ARIZONA BOARD OF REGENTS
UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
STUDENT UNION MEMORIAL CENTER

November 14-16, 2018
Schedule of Events and Meetings

Wednesday, November 14, 2018

5:00 p.m. – 6:30 p.m. Executive Session – Tucson Room
   (5:00-6:30 p.m. – Executive Director Arnold Review of Assignments)

Thursday, November 15, 2018

9:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. Executive Session – Tucson Room
   (9:00-10:30 a.m. – President Robbins Review of Assignments)
   (10:45-11:15 a.m. – Executive Session)
   (11:30-12:30 p.m. – Enterprise Executive Committee Review of Assignments)

11:30 a.m. – 1:30 p.m. Staff Lunch Available – Rincon Room

1:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. ABOR Meeting – North Ballroom

5:30 p.m. – 7:00 p.m. ABOR Reception at the Presidential Residence
   (Invitation only)

Friday, November 16, 2018

7:45 a.m. – 8:45 a.m. Faculty Breakfast – Old Main, Silver and Sage Room, Level 2
   (Invitation only)

9:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m. ABOR Meeting – North Ballroom

1:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. University of Arizona Strategic Plan Reception – Old Main, Level 2
   (Invitation only)
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Meeting Objectives:

- Discuss and take action on 2019 policy positions.
- Discuss and approve report on student financial aid.
- Receive and discuss report on wages of graduates from Arizona’s public institutions.
- Review performance of the University of Arizona and its academic, business and strategic imperatives through an annual operation and financial review.

**Wednesday, November 14, 2018**

5:30 p.m.  CALL TO ORDER

5:35 p.m.  EXECUTIVE SESSION

**Thursday, November 15, 2018**

9:00 a.m.  RECONVENE EXECUTIVE SESSION

1:30 p.m.  RESUME PUBLIC MEETING, GREETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE BOARD CHAIR

1:45 p.m.  UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA PRESIDENT’S WELCOME

2:00 p.m.  CALL TO THE AUDIENCE

Per board policy 1-114, time has been set aside for Call to the Audience, an opportunity for people to express their views or concerns on matters of board governance to the entire board in a public setting.
2:30 p.m. ADOPTION OF CONSENT AGENDA ACTION ITEMS AND ACCEPTANCE OF CONSENT INFORMATION ITEMS

All items on the Consent Agenda are listed at the end of this agenda, underlined and marked with an asterisk (*). These items will be considered by a single motion with no discussion. All other items will be considered individually.

2:35 p.m. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

1. 2019 ABOR Policy Positions

   The board office asks the board to discuss and approve the 2019 ABOR Policy Positions.

2:50 p.m. FINANCE, CAPITAL AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE

2. Property Acquisition of 1301 S. Fourth Street, Flagstaff, AZ (NAU)

   Northern Arizona University asks the board for approval to purchase a 120 acre parcel of land, located at 1301 S Fourth Street in Flagstaff, AZ from Northern Arizona Real Estate Holdings, LLC.

3. Proposed Revisions to ABOR Policy 7-207 “Leases of Real Property” Regarding Use of University Property for Commercial Purposes (First Reading)

   The board office asks the board to review on first reading the proposed revisions to ABOR Policy 7-207 “Leases of Real Property,” regarding the use of university property for commercial purposes.

3:05 p.m. 15-MINUTE BREAK

3:20 p.m. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS AND EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT COMMITTEE

4. Appointment of Regents Professors (ASU)

   Arizona State University asks the board to approve appointment of four Regents Professors effective December 31, 2018: Michelene Chi (Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College), Donald Fixico (School of Historical, Philosophical and Religious Studies), Stewart Fotheringham (School of Geographical Sciences & Urban Planning), and Osvaldo Sala (School of Life Sciences).

5. FY 2018 Financial Aid Report

   The board office and the universities ask the board to discuss and accept the Fiscal Year 2018 Financial Aid Report.
6. 2018 Wages of Graduates Report

The board office asks the board to discuss and accept the 2018 Annual Wages of Graduates Report.

4:35 p.m. STUDENT REGENT REPORT

4:45 p.m. REPORT FROM THE ARIZONA FACULTIES COUNCIL

4:55 p.m. INQUIRIES, REQUESTS, REPORTS, AND COMMENTS FROM REGENTS AND MEMBERS OF THE ENTERPRISE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

5:00 p.m. RECESS

Friday, November 16, 2018

9:00 a.m. RESUME PUBLIC MEETING

9:00 a.m. UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA OPERATIONAL AND FINANCIAL REVIEW


The University of Arizona and the board office ask the board to receive their Fiscal Year 2018-2019 operational and financial review composed of the background report, proposed strategic plan, and public presentation and strategic discussion.

CONSENT AGENDA

These items were considered by a single motion with no discussion and approved earlier in the meeting.

*Minutes
(a) June 13-15, 2018 Regular Board Meeting; (b) June 13-15, 2018 Executive Session; (c) June 29, 2018 Special Executive Session; (d) July 26, 2018 Special Executive Session; (e) August 8, 2018 Special Executive Session; (f) August 23, 2018 Special Board Meeting; (g) November 1, 2018 Special Board Meeting

FINANCE, CAPITAL AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE

8. *Report on the Finance, Capital and Resources Committee Meeting

The board office asks the board to review the report of the November 1, 2018 Finance, Capital and Resources Committee.
9. *Proposed Revisions to ABOR Policy Chapter 4 – Relating to the Setting of Tuition and Fees (Second Reading) and Proposed Repeal of ABOR “Guidelines for Class Fees;” “Guidelines for Definitions Used in Setting Tuition and Fees;” and “Guidelines for Requesting Differential Tuition and Program Fee Additions or Modifications”

The board office asks the board to approve the proposed revisions to ABOR Policy Chapter 4 relating to the annual setting of tuition and fees for Arizona State University, Northern Arizona University and University of Arizona. The board office also asks the board to approve the repeal of ABOR “Guidelines for Class Fees;” “Guidelines for Definitions Used in Setting Tuition and Fees;” and “Guidelines for Requesting Differential Tuition and Program Fee Additions or Modifications.”

10. *Proposed Revisions to ABOR Policy 7-203 “Purchase of Real Property” (Second Reading)

The board office asks the board to approve the proposed revisions to ABOR Policy 7-203 “Purchase of Real Property”, as described in this Executive Summary.

11. *Proposed Revisions to ABOR Policies 3-808 “Intergovernmental Procurement,” 3-809 “Legal Remedies” and 3-811 “Significant Procurement Roles” of Chapter III, Article H – University Procurement Code (Second Reading)

The board office asks the board to approve the proposed revisions to ABOR Policies 3-808 "Intergovernmental Procurement," 3-809 "Legal Remedies" and 3-811 "Significant Procurement Roles" of Chapter III, Article H--University Procurement Code.

12. *Amended Capital Development Plan (ASU)

Arizona State University asks the board to approve its Amended Capital Development Plan, which includes three new projects.


The University of Arizona asks the board to approve its FY 2019 Capital Development Plan (CDP), and financing, which includes four (4) new projects and two (2) previously approved projects. The CDP total project budget is $352 million. The financing request is $314.7 million for the projects in the financing plan outlined in the CDP. The FY 2019 CDP does not include any third-party projects.
14. *Property Acquisition of 624 N. 5th Street, Phoenix, Arizona (ASU)*

Arizona State University asks the board to approve its request to purchase the 7,500 square foot site located at 624 N. 5th Street in Phoenix, Arizona.

**ACADEMIC AFFAIRS AND EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT COMMITTEE**

15. *Report on the Academic Affairs and Educational Attainment Committee Meeting*

The board office asks the board to review the report of the November 1, 2018 Academic Affairs and Educational Attainment Committee meeting.

16. *Request for New Academic Programs for Arizona State University (ASU)*

Arizona State University asks the board to approve its request for new academic programs.

17. *2018 Fall Enrollment Report*

The board office asks the board to approve the 2018 Fall Enrollment Report of headcount and full-time equivalent enrollment for universities in the Arizona University System.


The board office asks the board to approve the 2017-2018 High School Report Card.

19. *2018 Annual Report on Articulation and Transfer for Arizona Postsecondary Education*

The board office asks the board to approve the 2018 Annual Report on Articulation and Transfer for Arizona Postsecondary Education.

**AUDIT COMMITTEE**

20. *Report on the Audit Committee Meeting*

The board office asks the board to review the report of the November 1, 2018 Audit Committee meeting.
REGENTS EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

21. *Amendments to Contracts of Athletic Director and Head Coaches to Address Title IX Reporting Requirements and New NCAA Contractual Requirements (ASU)

Arizona State University asks the board to authorize amendments to the contracts of its Athletics Director and its head coaches to include language requiring compliance with all Title IX and other reporting requirements as well as language mandated by the NCAA requiring compliance with the NCAA Infractions Process.

ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS

22. *Proposed Policy Revisions to ABOR Policy 6-1101 “Appointments of Presidents” (Second Reading)

Proposed Revisions to ABOR Policy 6-1101 “Appointments of Presidents” (Second Reading)

23. *Proposed Repeal of ABOR Policies 3-701 and 7-115 (First Reading)

The board office asks the board to review on first reading the proposed repeal of ABOR Policies 3-701 “Authority and Responsibilities – Internal Audits” and 7-115 “Capital Projects Audits.”

1:00 p.m.  ADJOURN

PLEASE NOTE: This agenda may be amended at any time prior to 24 hours before the board meeting. Estimated starting times for the agenda items are indicated; however, discussions may commence, or action may be taken, before or after the suggested times. Any item on the agenda may be considered at any time out of order at the discretion of the board chair. The board may discuss, consider, or take action regarding any item on the agenda. During the public meeting, pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03 (A)(3), the board may convene in executive session for legal advice regarding any item on the agenda.

Regular Board Meeting Schedule

Meeting Schedule for 2018-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>February 6-8, 2019</th>
<th>ASU</th>
<th>April 10-12, 2019</th>
<th>UA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Meeting Schedule for 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>August 22, 2019</th>
<th>ABOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 18-20, 2019</td>
<td>NAU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 12-14, 2020</td>
<td>ASU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 10-12, 2020</td>
<td>NAU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Meeting Schedule for 2020-2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 20, 2020</td>
<td>ABOR</td>
<td>November 18-20, 2020</td>
<td>UA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 9-11, 2020</td>
<td>NAU</td>
<td>April 14-16, 2021</td>
<td>UA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 10-12, 2021</td>
<td>ASU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 9-11, 2021</td>
<td>NAU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Meeting Schedule for 2021-2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 26, 2021</td>
<td>ABOR</td>
<td>September 22-24, 2021</td>
<td>NAU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 17-19, 2021</td>
<td>UA</td>
<td>February 9-11, 2022</td>
<td>ASU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 6-8, 2022</td>
<td>UA</td>
<td>June 8-10, 2022</td>
<td>NAU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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EXECUTIVE SESSION AGENDA
November 14-15, 2018

NOTE: This agenda may be amended at any time prior to 24 hours before the Board meeting. The executive session is scheduled for 5:00 p.m. on Wednesday, November 14, 2018 and 9:00 a.m. on Thursday, November 15, 2018. The executive session may be recessed and continued as necessary.

Statutory Authorization
A.R.S. § 38-431.03

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items to be Discussed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Review of minutes of previous executive session(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. From the board, board office staff or counsel to the board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A. 3 &amp; 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Report on pending or contemplated litigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A. 1, 3 &amp; 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Review of assignments – Presidents and Executive Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLEASE NOTE: This agenda may be amended at any time prior to 24 hours before the meeting. Estimated starting times for the agenda items are indicated; however, discussions may commence before or after the suggested time. Any item on the agenda may be considered at any time out of order at the discretion of the Chair. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03 (A)(3) the board may convene in Executive Session at any time during the meeting to receive legal advice regarding any item on the agenda.

Instruction re: Confidentiality
Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(B) & (C) all are reminded that minutes of and discussions that occur in executive sessions are confidential by law and that violations of that confidentiality may subject the individuals involved to such penalties as are prescribed by law, including fines, costs, attorneys’ fees, and removal from office.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Item Name: 2019 ABOR Policy Positions

☑ Action Item

Requested Action: The board office asks the board to discuss and approve the 2019 ABOR Policy Positions.

