter of Intent that need to be addressed in the planning process. If the Executive Director is unable to approve the Letter of Intent as submitted, he or she shall indicate to the chief executive officer the specific reasons why the Letter of Intent is incomplete.

3. Needs Study

The Needs Study provides the findings from a comprehensive needs analysis for the project. The purpose of a Needs Study is to provide evidence of the need for and location of new institutions and campuses of public higher education. A Needs Study is considered complete only when it fully addresses each of the criteria listed below.

Upon receipt of a Needs Study, the Executive Director shall certify to the systemwide chief executive officer, in writing and within 60 days, that it is complete, or that it requires additional information. If it is incomplete, the Executive Director shall indicate the specific deficiencies involved. When the Commission Executive Director has certified that all necessary materials for the Needs Study have been received, the Commission, within 12 months, will approve or disapprove the new institution.

The Commission Executive Director will notify the system executive officer, appropriate legislative committee chairs, the Department of Finance, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst.

A Needs Study for the conversion of an educational center to a university or community college campus should contain the following information:

3.1 General Description and Overview

The opening section of the Needs Study must include: A general description of the proposal, a brief history of the center, a physical description of the site, and a social and demographic analysis of the surrounding area. Data describing the socioeconomic profile of the area or region should be included, with income levels and racial/ethnic categorizations provided. Inclusion of various charts, tables, or other displays is encouraged.

3.2 Enrollment Projections

♦ Enrollment projections must be sufficient to justify the establishment of the new campus. For a proposed new community college or university campus, enrollment projections for the first ten years of operation (from opening date) must be provided.

♦ The Demographic Research Unit (DRU) of the Department of Finance must approve enrollment projections. As the designated demographic agency for the State, the DRU has the statutory responsibility for preparing systemwide enrollment projections. For a proposed new institution, the DRU will approve all projections
Undergraduate enrollment developed by a system office of one of the public systems proposing the new institution. Enrollment projections developed by a local community college district must be approved by the Chancellor's Office. Upon request, the DRU shall provide the system with advice and instructions on the preparation of enrollment projections.

- Undergraduate enrollment and attendance projections for a new institution shall be presented in terms of Fall-Term headcount and Fall-Term Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES). Enrollment projections for California Community Colleges should also include Weekly Student Contact Hours (WSCH) and WSCH per headcount student.

- A discussion of the extent to which, in quantitative terms, the proposed campus will increase systemwide or district capacity and help meet statewide and regional enrollment demand.

- The educational center's previous enrollment history, or the previous 10 year’s history (whichever is less) must also be provided.

- Graduate and professional student enrollment projections shall be prepared by the system office proposing the new institution. In preparing these projections, the specific methodology and/or rationale generating the projections, an analysis of supply and demand for graduate education, and the need for new graduate and professional degrees must be provided.

- For a new University of California campus, statewide enrollment projected for the University should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing University campuses and educational centers. If the statewide enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity for the University system, compelling statewide and/or regional needs for the establishment of the new university campus must be demonstrated.

- For a new California State University campus, statewide enrollment projected for the State University system should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing State University campuses and educational centers. If the statewide enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity for the system, compelling regional needs must be demonstrated.

- For a new community college campus, enrollment projected for the district proposing the college should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing district colleges and centers. Compelling regional or local need must be demonstrated if the district enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing district colleges or centers.
3.3 Alternatives

♦ Proposals for new institutions should address at least the following alternatives:

(1) the possibility of maintaining an educational center instead of a university or college campus;
(2) the expansion of existing institutions within the region;
(3) the increased utilization of existing institutions, particularly in the afternoons and evenings, and during the summer months;
(4) the shared use of existing or new facilities and programs with other postsecondary education institutions, in the same or other public systems or independent institutions;
(5) the use of nontraditional modes of instructional delivery such as television, computerized instruction, instruction over the Internet, and other "distributed education" modes and techniques; and
(6) private fund raising or donations of land or facilities for the proposed new institution.

♦ A cost-benefit analysis of alternatives, including a consideration of alternative sites for the new institution, must be articulated and documented. This criterion may be satisfied by the Environmental Impact Report (EIR), provided it contains a comprehensive analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of alternative sites. Overall, the system proposing the new institution must demonstrated substantial analytical integrity with regard to the site selection process.

♦ Where a four-year system, or a community college district, already owns - or will have received as a donation - the site on which a new institution is proposed to be located, and has not considered other sites, a strong justification for "sole-sourcing" the site in question must be included. Options to be discussed should include the sale of the site, with the resulting revenue used to purchase a better site, or an alternative delivery system such as a collaboration with another public or private institution or organization.