Background/History of Previous Board Action
The Arizona Board of Regents has previously approved the Enterprise Lobbying Principles on an annual basis. The ABOR Policy Positions replace and expand on those Principles to add more specificity around policy areas that regularly come before the enterprise during legislative session. The Policy Positions are designed to set expectations regarding policy areas that may be introduced during the coming legislative session. The Policy Positions are annually set by the board for all lobbyists representing the university enterprise.

Discussion
The ABOR Policy Positions to be discussed include:
- Board Governance
- Enterprise Funding
- Tuition & Fee Waivers
- Campus Safety
- Retirement

Contact Information:
Brittney Kaufmann (602) 229-2509 britney.kaufmann@azregents.edu
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**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**Item Name:** Property Acquisition of 1301 S Fourth Street, Flagstaff, AZ (NAU)

☑️ Action Item

**Requested Action:** Northern Arizona University asks the board for approval to purchase a 120 acre parcel of land, located at 1301 S Fourth Street in Flagstaff, AZ from Northern Arizona Real Estate Holdings, LLC (NAREH), as described in this Executive Summary.

**Background/History of Previous Board Action**

- NAREH is a subsidiary of the NAU Foundation (NAUF) and is organized to finance, acquire, construct, develop, equip, operate, maintain, lease and hold real estate investments on behalf of the NAUF for the benefit of NAU.
- The parcel consists of approximately 120 acres of real property and is located in Flagstaff, Arizona, at 1301 S. Fourth Street as shown on Exhibits A and B.
- The parcel is located to the east of campus and is not contiguous.
- The parcel is undeveloped.

**Discussion**

- The purchase price of the parcel is $3,000,000, plus customary transaction costs.
- Two appraisals were obtained, one appraised the parcel at $2,940,000 and the other appraised it at $3,000,000.
- NAU will acquire the real property from NAREH under the terms proposed below:
  - Twenty equal annual installments at an interest rate of 5%;
  - Payment of all due diligence costs, to include NAREH’s attorney’s fees;
  - Early payment option in whole or in part, without penalty; and
  - NAU will take title to the real property at the close of escrow.
- Upon approval of this item, the following are each separately authorized in the name and on behalf of the Board to take all appropriate actions to finalize negotiations and to sign and deliver all documents and agreements necessary to

**Contact Information:**
Daniel T Okoli, Vice President for Capital Planning and Campus Operation • (928) 523-8871 • daniel.okoli@nau.edu
consummate the transaction described in this Executive Summary on substantially the terms described herein: the NAU President and the NAU Executive Vice President and Chief of Staff.

Exhibits

- Exhibit A – Location Map
- Exhibit B – Legal Description

Committee Review and Recommendation

This is presented to the full Board for review and consideration.

Statutory/Policy Requirements

- ABOR Policy 7-203 requires Finance, Capital and Resources Committee review and Board approval for purchases of real property that exceed $500,000. The University requests a waiver of this Policy due to the timing of property appraisals, close of escrow and the schedule of Board meetings, and that the Board consider full approval.

- ABOR Policy 7-203 requires that any request for authorization to purchase real property shall include a legal description of the property; please see attached Exhibits.

- ABOR Policy 7-206 requires two appraisals for any property purchase with an estimated purchase price above $1,000,000. All appraisals shall be independent, unilaterally required and paid for by the University.
Exhibit A

Commitment No.: 70506342-005-JRK

EXHIBIT A
Legal Description

The Land referred to herein below is situated in the County of Coconino, State of Arizona, and is described as follows:

PARCEL NO. 1:

A portion of Section 25, Township 21 North, Range 7 East, Gila & Salt River Base and Meridian, Coconino County, Arizona, described as follows:

BEGINNING at the Southwest corner of said Section 25, the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING;

THENCE North 0° 45' 09" West, a distance of 1,336.00 feet;

THENCE North 89° 49' 36" East, a distance of 659.41 feet;

THENCE North 0° 34' 19" West, a distance of 333.71 feet;

THENCE North 89° 54' 25" East, a distance of 1,976.81 feet;

THENCE South 89° 57' 54" East, a distance of 656.79 feet;

THENCE South 0° 20' 16" East, a distance of 1,649.65 feet;

THENCE South 89° 42' 18" West, a distance of 656.59 feet;

THENCE South 89° 32' 00" West, a distance of 2,625.36 feet to the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING;

EXCEPT any portion of said parcel lying outside of the boundaries of that parcel described in Patent recorded in Docket 519, Page 623, records of Coconino County, Arizona.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Item Name: Proposed Revisions to ABOR Policy 7-207 “Leases of Real Property” Regarding Use of University Property for Commercial Purposes (First Reading)

☐ Action Item

Requested Action: The board office asks the board to review on first reading the proposed revisions to ABOR Policy 7-207 “Leases of Real Property,” regarding the use of university property for commercial purposes.

Background/History of Previous Board Action

- ABOR policy does not define a process for consideration of the use of university property for commercial purposes, beyond requiring approval of a ground lease.

- The ABOR office contracted with RCLCo Real Estate Advisors for real estate consulting services to review current ABOR policy on property governance, and to develop recommendations for an oversight process related to using university property for commercial projects.

- At its meeting in September 2018, the board also adopted a policy position and principles on university property development.

Discussion

- The ABOR office is working with the universities on finalizing a proposal for ABOR policy on the use of university property for commercial purposes, that includes recommendations from the RCLCo report and the board adopted property development principles.

- The policy will outline a process that includes three primary steps and speaks to the type of information that should be provided at each step. The three steps include:

  i. Notification: informal notification as soon as possible after conceptualized use of the property.

  ii. Preliminary Report: preliminary report submitted for review after agreement providing exclusive rights to work towards eventual use of the property.

  iii. Final Approval: approval request submitted after due diligence and agreement terms have been negotiated.
iv. **Ongoing Reporting**: annual reporting on the performance, including timelines and financial information relative to the terms of executed leases.

- The draft policy will also increase the threshold amount of when leases require committee review and board approval from $500,000 to $1,000,000.

- The policy will be forwarded to the board under separate cover.

**Committee Review and Recommendation**

The Finance, Capital and Resources Committee received an update on status of the draft policy and its components, and did not object to the proposed policy being presented directly to the board.

**Statutory/Policy Requirements**

- Chapter 7 of ABOR policy governs capital and real property. In particular, section 2 of chapter 7 governs real property transactions.

[Revisions to ABOR Policy 7-207 “Leases of Real Property” will be sent out under separate cover.]
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Item Name: Appointment of Regents Professors (ASU)

☒ Action Item

Requested Action: Arizona State University asks the board to approve appointment of four Regents Professors effective December 31, 2018: Michelene Chi (Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College), Donald Fixico (School of Historical, Philosophical and Religious Studies), Stewart Fotheringham (School of Geographical Sciences & Urban Planning), and Osvaldo Sala (School of Life Sciences).

Background/History of Previous Board Action

- Arizona State University requires all nominations for Regents’ Professor to come from groups of tenured faculty members. A review process and an Advisory Committee evaluates all nominations. The President then considers the recommendations provided from the committee and decides which names should go forward for the Board’s consideration.

- On this occasion, four names are recommended by President Crow.

- By approval of these appointments, ASU is authorized to appoint Professors Chi, Fixico, Fotheringham and Sala to the rank of Regents Professor, effective December 31, 2018, and to award the $5,000 salary increase that customarily accompanies these appointments.

Discussion

- **Michelene Chi**
  Professor Chi is the Dorothy Bray Endowed Professor of Science and Teaching. She has designed and implemented best-practice forms of school instruction to enhance students’ learning at the K-16 level. She has published pioneering research on such topics as conceptual change, the nature of expertise, learning from being tutored, and learning strategies. Her current work focuses on three strands. One strand is devoted to how to assess different ways of engaging students cognitively, using students’ overt actions as a measure of cognitive engagement. A second strand of her research is devoted to enhancing students’ understanding of complex processes that are typically taught in science classes. The third strand studies new ways to deliver digitally enhanced instruction incorporating ways that can optimize student learning. Her research has been used in important ways in ASU’s design of our blended adaptive-active learning courses for general education.

Contact Information:
Mark Searle, Executive Vice President and University Provost, (480) 965-1224, MARK.SEARLE@asu.edu
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

She is an internationally renowned cognitive scientist who has been awarded at the highest levels. Her contributions for which she has been awarded are not only transformative, they are founding. She is regarded as one of the founding figures of modern learning science. She has published 120 papers that garnered 48,000 citations. Her research cuts across disciplines as indicated by her membership in national academies and the national awards she has won. Professor Chi has been voted into American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the National Academy of Education and was named one of 23 scholars selected as 2013 American Educational Research Association (AERA) fellows. In 2018 she was announced as the 2019 Rumelhart Prize in Cognitive Science, regarded as the Nobel Prize in the area. She also holds multiple distinctions as a Fellow of the Cognitive Science Society, the American Psychological Association, the Center for Philosophy of Science, and Resident Fellow for the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences. She has also been recognized by the American Psychological Association with the E. L. Thorndike Career Achievement Award. Additionally, she was the recipient of the Sylvia Scribner Award by The American Educational Research Association for her work on learning and instruction. Her letters clearly indicate pioneering research in a number of subareas.

Her reviewers are unequivocal about her prominence. One writer says "her accomplishment merits the equivalent [award] at any university … the breadth of organizations that honored her is rare." Another says she has "5 papers that are seminal. I wish there was a google index for percent of papers in a field that cite a given work -- I suspect it would be stunning." A third claims "she [is] a god. She has repeatedly identified phenomena that present the critical test of competing theories. This is extremely rare and the mark of the very finest scholars. A single time makes a career and she has done it at least 3 times. Modern cognitive science would not be in the advanced state it is without her work of the past 40 years."

Professor Chi’s research in cognitive sciences is foundational and path-breaking. She has led academic research and enlightened practitioners, including ASU in its development of adaptive-active learning. Her awards attest to her influence. She is most worthy of the title of Regents’ Professor.

- Donald Fixico
  Professor Fixico is the Distinguished Foundation Professor of History. He is among the foremost scholars in North American Indian history. Don’s scholarly achievements are monumental, including pioneering contributions to Native American ethno-history and oral history. He is internationally recognized as an expert on indigenous studies. He has led national historical organizations. Further testimony to his preeminence, the Oxford University Press has selected Professor Fixico for their major Indian history survey. His scholarly leadership achievements
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

include the presidency of the Western Historical Association, one of the most prestigious appointments in historical studies.

Professor Fixico has created a knowledge base of the narratives that did not exist before his research. He has shown the importance of Indian oral traditions and Native perspectives in general as a necessary ingredient for the writing of not only Indian histories but American histories. His extensive research on the termination and relocation policies is regarded as the first place to begin any serious account of this critical period for American Indian peoples.

In terms of social impact, he works with tribes and indigenous organizations throughout the U.S and worldwide. He was appointed by President Bill Clinton to the Advisory Council of the National Endowment for the Humanities. In 2007 he was given the Lifetime Achievement Award for Advancing American Indian History by Indian historians of the Western History Association. In 2010 he received the National Museum of the American Indian Achievement Award in History and Education. Given the subject matter of his research, it is notable that his impact is global, not just North America. Through the organization of American Historians he has lectured in Japan, China, New Zealand and elsewhere.

One reviewer writes that “he is one of the three most prominent historians of Native America working in the academy today …. Professor Fixico may in fact be the most accomplished of the three … Professor Donald Fixico has left an indelible mark not just on his own field but on American history as a whole.”

A second reviewer explains: “Don’s role as a scholar has moved beyond a purely academic setting into a kind of public scholarship that he himself has largely pioneered. His decency, his scholarship, and his connections both in the academy and in tribal communities have allowed him to undertake intellectual work that no one else has been able to do …. He stands alone as a major intellectual presence and force.”

Professor Fixico has made pioneering contributions to our knowledge of North American Indian History and American History. He created a knowledge base of narratives, the oral history, which has opened up new avenues of inquiry for historical scholars and changed our historical perspective. Beyond his scholarship, he has had a significant social impact on tribes and indigenous organizations throughout the U.S. His transformative scholarship and social impact exemplify the accomplishments that the title of Regents’ Professor is intended to recognize.

- **Stewart Fotheringham**
  Professor Fotheringham sits at the triple junction of Geographical Information Science, statistical analysis, and spatial modeling. He has authored or co-authored
12 books, 36 book chapters and more than 100 research articles. In recognition of his contributions to science, he was elected to the National Academy of Sciences in 2013 and the UK Academy of Social Sciences. He also was awarded a Leverhulme Fellowship (the U.K. equivalent of a Guggenheim).

His crowning achievement was the development of a tool called geographically weighted regression. GWR addresses the problem of spatial dependency in traditional regression analysis and allows in-depth analysis of how and why regression parameters vary across space. This tool is at the essence of geographical thinking, and thus it has been widely embraced by geographers and incorporated into commercial GIS (Geographical Information Systems) software packages.

Beyond GWR, Professor Fotheringham’s performs analysis on Big Data. More specifically, he built a framework for classifying and analyzing GPS data for analysis of urban mobility patterns. These patterns are then used for marketing, facility location, urban planning, and social scientific investigation of the urban mobility process. It also is noteworthy that he has developed five high profile research centers: Centre for Geoinformatics, University of St. Andrew’s, Scotland; National Centre for Geocomputation, Ireland; Network of Centres of Excellence in Geomatics for Informed Decisions, Canada; and the NSF National Center for Geographic Information and Analysis, SUNY Buffalo. At ASU he has advanced geography and social science as Director of the Spatial Analysis Research Center (SPARC).

For his many achievements, one reviewer says: “The significance of his work cannot be overstated. For example, these approaches have been implemented in a series of software platforms which are used by hundreds of thousands of scholars and practitioners.”

Another writes simply: “Stewart Fotheringham is, without doubt, one of the most renowned quantitative geographers of his generation – perhaps the most renowned.”

Professor Fotheringham’s achievements in scholarly research, his international reputation as a scholar of the highest rank, and impact on the practice of geographical science is worthy of the title of Regents’ Professor.

- **Osvaldo Sala**
  Professor Sala is the Julie A. Wrigley Professor and founding Director of the Global Drylands Center at Arizona State University. Dr. Sala has explored several topics throughout his career from the response of arid ecosystems to climate and land-use change to global biodiversity scenarios for the next 50 years. His work has been truly interdisciplinary, collaborating with geologists, social scientists, mathematicians and humanists and using a variety of tools from experimentation to simulation modeling.
He is best known for his experimental manipulations of drylands. Professor Sala’s research has had a substantial local as well as global impact. He has carried out many experiments around the world from Patagonia to the Kalahari, from the Loess Plateau (China) to the Chihuahua Desert (US). He has established scientific collaborations all over the world from China, Israel and Australia to Europe, North and South America. Osvaldo’s level of activity continues to increase on a daily basis. He currently has an active lab at ASU with five ongoing grants from the National Science Foundation, US Department of Agriculture and Department of Defense.

His publications are among the most cited in the fields of ecology, sustainability and biology. He has more than 200 publications and 40,000 citations. Qualitatively, his honors include: elected member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the Argentinian National Academy of Sciences, the Argentinean National Academy of Physical and Natural Sciences, a Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science and the Ecological Society of America. As President of the Latin American Botanical Network, he received the prestigious Tyler award in 2004. Additionally, he has served in the most important scientific international bodies as President of the Scientific Committee of Problems of the Environment (SCOPE), headquartered in Paris; as a member of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment; and the IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change).

One reviewer writes “Dr. Sala’s service to the scientific community is extraordinary. He is considered a world expert in biodiversity in global terrestrial ecosystems …. He is a scientist who has been at the frontiers of knowledge in ecology his whole career.”

A second reviewer explains his pioneering contributions: “Dr. Osvaldo Sala is a world leader in both scientific research and scientific leadership. Osvaldo’s contributions to our understanding of the controls on primary production in grasslands are without equal. …. Osvaldo also developed an experimental approach for studying the consequences of drought in grasslands. The science community has broadly adopted this experimental infrastructure. Indeed, his “Sala Shelters” are integral to climate change studies in a wide variety of ecosystems worldwide.”

Professor Sala’s scholarly accomplishments, academic leadership and awards epitomize what the title of Regents’ Professor conveys.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Item Name: FY 2018 Financial Aid Report

☑ Action Item

Requested Action: The board office and the universities ask the board to discuss and accept the Fiscal Year 2018 Financial Aid Report.

Background and Discussion

The Arizona Board of Regents fiscal year 2018 Financial Aid Report provides financial aid trends and analysis for Arizona’s public universities. It also serves as an important tool for the board as it continues to address higher education access and affordability.

Data for the report was obtained from Arizona’s public universities – Arizona State University, Northern Arizona University and the University of Arizona. Additional information is included from the U.S. Department of Education, the U.S. Census Bureau 2017 American Community Survey and the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). All years referred to in this report are fiscal years, unless otherwise noted.

The full report will be provided separately to the board and posted on the ABOR website.

Statutory/Policy Requirements

The fiscal year 2018 Student Financial Aid Report for Arizona’s public universities is submitted in compliance with A.R.S. §15-1650.

Contact Information:
Chad Sampson 602-229-2512 Chad.Sampson@azregents.edu
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Item Name: 2018 Wages of Graduates Report

☑️ Action Item

Requested Action: The board office asks the board to discuss and accept the 2018 Annual Wages of Graduates Report.

Background and Discussion

The 2018 Arizona Board of Regents Wages of Graduates Report documents wages earned by graduates from Arizona’s public universities, including a breakdown of median earnings according to major and the overall economic contribution of Arizona university graduates to the state.

Wages were examined for graduates from Arizona State University, Northern Arizona University and the University of Arizona.

This report provides an analysis of Arizona public university system graduates working in Arizona in 2017 who graduated between fiscal years 1990 and 2017. Wages by academic program data include the most recent five-year cohort of graduates from 2013 through 2017; information is not provided for programs with small numbers of graduates working in Arizona.

The data cited in this report comes from the Arizona Department of Economic Security employer records and the U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey.

The full report will be provided separately to the board and posted on the ABOR website.

Statutory/Policy Requirements

None

Contact Information:

Chad Sampson  602.229.2512  chad.sampson@azregents.edu
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Item Name: The University of Arizona FY 2018-2019 Operational and Financial Review (UA)

☐ Action Item

Requested Action: The University of Arizona and the board office ask the board to receive their Fiscal Year 2018-2019 operational and financial review composed of the background report, proposed strategic plan, and public presentation and strategic discussion.

Background/History of Previous Board Action

As part of its constitutional responsibility to ensure that Arizona’s public universities accomplish their public purpose and mission, the Arizona Board of Regents conducts an annual comprehensive review of the operations and finances of each university. This review emphasizes the UA’s:

- differentiated mission, purpose and identity;
- strategic initiatives;
- current performance levels of the organization;
- emerging threats and opportunities;
- current and future university priorities;
- strengths and weaknesses relative to higher education peers and competitors;
- financial model and resource allocation necessary to support the mission and initiatives;
- key partnerships, relationships and alliances; and,
- anticipated responses to contingencies or environmental changes.

The OFR allows the regents to understand the details and progress of each university’s academic, business, and strategic initiatives against the goals assigned in the ABOR strategic plan, as well as the personnel and financial resources that will be committed.

The review also highlights for the board the strategic and material decisions or policy changes required by the board as part of the plan. The process is also intended to enhance transparency in university planning and performance.

The board will draw on the information provided throughout the course of the year as it makes decisions regarding the university (e.g., tuition, capital projects, partnerships, academic programs, etc.).

Contact Information:
President Robert C. Robbins president@email.arizona.edu (520) 621-5511
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Once received by the board, the university OFR materials will be used to facilitate university operating decisions internally.

Discussion

The UA’s review is composed of three components:

1) background report
2) proposed strategic plan; and,
3) public presentation and strategic discussion with the board.

UA’s OFR materials may be found here.

Each OFR component is briefly described below.

UA Background Report

The background report is designed to provide the regents with an overview of each university’s progress in key areas of responsibility from the prior year relative to the ABOR metrics and university projections. The report includes several schedules populated by data obtained from the board’s business intelligence database, the financial aid report, other financial data, additional board annual reports and university provided financial projections.

The UA’s Strategic Plan

In addition to the background report, the UA submits a strategic plan to be accepted by the board at its November 15-16, 2018 board meeting. The strategic plan:

- contains the university’s most important modifications to operations and financial strategies;
- informs the board what the university intends to achieve, recognizing the current competitive conditions and environment;
- details the major initiatives that will be deployed;
- identifies the resource commitment it will take to achieve those initiatives;
- identifies the key opportunities available to the university; and
- addresses what risk factors exist that could prevent the university from achieving its initiatives/goals and the actions needed to mitigate.

Public Presentation and Strategic Discussion

As part of the review process, the President (and, at the President’s discretion, key members of the university leadership team) will have the opportunity to make a presentation and engage in a strategic discussion with the board.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The presentation and discussion is expected to focus on those areas of greatest importance and urgency to the UA and cover the strategies and initiatives that will be pursued in the coming years.

Statutory/Policy Requirements
A.R.S. §15-1626(A) General Administrative powers and duties of board
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ARIZONA BOARD OF REGENTS
Minutes of a Regular Meeting
Wednesday, June 13, Thursday, June 14
and Friday June 15, 2018

A meeting of the Arizona Board of Regents was held on Wednesday, June 13,
Thursday, June 14 and Friday, June 15, 2018 at Northern Arizona University, High
Country Conference Center in Flagstaff, Arizona.

Members present: Regent Ridenour, Regent Shoopman, Regent Penley, Regent
Manson, Regent Heiler, Regent Taylor Robson, Regent Careaga and Regent
DeGravina.

Members absent: Regent Rick Myers, Regent Ram Krishna, Governor Doug Ducey and
Superintendent Douglas.

Others present: from Northern Arizona University, President Rita Cheng, Provost Daniel
Kain, Senior Associate Christy Farley, General Counsel Michelle Parker, Bjorn Flugstad
and David Schultz; from Arizona State University, President Michael Crow, Provost
Mark Searle, Senior Associate Christine Wilkinson, Morgan Olsen and Sethuraman
Panchanathan; from the University of Arizona, President Robert Robbins, Interim
Provost Jeffrey Goldberg, Senior Associate Jon Dudas, General Counsel Laura Todd
Johnson, Gregg Goldman, Kim Ogden, Dave Heeke and Heather Gaines; from the
Board Office: Interim Managing Director John Arnold, General Counsel Nancy
Tribbensee, Chad Sampson, Lorenzo Martinez, Brittney Kaufmann and Kate Linder;
and Benning Tieke on behalf of the Arizona Faculties Council Representative Lynn
Nadel.

All lists, reports, summaries, background materials and other documents referred to in
the minutes can be found in the June 13-15, 2018 Document Files. The meeting was
called to order on June 13, 2018 at 4:35 p.m. The board immediately voted to go into
executive session.

Thursday, June 14, 2018

RESUME PUBLIC SESSION, GREETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE
BOARD CHAIR

The public meeting resumed on June 14, 2018 at 1:16 p.m. Regent Ridenour resumed
the meeting and Regent Careaga led the Pledge of Allegiance. Regent Ridenour
provided his welcoming remarks to the audience and excused both Regent Myers and
Regent Krishna who were not able to attend the meeting. It was noted that this is the
first meeting for Interim Managing Director John Arnold. Regent Ridenour
acknowledged the recent passing of Barbara Ridge, who was an original visionary of
ASU’s West Campus. President Crow also remarked on Ms. Ridge’s contributions to the West Campus. Regent Careaga led the Pledge of Allegiance.

NORTHERN ARIZONA UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT’S WELCOME

President Cheng provided her welcoming remarks and announced that NAU was a nationally recognized institution that is connected to the Flagstaff community and is focused on student success. The university’s new strategic plan is a guide to greater results and captures the essence of what makes NAU a unique university and reflects the vision of what NAU can become.

President Cheng highlighted the five areas of NAU’s strategic plan, which include:
• Student Success: NAU’s 2018 spring commencement saw over 5,700 students graduate; 70% of whom were from Arizona. Statewide and online enrollment continues to grow, with more than 2,000 students attending on a campus outside of Flagstaff and over 6,000 enrolled online.
• Intellectual Curiosity and Research: The quality of NAU’s team and dedication in research gives the university success in recruiting excellent faculty.
• Commitment to Native Americans: Native American students remain an essential priority of NAU. Examples of various programs geared toward Native American success were presented.
• Engagement: The work NAU does with its various partners helps to create opportunities to lead on a national scale. The strategic plan guides the university in efforts to advance its collaborations and enable it to further align research, scholarly works, degree programs and student and local workforce needs.
• Stewardship: the goal of stewardship requires action across many areas of NAU’s operations including a high quality professional workforce for its students. Stewardship allows for continued improvement to ensure Arizona has affordable and accessible education options.