3.4 Academic Planning and Program Justification

♦ The proposal must include a preliminary description of the proposed academic degree programs, along with a description of the proposed academic organizational structure. This description must demonstrate conformity with the Commission’s academic
program review guidelines and with such State goals as access, quality, intersegmental cooperation, and the diversification of students, faculty, administration, and staff.

♦ The Needs Study must show evidence of a process leading to full institutional accreditation by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) and provide an estimated timeline for attaining accreditation by WASC within a reasonable period of time following approval of the institution.

3.5 Student Services and Outreach

The proposal for the new institution must include a description of the student services planned for the new campus including student financial aid, advising, counseling, testing, tutoring, educational opportunity programs, compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, and outreach services to historically underrepresented groups and how these programs will be sustained over time.

3.6 Support and Capital Outlay Budget Projections

♦ The proposal must include a 10-year capital outlay projection that includes the total Assigned Square Feet (ASF) anticipated to be required for each year of the projection period, with estimates of the average cost per ASF.

♦ The proposal must include a five-year projection of anticipated support costs including administration, academic programs (including occupational/vocational as appropriate), academic support, and other standard expense elements.

3.7 Geographic and Physical Accessibility

♦ The proposal must include a plan for student, faculty, and staff transportation to the proposed campus and compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act. Reasonable commuting times must be demonstrated.

♦ Plans for student and faculty housing, including projections of needed on-campus residential facilities should be included if appropriate.

3.8 Effects on Other Institutions

♦ Provide evidence that other systems, institutions, and the community in which the new institution is to be located were consulted during the planning process, especially at the time that alternatives to expansion are explored. Strong local, regional, and/or state-
wide interest in the proposed facility must be demonstrated by letters of support from responsible agencies, groups, and individuals.

♦ The conversion of an educational center to a university campus must take into consideration the impact of the expansion on existing and projected enrollments in neighboring institutions of its own and other systems.

♦ The conversion of an educational center to a community college must not reduce existing and projected enrollments in adjacent community colleges either within the district proposing the new community college, or in adjacent districts, to a level that will damage their economy of operation, or create excess enrollment capacity at these institutions, or lead to an unnecessary duplication of programs.

3.9 Environmental Impact

The proposal must include a copy of the Summary Draft or Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the site or the project. The system board shall provide the Commission with detailed sections of the Draft or Final EIR upon request.

3.10 Economic Efficiency

The Commission encourages economic efficiency and gives priority to new institutions where the State of California is relieved of all or part of the financial burden. When such proposals include gifts of land, construction costs, or equipment, a higher priority shall be granted to such projects than to projects where all costs are born by the State, assuming all other criteria listed above are satisfied. A similar priority shall be given to new campuses that engage in collaborative efforts with other segments to expand educational access in underserved regions of the State as determined by the Commission.
4 University or Community College Educational Centers

THE PROCESS for each public higher education system to establish a new educational center, as defined in the definitions section of the guidelines, is as follows:

1. Preliminary Notice

At such time as a public higher education system, including a community college district, begins a planning process to establish a new educational center, a new community college, or a new university campus, or to convert an educational center to a community college or university campus, the governing board of the system or district shall forward to the Commission a Preliminary Notice of the planning event. This notice shall indicate only the general location of the proposed new institution, the type of institution under consideration, the estimated enrollment size of the institution at its opening and within five years of operation, and a copy of the agenda item discussed by the local district or system governing board, if any. A Preliminary Notice shall represent only an informational process, and will not require formal consideration or approval by the Commission.

2. Letter of Intent

University of California and the California State University

Not less than two years prior to the time it expects the first capital outlay appropriation for the new educational center, the University of California Regents or the California State University Trustees should submit to the Commission (with copies to the Department of Finance, the Demographic Research Unit, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst) a Letter of Intent.

A Letter of Intent to establish a new educational center should contain the following information:

- A preliminary five-year enrollment and attendance projection (headcount and FTES) for the new educational center (from the center's opening date), developed by the system office, including itemization of all upper-division and graduate enrollments. The system office may seek the advice of the Demographic Research
Unit (DRU) in developing the projection, but Unit approval is not required at this stage.

♦ When converting an off-campus operational center to an educational center, the enrollment history of the off-campus operation.

♦ The geographic location of the new educational center in terms as specific as possible. A brief description of each site under consideration should be included.

♦ Maps of the area in which the proposed educational center is to be located, indicating population densities, topography, road and highway configurations and any other features of interest.

♦ A time schedule for development of the new educational center, including preliminary dates and enrollment levels at the opening, intermediate, and final build out stages.

♦ A tentative five-year capital outlay budget starting on the date of the first capital outlay appropriation.

♦ A copy of the resolution by the Regents or the Trustees authorizing the new educational center.