President Cheng concluded her welcoming remarks by thanking the members of the board for their leadership and support of NAU.

CALL TO THE AUDIENCE

Per board policy 1-114, time was set aside for Call to the Audience, an opportunity for people to express their views or concerns on matters of board governance to the entire board in a public setting.

Matt Ryan from the Coconino County Board of Supervisors spoke in support of NAU and the mission of the Board of Regents
James Jayne from Coconino County spoke in support of NAU
Clif Balderas, a Flagstaff citizen expressed concerns over the growth of NAU
Adam Shimoni, Shimoni Campaign for City Council spoke about NAU’s impact on affordable housing
Eric Yordy from NAU's School of Hotel and Restaurant Management spoke about the success and quality of the Hotel and Restaurant Management program.
Marie Teemant from UA GPSC spoke about tuition and fee increases.
Christopher Edwards from NAU Department of Physics and Astronomy spoke about the Physics and Astronomy program.
Barbara Goodrich from the City of Flagstaff expressed support for NAU.
Steve Peru from United Way of Northern Arizona stated his support for NAU.
Christina Caldwell from Goodwill of Central and Northern Arizona spoke about the community partnership between Goodwill and NAU.
Kathy Fraser, a Flagstaff citizen expressed her concerns over campus growth and the current university administration.
Natalynn Master, ASUA President spoke about diversity engagement.
Dylan Graham, ASNAU spoke about student government activities.
Alexander Haw, from ASU West campus spoke about campus-wide initiatives and student government activities.

ADOPTION OF CONSENT AGENDA ACTION ITEMS AND ACCEPTANCE OF CONSENT INFORMATION ITEMS

All items on the Agenda that are marked with an asterisk (*) are consent matters and included items 11-35. The Agenda was adopted as described in the executive summaries upon motion by Regent Ridenour, second by Regent Careaga with Regents Ridenour, Shoopman, Penley, Heiler, Manson, Taylor Robson and Careaga voting in favor. None opposed and none abstained. These items were considered by a single motion with no discussion.

*Minutes

The board approved the (a) December 13, 2017 Special Executive Session; (b) January 23, 2018 Special Board Meeting; (c) January 25, 2018 Special board Meeting; (d) January 26-27, 2018 Board Retreat; (e) February 8-9, 2018 Regular Board Meeting; (f) February 20, 2018 Special Board Meeting; (g) February 22, 2018 Special Board Meeting; (h) February 24, 2018 Special Emergency Board Meeting; (i) March 1, 2018 Special Board Meeting; (j) March 9, 2018 Special Board Meeting; (k) April 16, 2018 Special Board Meeting; and (l) May 1, 2018 Special Board Meeting.

BUSINESS AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

*Report on the Business and Finance Committee Meeting (Item 11)

The board reviewed the report of the May 31, 2018 Business and Finance Committee meeting.
*Extension of Lease Term for Subway Retail Lease at Cronkite Building, 555 North Central Avenue, Suite 104, Phoenix, AZ (ASU) (Item 12)

The board approved Arizona State University's (ASU) request to take all appropriate actions necessary to extend the term of the lease between ASU and Subway Real Estate Corp.

*Approval of ASU Lease of Approximately 80,000 Rentable Square Feet in the Novus 1 Building (Parcel 3C) (ASU) (Item 13)

The board approved Arizona State University's request to authorize all actions necessary to execute the lease of property between the Ryan Companies US, Inc., or its affiliate, as landlord, and ASU as tenant, in the Novus 1 Building to be constructed on Novus Parcel 3C, north of the northwest corner of Rural Road and University Drive.

*Land Exchange between ASU and City of Tempe (ASU) (Item 14)

The board approved Arizona State University to take all actions necessary to consummate the exchanges of property.

*Consolidation and Extension of Arizona State University Retail Leases at Taylor Place, 120 East Taylor Street, Phoenix, AZ 85004 (ASU) (Item 15)

The board approved Arizona State University to authorize all actions necessary to consolidate and extend the term and rate of the retail leases between ASU and Downtown Phoenix Student Housing, LLC at Taylor Place.

*Cash Balance Pension Plan (Item 16)

The board approved the Third Amendment of the Cash Balance Pension Plan and authorized the Board Chairman to execute this Amendment.

*Amended Capital Development Plan (ASU) (Item 17)

The board approved Arizona State University's amended Capital Development Plan, which included one new project.

*University of Arizona Tech Park at the Bridges Master Plan and Development Update (UA) (Item 18)

The board reviewed an update on the development of the UA Tech Park at The Bridges and The Bridges Vision and Concept Plan.
*Presidential Residence (UA) (Item 19)*

The board approved the University of Arizona’s request to acquire 2141 E. 3rd Street, Tucson, a 3,756 square foot Presidential Residence on an approximately 15,820 square foot parcel of land located just east of the main campus.

*Proposed Revision to ABOR Policy 7-106 “Annual Capital Improvement Plans” (First Reading) (Item 20)*

The board reviewed on first reading a proposed revision to ABOR Policy 7-106 “Annual Capital Improvement Plans” to add a new statutory requirement to include in the annual university capital improvement plans the status of capital projects that have been reviewed or approved by or reported to the Joint Committee on Capital Review.

**ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

*Report on the Academic and Student Affairs Committee Meeting (Item 21)*

The board reviewed the report of the May 31, 2018 Academic and Student Affairs Committee Meeting.

*Proposed Revisions to ABOR Policy 4-323(C)(2) “Tuition Waiver Scholarships and Institutionally Supported Financial Aid Programs – Student Financial Aid; Resident Tuition Waiver Scholarships for Recipients of a Regents High Honors Endorsement (also known as the AIMS Scholarship)” (Second Reading) (Item 22)*

The board approved the proposed revisions to ABOR Policy 4-323(C)(2) “Tuition Waiver Scholarships and Institutionally Supported Financial Aid Programs – Student Financial Aid; Resident Tuition Waiver Scholarships for Recipients of a Regents High Honors Endorsement (also known as the AIMS Scholarship).” The revision removed the reference to the “AIMS Scholarship.”

*Proposed Revision to ABOR Policy 2-221 “Academic Degree Programs” (Second Reading) (Item 23)*

The board approved the proposed revision to ABOR Policy 2-221 “Academic Degree Programs.”

*Proposed Revision to ABOR Policy 6-202 “Academic Freedom” (Second Reading) (Item 24)*

The board approved the proposed revision to ABOR Policy 6-202 “Academic Freedom.”
*Proposed Revisions to ABOR Policy 6-310 “Conditions of Postdoctoral Service” (First Reading) (Item 25)

The board reviewed on first reading the proposed revisions to ABOR Policy 6-310 “Conditions of Postdoctoral Service.”

*Review of Approved Exams for Equivalencies for High School Teachers’ Bonus (Item 26)

The board approved a revised list of credit by examination subjects that Arizona high school teacher may teach in order to be eligible for the incentive bonuses. This action was necessary to comply with A.R.S. §15-249.06 College credit by examination incentive program, incentive bonuses, report; program termination.

*Request for New Academic Programs for the University of Arizona (UA) (Item 27)

The board approved the University of Arizona’s new program request effective in the 2018-2019 catalog year.

*2018 Arizona Teachers Academy Annual Report (Item 28)

The board approved the 2018 Arizona Teachers Academy Annual Report.

*Request for a New College of Engineering, Informatics and Applied Sciences at Northern Arizona University (NAU) (Item 29)

The board approved Northern Arizona University’s request to reorganize the College of Engineering, Forestry and Natural Sciences into two colleges, effective AY 2018-2019.

*Review of Proposed ABOR Policy 1-123 “Student Regent Protocols” (First Reading) (Item 30)

The board office reviewed on first reading the proposed ABOR Policy 1-123 “Student Regent Protocols.”

AUDIT COMMITTEE

*Report on the Audit Committee (Item 31)

The board reviewed the report of the May 31, 2018 Audit Committee meeting.
RESEARCH, INNOVATION AND IMPACT COMMITTEE

*Report on the Research, Innovation and Impact Committee Meeting (Item 32)

The board reviewed the report of the May 31, 2018 Research, Innovation and Impact Committee meeting.

*Technology and Research Initiative Fund – Regents’ Innovation Fund Proposals (Item 33)

The board approved the FY 2018-2019 Regents’ Innovation Fund proposals as presented.

REGENTS EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

*Proposed Revisions to ABOR Policies 5-302 “Code of Conduct-Definitions,” 5-303 “Code of Conduct-Prohibited Conduct” and 5-308 “Student Code of Conduct” (Second Reading) (Item 34)

The board reviewed on first reading and approved for immediate implementation proposed revisions to ABOR policies 5-302 “Code of Conduct-Definitions,” 5-303 “Code of Conduct-Prohibited Conduct” and 5-308 “Student Code of Conduct.” The revisions updated definitions and prohibitions and require each university to maintain and publish a list of permitted Personal Safety Devices to include personal alarms, chemical repellents and other devices designed to protect personal safety.

*Proposed Revisions to ABOR Policy 6-910 “Appointments Requiring Board Approval” and Proposed Repeal of ABOR Policy 6-915 “Executive Compensation” (First Reading) (Item 35)

The board reviewed on first reading the proposed revisions to ABOR Policy 6-910 “Appointments Requiring Board Approval” and the proposed repeal of ABOR Policy 6-915 “Executive Compensation.”

ABOR INTERIM MANAGING DIRECTOR REPORT

ABOR Interim Managing Director Report (Item 1)

The board received a report from Interim Managing Director John Arnold and was asked to accept the ABOR Annual Report.

Mr. Arnold began his report by thanking board office staff, the universities and the board for the outpouring of support in his new role. Mr. Arnold congratulated Sarah Harper and her team for the work they put into preparing the ABOR Annual Report 2018 titled Delivering Results, which is accessible on the ABOR website. The Delivering Results
report celebrates and memorializes accomplishments of the board and the universities over the past year.

Highlights from the report included:

- **The Cost Study** - board staff and university CFOs worked to determine that the average cost for Arizona’s public universities to educate a student is slightly over $16,800; approximately 5% lower than the national average of all four-year public institutions.
- **The launch of the Arizona Teacher’s Academy.**
- **The launch of the University Capital Infrastructure Fund** - current projects from the fund are worth approximately $282 million, with an additional $400 million in projects launched over the next few years.
- **Access**
  - College readiness - the recent High School Report Card reflected that out of the 14,000 incoming high school seniors, 87% were admitted without an academic deficiency.
  - Tuition Affordability and Predictability - the latest tuition setting resulted in the vast majority of Arizona resident students avoiding a tuition increase. The board asked the Enterprise Executive Committee to review multi-year tuition setting in an effort to increase further tuition predictability.
  - Pathways to Success - over 10,000 students transferred from an Arizona community college to one of Arizona’s public universities.
- **Advancing Innovation and Impact**
  - TRIF and Research Impact
  - Excellence in Rankings – ASU was selected as the nation’s most innovative school for the third year. NAU ranked as #2 nationally for masters degrees awarded to Native Americans. UA was recently recognized as a Hispanic Serving Institution.
- **Productivity**
  - Fee Reforms - in conjunction with the Auditor General, board staff reviewed fee structures and how academic fees are levied. A new protocol around fee setting is expected to be brought to the board in September.
  - University Property Oversight Subcommittee – with Regent Taylor Robson’s leadership, the subcommittee is reviewing ways in which the board looks at real estate transactions.
  - Auditor General Audits – the board successfully completed three performance audits with the Auditor General during the past year. Mr. Arnold expressed his appreciation to the universities for helping to successfully navigate the audits.

Mr. Arnold discussed metrics and stated the universities are either at or ahead of their 2025 goals in 11 out of 14 areas. Benchmarks were drawn in comparison to other states geographically close to Arizona. Washington and Tennessee were also included in the comparison due to their similarities in terms of population.
Out of this group of states, Arizona ranked 6th in state support per capita; 1st in enrollment growth; 2nd in degree growth, 2nd in freshman retention; 1st in six-year graduation rate and 4th in research and development per capita. The main message from this benchmarking is highlighting lower public support, lower participate rate; although, Arizona does very well with the assets it has.

Various open board items were presented and Mr. Arnold requested feedback on prioritization. Board staff will use regent feedback to set the committee agendas for the upcoming year.

President Crow added that the states of Colorado and Washington significantly enhanced their per capita GDP statistics. The gap between those two states and Arizona is currently 25% per capita GDP. Regent Taylor Robson asked if there was a different analytical way to select the comparative set of states. Mr. Arnold stated there may be some value in establishing an ABOR peer set for the enterprise system.

Regent Penley commented that Arizona’s median household income is low relative to many other states, which makes the question of affordability significant and drives the need for a financial solution. Focusing as a board on the college going rate could be significant in helping Arizona move ahead.

Upon motion by Regent Ridenour, second by Regent Careaga, the board accepted the ABOR Annual Report with Regents Ridenour, Shoopman, Manson, Penley, Heiler, Taylor Robson, Careaga voted in favor. None opposed and none abstained.

RESEARCH, INNOVATION AND IMPACT COMMITTEE

Annual Research Report (Item 2)

The board office and the universities provided the board with an annual update to the research metrics and overall research enterprise for FY 2017.

Regent Manson explained that the Annual Research Report was presented in a two-part discussion. The committee reviewed the data and metric dashboards with a focus on FY 2017 metrics and indicators. The vice presidents of research discussed progress to date against the goals, successes and limitations caused by capital capacity infrastructure needs. Regent Manson asked presenters to include information on where the universities are going with research, areas of focus that have been identified, and how proposed metrics will be met.

David Schultz presented that NAU’s strategic plan for research supports the university’s mission to serve the state by generating new knowledge that enriches and develops the next generation of Arizona’s workforce and citizens. NAU’s achievements in research and education have resulted in NAU’s recognition by the Carnegie Institution as a Tier II doctoral university with higher research activity. NAU’s foundational research strengths stem from a tradition of the Arizona land and people and include land management,
environmental sciences, forest restoration and water quality and supply. Foundational strengths also include biological sciences and are focused on bio-defense and human health. In partnership with T-Gen, these areas have developed into NAU’s Pathogen and Microbiome Institute, which has a strong base of support from agencies such as Department of Homeland Security and the Defense Threat Reduction Agency. Through NAU’s new School of Informatics, Computing and Cybersystems, the growing science of informatics is applied to biosciences, ecology and environment and astronomy.

NAU will meet goals by continuing to build on existing, nationally recognized strengths in ecology, forestry and earth sciences, biology, applied linguistics and interdisciplinary health sciences. Investments will be made in emerging areas of excellence including astronomy and planetary science, health equity, material science and bioengineering. NAU will continue to recruit and develop outstanding individual performers in research and scholarly activities. Pathways to sustainable and significant research programs also depend on building groups of faculty members that work together. NAU’s seven major research centers and institutes contribute approximately 45% of the university’s total annual research expenditures.

A key strategic action for NAU to reach its goals is to maintain a robust program of making both strategic hires and regular research active hires that fit into the core areas that can grow national reputation and success. NAU also plans to increase focus and support for emerging programs in engineering by creating the College of Engineering, Informatics and Applied Sciences while refocusing efforts to support the existing strengths in the College of the Environment, Forestry and Natural Sciences. With increased focus on scholarship and research in the College of Health and Human Services, College of Social Behavioral Sciences and the College of Arts and Letters will build on core strengths and nationally recognized programs. All core scholarship and research strengths benefits NAU’s recruiting, retention and graduating students.

Specifically, NAU's integration of research and undergraduate education provides skills for students entering the workforce as engineers, scientists and technical workers as well as provides additional hands-on experience to develop critical thinking, oral and technical communication skills for many others.

NAU continues to focus on its core nationally recognized research strengths to build into allied and synergistic areas such as bioengineering, informatics, health equity and material science progress will be measured in several ways including:

- Ranked 200 or better in the National Science Foundation Survey of Research and Development in Higher Education.
- Increase research expenditures 5% per year.
- Move up in research expenditures among its 15 ABOR designated peers.
- Development and exploitation of intellectual property has increased, which is reflected by the number of invention disclosures and patents, in addition to robust efforts to market and license impactful technologies.
NAU is proud to have met its ABOR 2025 goals for the number of invention disclosures ahead of schedule. NAU will continue to capture, protect and license more intellectual property (IP) and to spread production of IP across a broader range of inventors. Obstacles to achieving NAU's goals is the need for more modern research space, greater research infrastructure, and a greater number of faculty positions available for research-active hire. Sufficient laboratory space is an ongoing challenge at NAU. Peer institutions have significantly larger numbers of research and scholarship active faculty members and larger grant productivity per research active faculty member. NAU will continue to focus on recruiting and retaining great scholars and researchers while developing synergy among faculty members, and to develop greater sponsored project activity through learning opportunities and mentoring of existing members.

Regent Manson asked for clarification regarding research hires in specific areas providing half of the expected increase in research activity funding combined with the 1,400 students participating in identified research activity. Dr. Schultz explained that the 1,400 students are those enrolled in research/lab courses but do not include students employed through grants or research sponsored funding. Graduate students are becoming more involved in research due to their labor force readiness in the next generation of researchers. Regent Manson expressed concerns of hiring research professors who are geared more towards research and less towards teaching. Dr. Schultz explained that there are highly qualified teachers who focus on pedagogy with great experience. This is complemented by the team of faculty that are excellent scholars and researchers. Together they enrich the education of the undergraduates. Dr. Schultz also discussed the trend for increased undergraduate and graduate student participation in research as research activity is increased. Regent Manson inquired about the research focus in Applied Linguistics to which Dr. Schultz stated that NAU is one of the most recognized research programs in Applied Linguistics.

Dr. Kim Ogden reported on UA’s strategic plans. President Robbins is engaging faculty in strategic planning activities and will report on changes in the strategic plan later in the year. Dr. Ogden reported increases in research funding with UA receiving $1 million from the National Science Foundation. The $1 million will be used for fellowships for graduate students to engage them more in research and Masters and Ph.Ds. In the area of Space and Defense, OSIRIS-REx was launched on a seven-year mission. Students bring with them creative and innovative ideas and are being trained on how to apply and build on those ideas. Dr. Ogden gave an example of students who built a telescope to view space junk, satellites, etc. as one example of undergraduate engagement in the area of Space and Defense research. Health Sciences received research funding with the $67 million grant for the Precision Health Program and with the arrival of, Dr. Michael Dake, the new senior vice president for Health Sciences, growth is expected in the medical sciences. Focuses include aging related diseases, understanding the brain and developing wearable health technologies to help measure stress and other brain activities.

Additional investments are being applied to the Energy, Water and Food programs, and developing the integration of energy, water, food, and the environment. Donations were
received to endow the Biosphere and other investments are being made in such research areas as the West Center. The West Center works in partnership with Pima County, Dow Dupont, Pepsico, and municipalities in the area to develop ways to remove contaminants from wastewater and determine the most efficient equipment for a specific water need. Data Science and Cybersecurity incorporates the land-grant mission. High-tech robotics are being used to record data which is then analyzed at the university to improve whatever subject the data represents. Dr. Ogden noted the recent addition of the Center of Academic Excellence in Cyber Operations at the Sierra Vista campus where the development of Cybersecurity certificate programs are underway.

Regent Penley asked about the 2019 research projections. President Robbins noted the greatest opportunity for growth is in the health sciences arena and goals through 2025 are being developed. President Robbins addressed Regent Manson’s question regarding UA’s research faculty needs and anticipated significant growth in research faculty. UA plans to recruit faculty in the health sciences. Additionally, with the consolidation of the physical, digital and biological sciences, there will be a need for faculty in network sciences particularly artificial intelligence and quantum computing. Increasing UA’s expenditures to the goals that are set will require recruitment of more faculty. Dr. Ogden added information regarding the success of the Research Development Services whose task is to provide expert mentoring to grant writers and identify the best team leaders for groups that will go after large million dollar proposals.

Regent Manson inquired about the proportion of research work directly impacting and affecting undergraduate experiences. Dr. Ogden ensured Regent Manson there are many ways to involve students in undergraduate research, using as an example UA’s has an undergraduate biology research program which put students across all types of disciplines directly into the medical school and campus laboratories. The physical sciences have the NASA grant which provides opportunity for undergraduate research. The goal is one-hundred percent engagement and many faculty members support and engage undergraduate students in research.

President Crow and Dr. Sethuraman Panchanathan presented ASU’s research strategic plan. President Crow reminded the board that in 1980, ASU was not a research university. ASU now has more funded research activity than any university in China or Europe. The research enterprise at ASU includes 30,000 individuals including students who work in the enterprise, 2000 funded faculty members, and more than 10,000 individual projects, access to a lab, and access to expert faculty in unusual research environments. ASU’s goal is to have constructed an institution, which remains true to the spirit of an inclusive university with a world-class faculty, who teach more, do more and are paid more than other universities.

Dr. Panchanathan began ASU’s presentation by stating that every undergraduate at ASU is involved in research opportunities. Students are invited to participate in lab research and receive the benefits of research-grade faculty with every lesson. ASU’s process of determining its research focus includes the amount of resources invested in research. This is because Dr. Panchanathan and President Crow meet with individual faculty members in every discipline across the campus recognizing the intellectual capacity they have to do something remarkable and invest in them. Investments are
made in the broad areas of health solutions and sustainability, which encompass food, energy, water and more. Regarding ASU’s Earth and Space Exploration research, ASU won $850 million expedition to an asteroid; this is the scale to which ASU is focused on. ASU is exploring how the fusion of technology and humans can produce remarkable outcomes; how artificial intelligence and learning tutors, and working with industry and start-ups help to build an ecosystem of learning that produces tremendous outcomes.

Dr. Panchanathan presented the research strategic plan through 2025 and described foundational project focus areas of which there were tens of thousands. Starting at each college level where individual faculty members engage within nursing and health innovation and health solutions, within business matters and education, engineering and journalism and mass communication as well as law, sustainability, global management, and societies complex issues. Proposal submissions for the 2017 – 2018 year will be close to $2 billion. ASU has received awards for $400 million. Not only did ASU exceed the board’s goals every year for the last 10 years, but also for FY 2018, ASU will again exceed ABOR’s goals for ASU research. The accumulative excess of ABOR goals, not including FY2018, is $120 million. This is attributed to the exceptional faculty and leaders in the institutions driven by their intellectual spirit. For perspective, ASU’s research expenditures are just under $600 million without a medical school, compared to 2002 when ASU’s research expenditures were at $110 million.

Dr. Panchanathan discussed Solution Project Focus Areas. These are centers where teams across disciplines work to solve problems facing humanity and society.

The outcome of the Solution Project Focus Areas is the Mega Project Focus Areas. ASU’s conceptualization of these projects encompasses $20 million, $50 million, $100 million and $500 million projects. The mega projects involve multiple universities, investigators, disciplines and countries. President Crow explained that ASU will likely lose most of the Mega Projects they try for because they are extremely complicated and when ASU wins one, it is extraordinary. ASU seeks global partners and investors for the work being done. Currently, ASU is a finalist for a project in the $70 million range. ASU is on track for the $815 million goal for 2025 with an annual growth rate for an average of 7%. This growth rate exceeds the original target growth rate of 5% set when the goal was created.

Regarding undergraduate research, ASU has 2071 paid graduates and thousands of unpaid volunteers. Dr. Panchanathan listed some of the formal undergraduate research organizations in addition to less formal research projects. President Crow noted that there are no research projects at ASU that do not involve students. All three of Arizona’s state universities offer undergraduate research opportunities; most foreign universities reserve research programs for graduates. President Crow received information that the New College on the West campus received a $5 million grant to help community college transfer students engage in research activities and enter the research pipeline. Dr. Panchanathan presented information on faculty productivity and how it affects growth. A graph shows in 2010 expenditures per tenure-track faculty was at $184
million, for 2017 this figure was at $296 million. ASU’s research growth strategy includes building up both tenure-track faculty and research faculty.

ASU is intensely focused on acquiring greater numbers of talented faculty. For example, Craig Calhoun, a top ten social scientist in the nation, former director of the London School of Economics, and president of the Social Science Research Council, was recently appointed as a university professor of five different schools at ASU. Hiring such professionals in addition to scientists and engineers goes to the fluidity of the institution, attempting to appoint people who crosscut the institution in many ways.