♦ The identification of neighboring public and independent institutions in the area in which the proposed university campus is to be located.

The Commission Executive Director shall respond to the chief executive officer, in writing, no later than 60 days following submission of the completed Letter of Intent to the Commission. If the plans appear to be reasonable, the Commission’s Executive Director will advise the system chief executive officer to move forward with site acquisition or further development plans. The Commission Executive Director may in this process raise concerns about shortcomings or limitations in the Letter of Intent that need to be addressed in the planning process.

If the Commission Executive Director is unable to approve the Letter of Intent as submitted, he or she shall, within 30 days, indicate to the chief executive officer the specific reasons why the Letter of Intent is incomplete.

*California Community Colleges*

Not less than two years prior to the time it expects to convert an off-campus center operation to a community college educational center, a district should submit a Letter of Intent (with copies to the Commission, Department of Finance, the Demographic Research Unit, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst) to the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges. Upon completing its review, the Board of Governors, or the Chancellor, if so delegated by the Board, will forward its recommendation to the Commission, with copies to the Department of Finance and the Legislative Analyst.
A Letter of Intent to establish a new community college educational center should contain the following information:

♦ A preliminary five-year enrollment projection and attendance (headcount and FTES) for the new educational center (from the center's opening date), developed by the district and/or the Chancellor's Office. The Chancellor's Office may seek the advice of the Demographic Research Unit (DRU) in developing the projection, but DRU approval is not required at this stage.

♦ When converting an off-campus operational center to an educational center, the enrollment history of the off-campus operation.

♦ The location of the new educational center in terms as specific as possible. A brief description of each site under consideration should be included.

♦ Maps of the area in which the proposed educational center is to be located, indicating population densities, topography, road and highway configurations and any other features of interest.

♦ A copy of the district's most recent five-year capital construction plan.

♦ A time schedule for development of the new educational center, including preliminary dates and enrollment levels at the opening, intermediate, and final build out stages.

♦ A tentative five-year capital outlay budget starting on the date of the first capital outlay appropriation.

♦ A copy of the resolution by the district governing board authorizing the new educational center.

♦ The identification of neighboring public and independent institutions in the area in which the proposed campus is to be located.

The Commission Executive Director shall respond to the chief executive officer, in writing, no later than 60 days following submission of the completed Letter of Intent to the Commission. If the plans appear to be reasonable, the Commission's Executive Director will advise the system chief executive officer to move forward with site acquisition or further development plans. The Executive Director may in this process raise concerns about shortcomings or limitations in the Letter of Intent that need to be addressed in the planning process. If the Executive Director is unable to approve the Letter of Intent as submitted, he or she shall, within 30 days, indicate to the chief executive officer the specific reasons why the Letter of Intent is incomplete. The Executive Director of the Commission will act on a Letter of Intent only after it has been approved by Board of Governors or the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges.
3. Needs Study

The Needs Study provides the findings from a comprehensive needs analysis for the project. The purpose of a Needs Study is to provide evidence of the need for and location of new institutions and campuses of public higher education. A Needs Study is considered complete only when it fully addresses each of the criteria listed below.

3.1 General description and overview

The opening section of the Needs Study must include: A general description of the proposal, a physical description of the site, and a social and demographic analysis of the surrounding area. Data describing the socioeconomic profile of the area or region should be included, with income levels and racial/ethnic categorizations provided. Inclusion of various descriptive charts, tables, or other displays is encouraged.

3.2 Enrollment projections

♦ Enrollment projections must be sufficient to justify the establishment of the educational center. For a proposed new community college or university campus, enrollment projections for the first ten years of operation (from opening date) must be provided.

♦ The Demographic Research Unit (DRU) of the Department of Finance must approve enrollment projections. As the designated demographic agency for the State, the DRU has the statutory responsibility for preparing systemwide enrollment projections. For a proposed new institution, the DRU will approve all projections of undergraduate enrollment developed by a system office of one of the public systems proposing the new institution. Enrollment projections developed by a local community college district must be approved by the Chancellor's Office. Upon request, the DRU shall provide the system with advice and instructions on the preparation of enrollment projections.

♦ Undergraduate enrollment projections and attendance for a new institution shall be presented in terms of Fall-Term headcount and Fall-Term Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES). Enrollment projections for California Community Colleges should also include Weekly Student Contact Hours (WSCH) and WSCH per headcount student.

♦ Graduate and professional student enrollment projections shall be prepared by the system office proposing the new institution. In preparing these projections, the specific methodology and/or rationale generating the projections, an analysis of supply and de-
mand for graduate education, and the need for new graduate and professional degrees must be provided.

♦ For a new University of California center, statewide enrollment projected for the University should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing University campuses and educational centers. If the statewide enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity for the University system, compelling statewide and/or regional needs for the establishment of the new educational center must be demonstrated.

♦ For a new California State University center, statewide enrollment projected for the State University system should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing State University campuses and educational centers. If the statewide enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity for the system, compelling regional needs for the center must be demonstrated.

♦ For a new community college center, enrollment projected for the district proposing the college should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing district colleges and centers. If the district enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing district colleges or centers, compelling regional or local need must be demonstrated.

3.3 Alternatives

♦ Proposals for new institutions should address at least the following alternatives:

(1) the expansion of existing institutions within the region;

(2) the increased utilization of existing institutions, particularly in the afternoons and evenings, and during the summer months;

(3) the shared use of existing or new facilities and programs with other postsecondary education institutions, in the same or other public systems or independent institutions;

(4) the use of nontraditional modes of instructional delivery such as television, computerized instruction, instruction over the Internet, and other "distributed education" modes and techniques; and

(5) private fund raising or donations of land or facilities for the proposed new institution.

♦ A cost-benefit analysis of alternatives, including a consideration of alternative sites for the new institution, must be articulated and documented. This criterion may be satisfied by the Environ-
mental Impact Report, provided it contains a comprehensive analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of alternative sites. Overall, the system proposing the new institution must demonstrate substantial analytical integrity with regard to the site selection process.

♦ Where a four-year system, or a community college district, already owns - or will have received as a donation - the site on which a new institution is proposed to be located, and has not considered other sites, a strong justification for "sole-sourcing" the site in question must be included. Options to be discussed should include the sale of the site, with the resulting revenue used to purchase a better site, or an alternative delivery system such as a collaboration with another public or private institution or organization.

### 3.4 Academic Planning and Program Justification

♦ For University educational centers, a preliminary description of the proposed academic degree programs must be included, along with a description of the center's proposed academic organization. The description must demonstrate conformity with such State goals as access, quality, intersegmental cooperation, and diversification of students, faculty, administration, and staff.

♦ For a community college educational center, a preliminary description of the proposed academic degree and/or certificate programs must be included, together with a list of all course offerings, whether or not they are part of a degree or certificate track. A description of the center's academic/occupational organization must be included. These descriptions must demonstrate conformity with such State goals as access, quality, intersegmental cooperation, and diversification of students, faculty, administration, and staff.

### 3.5 Student Services and Outreach

The proposal for the new institution must include a description of the student services planned for the new campus including student financial aid, advising, counseling, testing, tutoring, educational opportunity programs, compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, and outreach services to historically underrepresented groups.

### 3.6 Support and Capital Outlay Budget Projections

♦ Proposals for educational centers must include a five-year capital outlay projection that includes the total Assigned Square Feet
(ASF) anticipated to be required for each year of the projection period, with estimates of the average cost per ASF.

♦ The proposal must include a five-year projection of anticipated support costs including administration, academic programs (including occupational/vocational as appropriate), academic support, and other standard expense elements. The number of Personnel Years (PY) should be indicated.

3.7 Geographic and Physical Accessibility

♦ The proposal must include a plan for student, faculty, and staff transportation to the proposed campus and compliance with the American Disability Act. Reasonable commuting times must be demonstrated.

♦ Plans for student and faculty housing, including projections of needed on-campus residential facilities should be included if appropriate.

3.8 Effects on Other Institutions

♦ Other systems, institutions, and the community in which the new institution is to be located should be consulted during the planning process, especially at the time that alternatives to expansion are explored. Strong local, regional, and/or statewide interest in the proposed facility must be demonstrated by letters of support from responsible agencies, groups, and individuals.

♦ The establishment of a new university center must take into consideration the impact of a new facility on existing and projected enrollments at neighboring institutions of its own and other systems.

♦ The establishment of a new community college educational center must not reduce existing and projected enrollments in adjacent community colleges either within the district proposing the new community college, or in adjacent districts, to a level that will damage their economy of operation, or create excess enrollment capacity at these institutions, or lead to an unnecessary duplication of programs.

3.9 Environmental Impact

The proposal must include a copy of the Summary Draft or Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the site or the project. The system governing board shall provide the Commission with detailed sections of the Draft or Final EIR upon request.
3.10 Economic Efficiency

The Commission encourages economic efficiency and gives priority to new institutions where the State of California is relieved of all or part of the financial burden. When such proposals include gifts of land, construction costs, or equipment, a higher priority shall be granted to such projects than to projects where all costs are born by the State, assuming all other criteria listed above are satisfied. A similar priority shall be given to a new proposed center that engages in collaborative efforts with other segments to expand educational access in underserved regions of the State as determined by the Commission.