BUSINESS AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

2019 Annual Budgets for Arizona State University, Northern Arizona University, University of Arizona and the Board’s System Office (Item 3)

The universities and the board office asked the board to approve their FY 2019 Annual Budgets.

President Cheng provided a summary for NAU’s proposed operating budget. NAU’s Operation and Finance Report detailed plans and strategies to achieve the 2025 metrics to improve student success and further the impact NAU has on the northern Arizona region and the state. NAU engaged in a software maintenance contract, and assessment of NAU’s administrative service delivery, leveraging technology to further address document management and workflow, and coordinating purchase payment discounts. NAU worked on several capital projects such as the Science Annex and has initiated new academic programs such as the Data Science and International Education Leadership. President Cheng thanked the board for approving the addition of the new College of Engineering Informatics and Applied Sciences and the tuition and fee proposals for 2019 which will allow NAU to offer its pledge program for the eleventh consecutive year. Incremental funding will be invested in enrollment growth and student success infrastructure, facilities, both new and deferred maintenance projects, technology infrastructure and the personnel recruitment and retention of faculty and staff members. Additionally, NAU will dedicate funds to its research enterprise and the recruitment of targeted hires in strategic areas.

Regent Penley complimented President Cheng on NAU’s personnel goals and merit-based increases and asked how the resident student funding model would affect the capacity of NAU. President Cheng emphasized student-to-faculty ratios, and the quality of NAU’s faculty as being key to student success. The resident student funding model would provide both for NAU’s students. Additionally, the support systems around the Native American and first generation students are not possible without state funding for staff and financial aid. NAU has struggled for several years to reallocate funds and to be as efficient as possible, but at some point the marginal benefits from those efforts will diminish and programs will be cut in order to provide those services. Regent Manson elaborated on NAU’s unique position in that 70% of NAU’s graduates last year were in-
state students. NAU is more heavily dependent on the state funding formula than the two other state universities who have a much larger international student population.

Regent Shoopman commented that the 50/50 resident student funding model has not made progress with Arizona’s state government. The funding deficiency impacts what the universities can do for the state both in the work that the universities do for the Arizona economy and for the students. All three university presidents are to be commended for the tremendous achievements they have made to keep great quality education while growing the programs effectively as much as possible. This issue will continue to be pursued at the board level.

UA’s FY 2019 budget utilizes a combination of incremental new revenues and strategic reallocations that total approximately $19 million. Revenues can be broken down into state general funds of about $8.6 million and the net tuition and fees revenues of $6.7 million after the 2% increase previously approved by the board. The revenue generated by the tuition and fees increase will complete the current renovation of Building 90. In the coming years, $10 million will be used from the capital infrastructure deferred maintenance funds. $10 million will be designated for financial aid to help meet recruitment and enrollment goals. $5.6 million designated for faculty, staff and graduate assistant merit adjustments. Even with that increase, UA is still at the low end of its peer group in terms of compensation of faculty and staff. UA will see an increase in funding for development operations anticipating that the strategic plan will lead to a roadmap for a large fundraising campaign. Regarding audits, the UA has invested $3 million in critical IT infrastructure and security. Over $1 million will be invested in student services, specifically in student mental health counseling. Students specifically requested more help in this area and the number of full-time employees will be doubled to better serve students’ mental health needs. This budget will add approximately $36 million to the universities net position resulting in over 180 days of cash-on-hand. The strategic plan is in its implementation phase and strategic investments are being made with the hire of Dr. Dake and the hire of Steve Moore, senior vice president for Marketing and Communication. Searches for additional key leader positions are underway to help move the university forward.

President Crow contextualized the overall financial structure of ASU and explained why he is concerned about the state no longer significantly funding the universities. The perception may be that the more successful the universities are financially, somehow the state does not need to invest as much. While this may be true to a limit, that limit was long ago exceeded.

ASU’s revenue in 2019 will be about $3 billion gross revenue. There is additional revenue of about $400 million from Enterprise Partners and affiliates making ASU a $3.4 billion a year entity. When Dr. Crow took office, ASU was generating $125 million in tuition revenue per year. ASU’s 2018 tuition revenue generation is $1.8 billion; research revenue was $110 million and is now is approaching $600 million. ASU is in the middle of a campaign that may raise as much is $2 billion if it continues its trajectory. While this is a lot of money, gifts, research grants and donations are always
restricted to a project or to a scholarship for specific use, not to be used for general tuition purposes. ASU’s net loss for educating Arizona’s in-state students is now more than $200 million per year. Over five years, that equates to a $1 billion loss which creates a loss in other resources to make up for other sources of revenue. President Crow stated that the university enterprise must find a way to get the state government to commit to the 5/50 funding model. Higher education has fewer dollars from the state today than when this administration came to office due to multiple taxes being placed on Arizona’s public institutions by the state. ASU’s budget plan is to generate as much revenue as possible while keeping costs contained as much as possible. There are two investments ASU asks from the state; one, invest in the students coming to the university from Arizona, and two, give the universities an investment equivalent to one mile of freeway expenditures. This is the message that needs to be communicated to the state.

John Arnold presented the board office budget of $13.3 million, $6.5 million toward the operating budget and the balance to support programs run through ABOR. The FY 2019 budget is approximately the same as the FY 2018 budget. ABOR’s operating budget equals 0.12% of the system operating budget and remains very efficient.

Regent Shoopman commented that the efficiency of the university enterprise is something to be proud of. The fact that the enterprise can do all that it does is made possible by having three great leaders at each of the universities and a board office that understands the board’s role, not only the fiduciary responsibility, but also to support the universities’ success.

Upon motion by Regent Shoopman; second by Regent Careaga, the board approved the FY 2019 annual budgets for Arizona State University, Northern Arizona University, the University of Arizona, and the ABOR office with Regents Ridenour, Shoopman, Penley, Heiler, Manson, Taylor Robson and Careaga voting in favor. None opposed and none abstained.

**Arizona State University Apartment Master Lease(s); Multiple Properties, Downtown Phoenix, Arizona (ASU) (Item 4)**

Arizona State University asked the board to approve authorization of all actions necessary to enter into one or more master leases for apartments in downtown Phoenix.

Morgan Olsen explained that ASU was in the process of moving the Thunderbird School for Global Management from Glendale to downtown Phoenix. While ASU’s undergraduate programs will remain at the West campus, the remainder of operations will move to downtown Phoenix. It is important that students have appropriate housing where they can learn from each other. Many of the students are coming from other countries and a large part of the Thunderbird experience is to learn other cultures, religions, history, and business differences. Currently, there are one hundred fifty beds at the Thunderbird Glendale campus. Several locations in the downtown area were
identified as places where students can live and study together. It is anticipated that there will be an increase in student housing inventory on the downtown Phoenix campus, but by August 1, 2018 ASU must have a place for new students to land in downtown Phoenix. The annual cap on this housing expenditure is $2 million for approximately four years until additional housing is needed. The delivery will be a public/private partnership and ASU's second student housing complex at the downtown Phoenix campus.

Upon motion by Regent Shoopman; second by Regent Careaga, the board approved Arizona State University's request to enter into master leases for apartments in downtown Phoenix as presented in the executive summary with Regents Ridenour, Shoopman, Penley, Heiler, Manson, Taylor Robson and Careaga voting in favor. None opposed and none abstained.

UNIVERSITY PROPERTY OVERSIGHT SUBCOMMITTEE

Report on the University Property Oversight Subcommittee (Item 5)

Regent Taylor Robson provided and update on activities relating to updating property governance policy. The results of previous subcommittee meetings led to the adoption of the subcommittee's charge and work plan. The ABOR office contracted with RCLCO as a real estate consultant to achieve the subcommittee's mission. RCLCO began work related to interviewing stakeholders at the ABOR office as well as universities, research and case studies, collecting university real estate asset information and reviewing the ABOR policies related to real property. The committee anticipates having some preliminary recommendations from the consultant by the end of the month and completion of their work by July 2018. It was anticipated the next subcommittee meeting would include the review of university property development principles and an update from the real estate consultant. The University of Arizona will provide a real estate overview, part of a series of reviewing each university's real estate organization. ASU and the ASU foundation will also provide an overview of their real estate relationship and interaction. The committee will also have a presentation from the Arizona State Land Department. Part of the committee's charge is to look at state land trust assets that are the benefit of the universities. The committee seeks to understand how the board and the universities can work with the State Land Department to help enhance value on those assets and use those assets to work for the universities through disposition and revenue generation or by using those properties directly for the benefit of the universities and their academic mission.

President Crow wanted the board to be aware of the fact that NAU and UA have gained access to and use control of 50,000 acre parcels each of state trust lands for mission-related activities associated with their universities over the past 15 years. At the time, ASU did not have projects that would benefit from a 50,000 acre parcel of state trust lands as it currently does. Therefore, ASU will be requesting at some point its equal share of such land. President Crow reminded the board of the 10 million acre land transfer gifted to the new state of Arizona by the United States Congress. More than
90% of this land remains undeveloped and not monetized. Some Arizona legislators claim one of the reasons this state is not making more economic progress is because the federal government owns too much land in Arizona and legislators are asking for more control of that land. President Crow suggests legislators stop complaining about that until they start utilizing the land the Federal Government already gave Arizona. Regent Taylor Robson added that much of the land is specifically designated to benefit education and the impact would be significant. If the state would do something with the property, the opportunity to generate lease income, disposition income and more importantly, once the property is put into productive use, it will generate tax revenue that goes into the general fund to support Arizona generally. The board has engaged the Arizona State Land Department who welcomed the involvement of the universities and the enterprise’s attempt to increase the value of their land.

RECESS

The board recessed at 4:27 p.m. and reconvened in public session at 9:05 a.m. on Friday, June 15, 2018.

Friday, June 15, 2018

The meeting reconvened at 9:05 a.m. Regent Ridenour excused President Robbins who had a speaking engagement. Regent Taylor Robson participated in Friday’s meeting by phone.

ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Proposed Agenda and Schedule for Quality Discussions (Item 6)

The board was asked to approve the proposed quality topics for FY 2018-2019. Regent Penley reported and highlighted the proposed set of topics, which included the academic program review processes regarding concepts and competencies with the approval process of new programs, value and impact of research professors on the undergraduate experience, and faculty evaluations, retention, and teaching research load.

Upon motion by Regent Manson; second by Regent Careaga, the board approved the proposed quality topics for FY 2018 – 2019 with Regents Ridenour, Shoopman, Penley, Manson, Taylor Robson, Heiler and Careaga voting in favor. None opposed and none abstained.
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

Report on Legislative Affairs and the State Budget (Item 7)

Regent Shoopman reported that the board found itself on the defense during the legislative session and state budget negotiations. National themes largely affected the outcome for Arizona’s higher education institutions. Teachers’ pay, campus and school safety and free speech dominated the legislative session even though these are not issues on Arizona’s campuses. Regarding the budget, the board worked hard to educate the house on the Health Insurance Trust Fund (HITF) issue and needed relief in that area, however little progress was made in changing that legislation. This issue remains a top priority for the board in the future. Arizona’s public universities have dealt with a number of state mandated tuition waivers that are not funded by the state. The board’s legislative team spent time working with legislators to discuss the impact of these unfunded mandates and much effort went into including language in legislation that would create a new waiver that required matching appropriations.

In preparation for the next session, the board and the universities will develop a strategic enterprise communications plan that will help the board better articulate and amplify the benefits of the higher education enterprise, particularly on how vital the universities are to Arizona’s economic success, growth, and the quality of life for Arizona citizens.

John Arnold reviewed the universities’ budgets and change in appropriations for the upcoming fiscal year. The enterprise-wide budget was $7 million and enterprise-wide appropriations of the state general fund was $704 million. A number of changes to the budget included the elimination of one-time funding of $15 million, and an add-back of $8 million of one-time funding for $7 million loss. $27 million was added for capital investment funds appropriated the prior-year. Freedom schools and the Economic Policy Institute received $2.5 million. ASU received an appropriation of $250,000 for economic development in Mexico. Other adjustments netted out to be a loss of $2.2 million. At the time of Mr. Arnold’s reporting, the legislature had yet to publish the final budget but the estimate stood at $725 million. President Crow inquired whether the freedom school appropriation was a one-time funding or an addition to the base. It was confirmed the appropriation was one-time funding, although the $250,000 economic development money was permanent. While there was net increase of $20.7 million, $27 million was for capital funding which left the operating net increase at a loss of $6.3 million. Additionally, Mr. Arnold explained that the year prior the state charged the universities a $22.2 million tax/surcharge on the universities participation in the health insurance plan. The legislature reduced that tax/surcharge to $9 million.