Upon receipt of a Needs Study, the Commission Executive Director shall certify to the system chief executive officer, in writing and within 60 days, that it is complete, or that it requires additional information. If it is incomplete, the Executive Director shall indicate the specific deficiencies involved. When the Executive Director has certified that all necessary materials for the Needs Study have been received, the Commission, within 6 months, will approve or disapprove the new institution.

Once the Commission has taken action on the proposal, its Executive Director will notify the systemwide executive officer, appropriate legislative committee chairs, the Department of Finance, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst.
Joint-Use Educational Centers

Preamble

Demographic changes, economic conditions, educational reforms, and progress in preparing students for postsecondary education are all factors that are converging to produce substantial increases in demand for higher education in California. Between 1998 and 2010, this demand—generally referred to as “Tidal Wave II”—is estimated to result in an increase of more than 714,000 students seeking enrollment at all levels of public higher education. The Commission, in its recent report, Providing for Progress: California Higher Education Enrollment Demand and Resources in the 21st Century (CPEC 00-1), estimated that California would need to spend $1.5 billion annually over the next 10 to 12 years for the existing physical plant and enrollment growth.

The Commission recognizes that this spending plan is a challenge, particularly in an era of state budget reductions. The explosive growth in demand for higher education and limited budgets are straining California’s system of public higher education. These pressures present an opportunity for the State’s higher education segments to encourage and implement cooperative, intersegmental approaches to providing access to higher education.

Joint-use educational centers are a viable policy alternative for accommodating enrollment growth with limited resources. As far back as 1990, the Commission, in its long-range planning report - Higher Education at the Crossroads: Planning for the Twenty-First Century (CPEC 90-1)—strongly encouraged the development of collaborative, joint-use facilities in meeting the educational needs of California’s diverse populations.

The educational needs of students should serve as the overall goal in establishing joint-use centers. The Commission therefore supports the following goals:

- **Promote a seamless system of higher education services**: Sharing facilities between two or more segments could substantially ease the flow of students from one segment to another, potentially increasing transfer rates.

- **Expand access to higher education in underserved or fast-growth regions of the state**: Joint-use educational centers increase opportunities for a university education to be available to place-bound students who are often from historically underrepresented socioeconomic groups. With this principle in mind, the Commission acknowledges that existing State-supported community college off-campus centers provide a significant opportunity for collaborative
ventures with public and independent universities to expand university programs throughout California.

- **Improve regional economic development opportunities**: The Commission recognizes the nexus between access to a university education and a region’s economic development. Joint-use educational centers can advance this linkage.

- **Encourage capital outlay cost savings to participating segments**: By encouraging the pooling of capital outlay resources between two or more education segments, joint-use educational centers can contain State capital outlay costs. These potential cost savings will stretch scarce state capital outlay funds.

- **Advance the efficient utilization of physical facilities**: Joint-use facilities have the potential to achieve higher levels of utilization than single purpose facilities. A jointly used classroom can yield utilization efficiencies by providing access throughout the day to both full-time and part-time students.

- **Expand the variety of academic programs offered in a single location**: Joint-use educational centers that include community colleges and universities increase the depth and breadth of the academic programs offered in a single location. This benefits both the educational needs of the students and the labor market needs of regional economies.

**Joint-use Educational Centers Subject to Review by the Commission:**

Joint-use Educational centers subject to the review and approval of the Commission are those that:

1. Meet the definitional requirements of a joint-use center specified on page 6 and 7 of the guidelines; and

2. Advance one or more goals articulated in the Preamble; and

3. Have the support of the participating systems.

1. **Preliminary Notice**

A Preliminary Notice must be submitted at such time as a public higher education segment, including a community college district, engages with another education institution to establish a joint-use center. The governing board of the system or district or the president, chancellor, or district superintendent participating in the collaborative shall forward the Preliminary Notice to the Commission, with copies to the Office of the Legislative Analyst and Department of Finance.
This notice shall:

- Identify the participating educational institutions;
- Indicate the general location of the proposed collaborative facility;
- Provide the actual and estimated enrollment size of the collaborative facility over the next five years of operation;
- Provide the estimated total state capital outlay funds required for the development of the collaborative facility; and
- Include a copy of the agenda item discussed by the local district or statewide governing board, if any, with action taken by the governing body.

A Preliminary Notice shall represent only an informational process, and will not require formal consideration or approval by the Commission.

The Commission Executive Director shall respond to the chief executive officers, in writing, following the submission of the Preliminary Notice. If the preliminary plan appears reasonable, the Commission’s Executive Director shall advise the chief executive officers of the systems and institutions to move forward with development plans and the submission of a formal proposal. If the Commission Executive Director is unable to approve the Preliminary Notice as submitted, he or she shall indicate to the chief executive officers the specific reasons why the Preliminary Notice is incomplete.