President Crow pointed out the universities were launching new facilities as part of the research infrastructure funding with the HITF tax equal to that amount of money in ASU’s case. ASU is advancing on major capital projects for which the state’s share of the investment has been eliminated. Mr. Arnold added that the HIDEF surcharges are split almost equally between UA and ASU, with NAU protected from the surcharge.
Over the last two years, UA and ASU were required to pay about $15 million each; in excess of the premiums the universities already paid for health insurance. Mr. Arnold explained there are several reasons the universities are forced to pay the surcharge, with the main reason being legislators transferring $280 million out of HITF into the general fund over the last several years. President Crow stated that the state is essentially taxing students’ tuition to pay for state government operations. In addition to the surcharge, the cost of health care for university employees is less than the premiums the universities are paying. The money swept into general fund profits that the HITF made over many years was largely funded by the universities being overcharged on the premium side. Despite efforts over the last couple of years to communicate this problem to the legislators, there has been no change in the situation. Contracts are due January 1, 2021, with the current contract extending to the end of 2020. This is the window in which the enterprise and universities would have to exit the system or seek reform for the system. President Crow asked board staff and counsel to look into how the state, without legislative or other action, can tax institutions or reach into their fund balances without some kind of specific action. Last year, the universities were unaware of the surcharge until after the legislative session was over.

Regent Shoopman commented on the lack of cooperation from the legislature in terms of the 50/50 funding model. In fiscal 2018, funding was 34.7% of the cost per student. In FY 2019, funding will drop to approximately 34% based on projected fall enrollment. The board had previously requested 39% funding for in-state students, which was the first step to the four-year phase of the 50/50 funding model.

Mr. Arnold continued with the statutorily mandated Cost Containment Report. Elements of the report included:

- Historical data on tuition, mandatory fee levels, housing and meal plans. Several past fiscal years are required to be included in the report as comparison.
- Employee FTEs and salaries are to be broken down by faculty, classified staff and administrators. Currently, university staff are not classified in these categories and some adjustments will be made to cover all employees and meet requirements. President Crow commented that ASU employs faculty, staff, and executives and does not use the term "administrator."
- Actions taken to contain costs and associated savings.
- Allocation of faculty and resources between instruction and research.
- Increased credit hour requirements for the top 10 programs since 2004. The legislature want the universities to review credit requirements to graduate for the 2004 incoming freshmen and compare the credit requirements to graduate for incoming freshmen in 2018, and list of the 10 programs that have recorded changes in credit requirements. Legislators ultimately want to see if the universities are making it more difficult to graduate. President Crow asked that this report include not only numeric data but also content that includes data that shows how students can graduate earlier with speedier processes, and enhanced graduation rates.
Regent Penley spoke about former Regent Andrew Horowitz and the policy he altered over two decades ago regarding a substantial reduction in credit hours in all degrees. President Crow added a point of historical importance. Years ago, the state was funding the universities on an enrollment growth model of 22 to 1, one faculty line for every 22 additional full-time students. There were elaborate mechanisms to fund that over a 40-year period. The legislature ended up funding it consistently over that forty-year period to a total of about 40% of the formula which created base level of funding problems in the institutions. There was legislation passed by the legislature saying that they would give no support to any student attending the universities above a certain number of credit hours. That knocked off the ability of the state to support people studying engineering and science and picking up languages at the same time or students with double and triple majors.

Regent Shoopman agreed that responses should include a history and explanation of courses needed to graduate and proposed a more efficient means of educating and communicating to the legislature and the governor's office as well as associated agencies on what the universities do.

- Nontraditional lower cost degree pathways. Universities currently work to catalog and describe those pathways to show the legislature there are a number of ways resident students can earn a degree at a lower cost path.

A report draft is expected by the end of July. The EEC will review and it will be brought before the board in late August for a vote.

Brittney Kaufmann presented a report on legislative updates including:

- Foster Care Tuition Waiver – the universities made the program mirror the pilot program. The original bill increased the fiscal impact. No appropriations were given to support the program.
- Non-lethal Weapons – the bill was introduced several times, and while the bill's sponsor was aggressive, the bill did not pass the Senate. President Crow commented that the policy on this issue can be improved dramatically to accommodate many of the bill authors' concerns and student options relative to their safety. Ms. Kaufmann explained that the bill was defeated by convincing the committee that the faculty, student life, campus police, and presidents know what's best for their campuses. Each university president along with the chief of police are to determine what is best and appropriate for the personal protection on the individual campuses. Each university will post the updated information on what is allowable for personal protection on their websites before the start of the fall semester.
- HB 2280 - University Leaseback Financing – while the bill did not pass, the question and the desire to look into this issue still remains.

Regent Shoopman conveyed the board's appreciation for Governor Ducey and members of the legislature who supported the board on several issues and defended what is best for the universities. There are many good people working at the legislature
who spend a great deal of time working with the universities and the board to better understand what the universities do.

**Establishment of a Free Expression Committee and Review of a Proposed Free Expression Policy (First Reading) (Item 8)**

The board was asked to establish the Free Expression Committee and review a proposed Free Expression policy on first reading.

Nancy Tribbensee reported that Arizona’s public universities have long protected speech on campus and are often in a position of explaining to students, families and occasionally legislators the importance of allowing even controversial speech on campus when that speech is protected by the First Amendment. The Arizona legislature enacted some additional state law requirements relating to free speech, and while much of the law reflects current federal law, there are some additional requirements imposed on the board, including the adoption of a policy on free expression and the establishment of a free expression committee.

The proposed committee will have approximately 16 members and will be chaired by a member of the ABOR office. Each University president will appoint additional members. By statute, ABOR is required to submit a report each year on September 1, with the first report will reflecting work done to create the committee and board review and adoption of the policy. President Crow asked that efforts be made to educate legislators as the majority of requests to constrain speech on ASU’s campus come from legislators.

Upon motion by Regent Shoopman, second by Regent Careaga, the board approved the establishment of a Free Expression Committee and reviewed on first reading a proposed Free Expression policy with Regents Shoopman, Ridenour, Penley, Manson, Heiler, Taylor Robson and Careaga voting in favor. None opposed and none abstained.

**GRADUATE EARNING POWER**

**Graduate Earning Power Presentation - 2018 Graduate Earning Power by Undergraduate Major Field (Item 9)**

The board received a presentation on graduate earning power by undergraduate degree major. Chad Sampson acknowledged the work of Ryan Tucker and Dan Anderson, as well as the universities’ institutional research offices for their work in compiling new data. He also thanked Provost Searle, Christy Farley, and Bjorn Flugstof who worked on this particular presentation to make sure nothing was overstated.

Mr. Sampson gave background on the purpose of the presentation, which combines information found in both the Wages of Graduates Report as well as the Financial Aid Report. The wages information was combined with the student loan debt level information to find out how graduates from Arizona’s public institutions were faring, what their return on investment was and the value of a degree. The report measures the
2012 graduating class, graduates that reside and work full time in Arizona. The report shows the 2012 graduating class’ total debt at graduation and the wages data that they have from working full-time in Arizona. The data is not measured on average, but measures by major or Classification of Instructional Program (CIP) Code. Mr. Sampson commented that approximately 40% of Arizona’s public university students graduate without debt. The presentation focused on the 60% of students who graduate with debt, with the most efficient way to present the data through lists by CIP Code. CIP codes are attached to the names of college majors but are not specific. For example, CIP code 14 indicates an Engineering major and includes all engineering programs. Another example would be the Hospitality and Tourism program which will not have its own code, but will be coded with the Business Management, Marketing, and Related Support Services major.

Mr. Sampson referred to PowerPoint slides for the remainder of his presentation. See document book to reference Item 9 - Graduate Earning PowerPoint. The following slides were discussed:

- **Number of Degrees Awarded, 2012** – this graph lists majors by CIP code and the number of graduates for that major.
- **Monthly Salary by Educational Attainment** - this graph shows people living in Arizona with a bachelor’s degree from an Arizona public institution, who are 25 years or older with a monthly take-home salary of $4,207. Arizonans with some college or an Associates Degree take-home $2,854 monthly and those with a high school diploma at approximately $2,309 a month. The formula to find the net monthly income was to subtract the monthly student loan payment from the monthly salary.
- **Monthly Debt Payment to Income for ASU, NAU and UA** – this chart reflects the median monthly wages and the median monthly debt payment of graduates from the three Arizona public institutions. Mr. Sampson noted that there is not a lot of variance between the debt obtained by those individuals obtaining an Engineering degree and those obtaining a Communications Technology degree. The reason for that for that is that because while there may be differences in programmatic or course fees, all undergraduates pay the same intuition.
- **Net Monthly Income by Institution** - this graph represents the net monthly income after the college debt payment of each institution’s graduates five years post-graduation. The benchmark used was the Arizona median salary for high school diploma recipients compared to college graduates, and highlights the return on investment of earning a college degree. President Crow noted that the largest payoff for college education was not realized until between the ages 40 and 80 because wages do not increase for high school graduation attainment but they do increase significantly for people between the ages of 40 and 80 with a college degree. He also noted that five years out many ASU graduates are attaining a Master’s degree. President Cheng noted there are people from out-of-state who choose to come to Arizona institutions and pay a higher price for tuition to get a quality education. These people may or may not choose to stay in Arizona. There are also varying levels of economic position for families and financial aid capabilities between the universities making it difficult to compare the
universities. Mr. Sampson agreed to present a larger picture of the comparisons between high school educational attainment and the attainment of a bachelors and/or Masters and doctorate degree attainment and the net income comparisons. The purpose of this information is to show that all majors at the Arizona public universities have a return on investment. Regent Heiler requested the data be aggregated for Arizona Students.

President Crow commented that ASU’s Office of the University Economist has performed several studies on return of investment for ASU graduates by degree over their lifetime. The average was a 12% return, with the range between 7% and 23% over their lifetime. ASU is also undergoing a pilot program in which it will have access to all ASU graduates across the nation using IRS data and collaborating with the National Economic Research Board. President Crow suggested using this data as a way to prove the notion of the value of a bachelor’s degree as well as a Masters or professional degree. President Crow asked board staff and board members to pull resources together to communicate the true value of a college degree. He additionally stated the value in any study made public by going through a review process similar to how an academic paper goes through a review process to avoid scrutiny.

Mr. Sampson further explained further that the annual Wages of Graduates Report consistently shows that on an economic level, the amount of money a graduate takes home reflects how a great investment. This report shows what degrees provide the highest wages while paying the same price for tuition. Teams at the universities vetted much of the data to ensure the data was accurate.

President Crow also suggested using the report to determine other kinds of outcomes. Referring to people with college degrees who make bad choices and have negative outcomes which equals about 2% of the population versus people with less than a college degree and their life choices that result in negative outcomes on a much grander scale.

Regent Ridenour spoke about the debt crisis being a matter of completion in that it is prevalent in students who do not graduate. It is clear, students who graduate with debt and within five years of graduation are engaged in their career with a full-time job are not in crisis.

John Arnold commented on legislature’s common practice of using anecdotes to trump data and suggested that data be summarized to create clear talking points to use with lawmakers. Mr. Arnold expressed gratitude for President Crow’s offer to bring the ABOR office into the academic rigor and to elevate the types of system-wide reports and conclusions that will advance the story. Regent Manson further suggested the board have its own anecdotes to help reflect data and counter the anecdotes the legislature focuses on.
The final slide represented Arizona’s student loan default rates by institution. Arizona has a higher default rate than the national average; however, individuals from Arizona’s public universities have the lowest default rates in the state.

Regent Heiler complemented Mr. Sampson and Ryan Tucker for the analytical work that is desperately needed. The value of an education is not purely economic, but also enriches human life and all kinds of ways that has nothing to do with money. When educating the next generation, it is important to remember that not only is knowledge being instilled, but also human beings are being formed and attributes are being instilled.

Regent Penley spoke on civic engagement and participation in the election process. Arizona, compared to most states in the country, has a relatively low participation rate in voting and civic engagement. The extent to which we raise the number of college educated individuals or technical degree and certificate recipients, the probability that there will be more engaged citizens. Regent Penley talked about the plaques that hang at NAU.

REGENTS EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Proposed Policy on Presidential Housing (First Reading) (Item 10)

The board was asked to review on first reading a proposed policy on presidential houses owned by a university or its foundation.