2. Letter of Intent

Not less than two years prior to the time the first capital outlay appropriation would be needed for the proposed joint-use educational centers, the appropriate governing boards should submit to the Commission (with copies to the Department of Finance, the Demographic Research Unit, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst) a Letter of Intent. Proposals for joint-use educational centers involving one or more California community colleges must also be submitted to the California Community College Chancellor’s Office for review.

A Letter of Intent to seek approval for joint-use should contain the following information:

- A brief overview of the need for and goals of the proposed joint-use educational center, including a description of the nature of the collaboration between the educational segments involved in the partnership.
• An enrollment history and a preliminary five-year enrollment projection (headcount and FTES) for the proposed joint-use educational center (from the projected opening date), developed by the systemwide central office, including an itemization of all lower-division, upper-division and graduate enrollments. The systemwide central office may seek the advice of the Demographic Research Unit (DRU) in developing the projection, but DRU approval is not required at this stage.

• The geographic location of the proposed joint-use educational center in terms as specific as possible.

• A brief description of each alternative site under consideration, if appropriate.

• Maps of the area in which the proposed joint-use educational center is located or is to be located, indicating population densities, topography, and road and highway configurations and access.

• A time schedule for the development of the new joint-use educational centers, including preliminary dates and enrollment levels at the early, intermediate, and final build out stages.

• A tentative five-year capital outlay budget starting on the date of the first capital outlay appropriation.

• A copy of resolutions by the appropriate governing boards authorizing the proposed institution.

The Commission Executive Director shall respond to the chief executive officers, in writing, no later than 60 days following submission of the completed Letter of Intent to the Commission. If the plans appear to be reasonable, the Commission's Executive Director will advise the systemwide chief executive officers to move forward with site acquisition, if appropriate, or further development plans. The Executive Director may in this process raise concerns about shortcomings or limitations in the Letter of Intent that need to be addressed in the planning process.

If the Commission Executive Director is unable to approve the Letter of Intent as submitted, he or she shall, within 30 days, indicate to the chief executive officer the specific reasons why the Letter of Intent is incomplete prior to notifying the Department of Finance and the Legislative Analyst.

3. Joint-use Educational Center Proposal

A Proposal for the establishment of a joint use educational center should contain the following information:
3.1 General description and overview

This section should include: a general description of the collaborative, a physical description of the site, and a social and demographic analysis of the surrounding area. Data describing the socioeconomic profile of the area or region should be included, with income levels and racial/ethnic categorizations provided. Inclusion of charts, tables, or other displays is encouraged.

3.2 Enrollment projections

- Enrollment projections must be sufficient to justify the establishment of the joint-use educational center. Enrollment projections for the first ten years of operation (from opening date) must be provided. A description of the methodologies used in the allocation of Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES) between the participating systems must be included.

- The Demographic Research Unit (DRU) of the Department of Finance must approve the enrollment projections. As the designated demographic agency for the State, the DRU has the statutory responsibility for preparing systemwide enrollment projections. Upon request, the DRU shall provide the system with advice and instructions on the preparation of enrollment projections.

- Undergraduate enrollment projections for the proposed institution shall be presented in terms of Fall-Term headcount and Fall-Term Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES). Enrollment projections for California Community Colleges should also include Weekly Student Contact Hours (WSCH) and WSCH per headcount student.

- Graduate and professional student enrollment projections shall be prepared by the systemwide central office proposing the new institution. The systemwide central office participating in the joint-use center shall prepare graduate and professional student enrollment projections. In preparing these projections, the specific methodology and/or rationale generating the projections, an analysis of supply and demand for graduate education, and the need for new graduate and professional degrees must be provided.

- Enrollments projected for the proposed joint-use center should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of the participating public institutions participating in the collaboration. If the enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity for the parent institutions, compelling regional needs for the proposed institution must be demonstrated.
• For a new community college joint-use center, enrollments projected for the district proposing the joint use center should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing district colleges and centers. If the district enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing district colleges or centers, compelling regional or local need must be demonstrated.

3.3 Alternatives

• Proposals for new joint-use educational centers should address at least the following alternatives:

(1) The feasibility of establishing an educational center instead of a joint-use educational center;

(2) The expansion of existing institutions within the region;

(3) The increased utilization of existing institutions, particularly in the afternoons and evenings, and during the summer months;

(4) The use of nontraditional modes of instructional delivery such as television, computerized instruction, instruction over the Internet, and other distributed education modes and techniques; and

(5) Private fund raising or donations of land or facilities for the proposed new institution.

• A cost-benefit analysis of alternatives, including a consideration of alternative sites for the joint-use, must be articulated and documented. This criterion may be satisfied by the Environmental Impact Report (EIR), provided it contains a comprehensive analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of alternative sites. Overall, the system proposing the joint use center must demonstrate substantial analytical integrity with regard to the site selection process.

• Where a four-year system, or a community college district, already owns - or will have received as a donation - the site on which a new joint-use is proposed to be located, and has not considered other sites, a strong justification for "sole-sourcing" the site in question must be included. Options to be discussed should include the sale of the site, with the resulting revenue used to purchase a better site, or an alternative delivery system such as a collaboration with another public or private institution or organization.
3.4 Academic Planning and Program Justification

- A description of the proposed academic degree programs must be included, along with a description of the joint-use educational center’s proposed academic organization and the nature of the articulation, including administrative relationships, between the participating postsecondary education institutions. The description must demonstrate congruence with the Commission’s academic program review guidelines and with such State goals as access, quality, intersegmental cooperation, and diversification of students, faculty, administration, and staff.

- If the academic plan includes the offering of certificate programs, provide a preliminary description of such programs, together with a list of all course offerings, whether or not they are part of a degree or certificate track. A description of the center’s academic/occupational organization must be included. These descriptions must demonstrate conformity with such State goals as access, quality, intersegmental cooperation, and diversification of students, faculty, administration, and staff.

3.5 Student Services and Outreach

A description of the student services planned for the new joint-use educational center including student financial aid, advising, counseling, testing, tutoring, educational opportunity programs, compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, and outreach services to historically underrepresented groups.

3.6 Support and Capital Outlay Budget Projections

- Provide a five-year capital outlay projection that includes the total Assigned Square Feet (ASF) anticipated to be required for each year of the projection period, with estimates of the average cost per ASF.

- Include a five-year projection of anticipated support costs including administration, academic programs (including occupational/vocational as appropriate), academic support, and other standard expense elements. The number of Personnel Years (PY) should be indicated.

- Provide a statement of agreement between the institutions concerning which institution will submit the capital request if an independent state fund source is not defined.

3.7 Geographic and Physical Accessibility
The proposal must include a plan for student, faculty, and staff transportation to the proposed campus or existing site. Reasonable commuting times must be demonstrated. Plans for student and faculty housing, including projections of needed on-campus residential facilities should be included if appropriate.

### 3.8 Effects on Other Institutions

- Other systems, institutions, and the community in which the joint-use educational center is to be located should be consulted during the planning process, especially at the time that alternatives to expansion are explored. Strong local, regional, and/or statewide interest in the proposed facility must be demonstrated by letters of support from responsible agencies, groups, and individuals. The establishment of a joint-use center must take into consideration the impact of a new facility on existing and projected enrollments at neighboring institutions of its own and other systems.

- The establishment of a new community college joint-use educational center must not reduce existing and projected enrollments in adjacent community colleges either within the district proposing the new community college, or in adjacent districts, to a level that will damage their economy of operation, or create excess enrollment capacity at these institutions, or lead to an unnecessary duplication of programs.

### 3.9 Environmental Impact

The proposal must include a copy of the Summary Draft or Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the site or the project. The statewide governing board shall provide the Commission with detailed sections of the Draft or Final EIR upon request.

### 3.10 Economic Efficiency

Since it is in the best interests of the State to The Commission encourages maximum economy of operation, priority shall be given to proposals for new joint-use centers institutions where the State of California is relieved of all or part of the financial burden. When such proposals include gifts of land, construction costs, or equipment, a higher priority shall be granted to such projects than to projects where all costs are borne by the State, assuming all other criteria listed above are satisfied.
3.11 Collaborative Arrangements

The intersegmental nature of joint-use educational centers requires that each segment clearly articulate the respective responsibilities of each participating segment, including but not limited to:

1. The participating institution, state agency, or other entity that will own the joint-use facility and, if appropriate, which participating system(s) will lease the facilities;

2. The participating public system of higher education that will exercise operational control and responsibility of the facilities, including such responsibilities as building and grounds maintenance;

3. The financial arrangements between the participating segments for the development and operation of the joint-use facility. Arrangements describing the establishment and collection of student fees must be discussed.

4. The nature of curricular cooperation and faculty responsibilities between the participating institutions; and

5. The nature of cooperative arrangements to provide academic support services and student services to all students attending the proposed collaborative facility.

4. Proposal Review

The Executive Director of the Commission shall respond to the chief executive officers of the segments and institutions (with copies to the Office of the Legislative Analyst and Department of Finance), in writing and within 60 days, and shall comment on the reasonableness of the proposal. The Executive Director may, in this process, raise concerns about the limitations of the proposal and request additional information. When the Commission Executive Director certifies that all necessary materials for the proposal are complete, the Commission will have six months to take final action.

5. Commission Notification

After the Commission takes final action on the proposal, its Executive Director will notify the chief executive officers of the participating institutions and segments, appropriate legislative committee chairs, the Department of Finance, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst.
CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

The California Postsecondary Education Commission is a citizen board established in 1974 by the Legislature and Office of the Governor to coordinate the efforts of California’s colleges and universities and to provide independent, non-partisan policy analysis and recommendations on higher education issues.

Members of the Commission

As of June 2004, the Commissioners representing the general public are:

Howard Welinsky, Culver City; Chair
Olivia K. Singh, San Francisco; Vice Chair
Alan S. Arkatov, Los Angeles
Carol Chandler, Selma
Hugo Morales, Fresno
Guillermo Rodriguez, Jr., San Francisco
Evonne Seron Schulze, San Diego
Faye Washington, Los Angeles
Dezie Woods-Jones, Oakland

Representatives of California education systems are:

Irwin S. Field, Beverly Hills; appointed by the Office of the Governor to represent the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities;

Anthony J. Alvarado, Coronado; appointed by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges;

Reed Hastings, Los Gatos; appointed by the California State Board of Education;

Kyriakos Tsakopoulos, Roseville; appointed by the Trustees of the California State University; and

Odessa P. Johnson, Modesto; appointed by the Regents of the University of California.

The two student representatives are:

Rachel Shetka, Napa
Vacant

Of the 16 Commission members, nine represent the general public, with three each appointed for six-year terms by the Office of the Governor, the Senate Rules Committee, and the Speaker of the Assembly. Five others represent the major systems of postsecondary education in California. Two student members are appointed by the Office of the Governor.

Functions of the Commission

The Commission is charged by the Legislature and the Office of the Governor to “assure the effective utilization of public postsecondary education resources, thereby eliminating waste and unnecessary duplication, and to promote diversity, innovation, and responsiveness to student and societal needs.”

To this end, the Commission conducts independent reviews of matters affecting the 2,600 institutions of postsecondary education in California, including community colleges, four-year colleges, universities, and professional and occupational schools.

As an advisory body to the Legislature and Office of the Governor, the Commission performs specific duties of planning, evaluation, and coordination by cooperating with other State agencies and non-governmental groups that perform those other governing, administrative, and assessment functions. The Commission does not govern or administer any institutions, nor does it approve, authorize, or accredit any colleges and universities.

Operation of the Commission

The Commission holds regular public meetings throughout the year at which it discusses and takes action on staff studies and takes positions on proposed legislation affecting education beyond the high school level in California. Requests to speak at a meeting may be made by writing the Commission in advance or by submitting a request before the start of the meeting.

The Commission’s day-to-day work is carried out by its staff in Sacramento, under the guidance of Acting Executive Director Murray J. Haberman, who is appointed by the Commission.

Further information about the Commission and its publications may be obtained from the Commission offices at 1303 J Street, Suite 500, Sacramento, California 98514-2938; telephone (916) 445-7933; website www.cpec.ca.gov.
Planning and Coordinating the Development of California’s Campuses: The Commission’s Role in the Review of New University Campuses, Community Colleges, and Educational Centers

Commission Report 04-09

ONE of a series of reports published by the California Postsecondary Education Commission as part of its planning and coordinating responsibilities. Summaries of these reports are available on the Internet at http://www.cpec.ca.gov. Single copies may be obtained without charge from the Commission at 1303 J Street, Suite 500, Sacramento, California 95814-2938. Recent reports include:

2003


03-09 Student Profiles, 2003: The Latest in a Series of Annual Factbooks About Student Participation in California Higher Education (November 2003)

2004

04-01 Commission Review of a Proposal by Riverside Community College District to Convert the Moreno Valley Educational Center to a Full-Service Community College Campus: A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to a Request from California Community College Board of Governors (March 2004)

04-02 Commission Review of a Proposal by Riverside Community College District to Convert the Norco Educational Center to College Status: A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to a Request from California Community College Board of Governors (March 2004)

04-03 State Licensure versus Accreditation of Proprietary Schools and Colleges – A Review and Comparison of Roles and Functions (March 2004)

04-04 Title IX Athletics Compliance at California’s Public High Schools, Community Colleges, and Universities: A Report Prepared for the California Postsecondary Education Commission and the California Department of Education by RMC Research Corporation (March 2004)

04-05 University Eligibility Study for the Class of 2003 (May 2004)

04-06 Information Collection and Dissemination Program (May 2004)


04-09 Planning and Coordinating the Development of California’s Campuses: The Commission’s Role in the Review of New University Campuses, Community Colleges, and Educational Centers (June 2004)