Nancy Tribbensee commented on the board’s prior approval of UA’s purchase of a presidential residence. The proposed policy on presidential residences and was brought to the board to memorialize oversight. The policy creates the expectation that if the university chooses to purchase a presidential house, the president must live in it and that a president living in provided housing is not eligible for the housing allowance specified in the president’s contract.

Amendment to Multiple-year Employment Contract for Head Baseball Coach (UA) (Item 36)

The University of Arizona asked the board to authorize revisions to the five-year contract for Head Baseball Coach Jay Johnson.

Dave Heeke and Heather Gaines presented a request for an extension of the contract of Jay Johnson as head baseball coach of the University of Arizona. The revisions included an increase of $10,000 to Coach Johnson’s base salary, effective July 1 of each year, as well as an additional 10,000 units of the donor funded longevity fund. The terms of vesting have been revised such that he will be entitled to the vested number of shares in that fund should his employment terminate for any reason between now and July 1, 2023. Regent Manson raised concerns over the academic incentives and academic goals of baseball athletes that have not achieved and asked if a plan is in
place to improve the academic status of the baseball team. Mr. Heeke reported that there is a plan to continue to move the academic performance higher.

Upon motion by Regent Ridenour; seconded by Regent Careaga, the board approved amendments to the multi-year employment contract for Head Baseball Coach for the University of Arizona with Regents Ridenour, Shoopman, Penley, Heller, Manson, Taylor Robson and Careaga voting in favor. None opposed and none abstained.

REPORT FROM THE ARIZONA FACULTIES COUNCIL

Dr. Benning Tieke of the Northern Arizona University presented the Arizona Faculties Council (AFC) report on behalf of Dr. Lynn Nadel, and reported on the following:

- The AFC expressed gratitude to the board for its efforts in drafting the new Academic Freedom policy. The Regents' commitment to the faculties' right to teach from their disciplines and their abilities to create and disseminate knowledge are crucial to the well-functioning of the universities.
- The AFC thanked the board for their ongoing commitment to support educational opportunities for DACA students. The Maricopa Community College case has settled the legal in-state student issue for now, this does not represent the combined effort to educate all those who reside in Arizona, including DACA students, through a variety of financial strategies. The AFC supports an integrated effort across all levels of education from preschool to doctoral studies.
- Recent state pay rate increases for teachers puts the average K-12 teacher’s salary higher than the average salary of non-tenure faculty members at the universities. Combined with the data highlighting the increasing rate of faculty turnover at the institutions, faculty encouraged the board to continue to advocate for all educators in Arizona.
- At the heart of every decision regarding education in Arizona is student learning, which may become problematic in an environment where student health and security may become an issue. Student health and security is an issue that needs to be addressed in the coming years. Many students deal with issues of food insecurity, which includes the availability of a balanced diet of nutrient dense foods. Efforts are underway at all three campuses to tackle the issue of food insecurity including the Campus Pantry at the University of Arizona, the Pitch Fork Pantry at Arizona State University and Louie’s cupboard at Northern Arizona University. The AFC invited the board to join the food insecurity movement begun by students on our campuses by working with the faculty senates, the student senates and the dining services companies at the three institutions to close the loop on food waste and food insecurity.

STUDENT REGENT REPORT

Regent Careaga and Regent DeGravina provided their student regent report to the board.
Regent DeGravina reported on the confirmation hearing for incoming student regent Lauren L’Ecuyer, in addition to a tour the student regents received of the Phoenix Biomedical Campus from the NAU perspective. The regents learned more about the facilities, the collaboration between the universities, and the goals that NAU has as well as their accomplishments. The student regents look forward to touring the ASU and UA areas of the biomedical campus in future months.

Regent Careaga attended the inaugural International Sports Diplomacy and Leadership Conference, which brought together some of the brightest minds in athletics, academics and international education to the University of Arizona campus. This conference served to display diverse and inclusive best practices, goals, and opportunities using sports as a universal language in providing global leadership.

Both Regent Careaga and Regent DeGravina gave opening remarks and participated in university commencement activities with a special note of Regent Careaga graduating with a Bachelor of Arts degree in political science from the University of Arizona.

Regent Careaga attended the reception for Dr. Michael Dake as UA’s new Senior Vice President for Health Sciences. Both Regents celebrated the achievements of former Arizona Board of Regents President Eileen Klein at the Arizona Chamber of Commerce and Industry Awards luncheon. While President Klein was grateful to be acknowledged for her accomplishments in the service to the State of Arizona, she felt the day was a victory for the universities because the business community recognized the great benefits the universities provide for the State of Arizona.

Regent Careaga gave an update of the Office of the Student Regents. This is the 40th year student regents have served on the Arizona Board of Regents and the 18th year of having voting rights on the board. One of Regent Careaga’s initiatives was to compile a handbook to assist future student regents as they begin their service.

Regent Ridenour remarked that the student regents are the connection to the board’s most important constituency at the various universities and their service to presenting students views and concerns. The board and the presidents expressed gratitude to Regent Careaga on his willingness to serve so well. Regent Careaga planned to continue his education at the Sandra Day O’Connor college of law for his Masters in legal studies and then onto his juris doctorate.

Regent Careaga thanked those people who made his service on the board possible; namely Governor Ducey for appointing in this capacity as well as his family, fellow regents and the university presidents.

Regent Shoopman remarked on the extensive and positive changes that have been made during Regent Ridenour’s term as board chair and his leadership has helped the board to be more coherent with its leadership transitions. New process are being formed in which the immediate past chair, the incoming chair and the chair elect will serve as the leadership team in the coming year. This new succession process will
reduce changes that often occur when the chair’s position is in transition. Regent Shoopman expressed gratitude for Regent Ridenour’s tireless effort, leadership, and friendship.

INQUIRIES, REQUESTS, REPORTS, AND COMMENTS FROM REGENTS AND MEMBERS OF THE ENTERPRISE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Regent Ridenour thanked President Cheng, her staff and the board office staff for their work in this meeting.

RECESS AND ADJOURNMENT

The board recessed its meeting at 11:28 a.m. and adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

Submitted by:

Katherine Linder
Secretary to the Board
The Arizona Board of Regents held a special meeting at the Arizona Board of Regents office in Phoenix, Arizona on August 23, 2018 at 1:30 p.m.

Present:  Regent Shoopman  
Regent Penley (via phone)  
Regent Ridenour  
Regent Krishna  
Regent Heiler  
Regent Manson (video conference)  
Regent Taylor Robson  
Regent DeGravina  
Regent L’Ecuyer (video conference)  

Absent:  Regent Myers, Superintendent Douglas and Governor Ducey

Also present were John Arnold, Nancy Tribbensee, Jennifer Pollock, Lorenzo Martinez, Chad Sampson, Sarah Harper, Kris Okazaki, Brittany Kaufmann, Gale Tebeau, Jan Oestreich, Julie Newberg, Lia Foy, Tom Merriam, Kate Linder and Suzanne Templin from the board office. President Cheng (video conference), Christy Farley, Bjorn Flugstad (video conference), Katy Yanez from Northern Arizona University; Dr. Robbins (via phone), Jon Dudas, Jeff Goldberg, Gregg Goldman, Art Lee, and Sabrina Vasquez from the University of Arizona; and President Crow, Christine Wilkinson, José Cárdenas, Mark Searle, Morgan Olson, Sethuraman Panchanathan, Lisa Frace, Maria Anguiano and Courtney Coolidge from Arizona State University.

Regent Shoopman called the meeting to order at 1:32 p.m. and announced moving forward the board will have a regular scheduled August meeting to approve statutorily required reports.

**FY 2020 State Budget Requests (Item 1)**

The board was asked to approve the Arizona State University, Northern Arizona University, University of Arizona, and ABOR office FY 2020 state budget requests for submittal to the Governor and Legislature. Lorenzo Martinez indicated that the EEC prioritized the FY2020 budget requests identifying two main priorities. The first priority is the funding of the 50% resident student funding model over a 3 year phase-in to meet the 2022 target. The calculation for resident students is a little over 102,000 students, and would require $262 million over that three-year period, $87.6 million per year. Maintaining the growth funded at 34% would equate to $15.1 million. Another component of the FY2020 state budget request is requesting a refund of $10.5 million that was charged to the universities in FY2019 for the short fall in the Health Insurance Trust Fund.

Dr. Crow stated that for the first time in 5 decades, there is not a funding model for the universities. The regents, universities and governor have a historical deal that has not
been implemented, which is the 50% funding model. During the past 3 budgets, the universities have had money taken away, and then only 1-year commitments for the past 2 years. It is essential that the university enterprise resolve the “no funding model” problem.

Regent Shoopman commented that the board takes very seriously the importance of the university enterprise and the effort to work with our legislative partners to fund education. It is imperative for the future of the state -- not only the quality of life, but the economy of the state.

Regent Taylor-Robson asked for clarification on the 3-year phase-in request in the funding model for new student growth to maintain current per student funding levels consistent with funding formulas for K-12, AHCCCS and DES. Lorenzo Martinez responded that K-12, AHCCCS and DES have formulas for those populations in state statute. University formulas have never been in statute, and the legislature tends to view statutory requirements at a higher priority than those not in statute.

Regent Taylor-Robson asked if there is a formula in statute for AZ Financial Aid Trust or building renewal. Lorenzo Martinez responded there is a statutory requirement for the legislature capital committee to adopt a formula for building renewal that gets submitted with the capital plans. Since 2001, there has only been 1 appropriation of $3 million out of $100 million requirement at that time. Building renewal has been calculated and highlighted every year which is approximately $160 million annually. Cumulatively we are beyond a billion dollars since the life of the formula. The AZ Financial Aid Trust is similar but had a 2:1 match when the budget was passed. The legislative approach has been to say, “not withstanding what the statute says,” they are not going to fund the match.

Regents discussed the need to identify the university enterprise’s position for Regents, universities and lobbyists to communicate.

President Robbins and Cheng support the ongoing efforts and advocates for implementing the 50% funding model request.

A motion was made by Regent Shoopman, seconded by Regent Krishna to approve the Arizona State University, Northern Arizona University, University of Arizona, and ABOR office FY 2020 state budget requests for submittal to the Governor and Legislature by September 4, 2018. Regents Shoopman, Penley, Ridenour, Krishna, Heiler, Manson, Taylor Robson and DeGravina voted “Aye”, none opposed, none abstained. The motion carried.

**2018 TRIF Report (Item 2)**
The board office and the universities ask the board to approve the FY 2018 Technology and Research Initiative Fund (TRIF) Annual Report for submission to the Governor and the Legislature.

Chad Sampson said that Arizona’s public universities are required to submit a report on their expenditure of Technology and Research Initiative Fund (TRIF) moneys. This past year, Arizona’s public universities received over $77 million in TRIF investment from Prop 301 sales tax. This year, TRIF revenues yielded a return on investment of over $457 million; $1.7 million over budget projections. The report tracks expenditures and return on
investment in outside research grants and gifts, technology transfer activity and workforce contributions. Every year the regents approve a Research Innovation Fund, which is a small amount of TRIF funds that is set aside for universities to work together on various research projects. One of the projects the regents funded is the research on the 1-10 corridor to understand dust storms and traffic logs in order to improve traffic flow and to improve weather warnings in anticipation of dust storms. TRIF funds not only bring in outside resources but help better the state.

Regent Shoopman noted that TRIF was voter protected for 20 years, last year the legislature chose to reinvest in Prop 301 monies, but it is no longer voter protected. There is now a lot of activity and discussion pro and con about TRIF funding portion and the possibility of legislative action to redirect funds. Executive Director Arnold commented that the TRIF funds are protected until 2021. The legislature can begin reallocating funds this year. There is a strong need to speak about the benefits that TRIF funds bring to the state.

A motion was made by Regent Shoopman, seconded by Regent Krishna to approve the FY 2018 Technology and Research Initiative Fund (TRIF) Annual Report for submission to the Governor and the Legislature. Regents Shoopman, Penley, Ridenour, Krishna, Heiler, Manson, Taylor Robson and DeGravina voted “Aye”, none opposed, none abstained. The motion carried.

Cost Containment Report (Item 3)
The board office asks the board to review and approve the cost containment report. The statutory report is due to the Governor, President of the Senate, Speaker of the House, and the Joint Legislative Budget Committee by September 1, 2018.

Kris Okazaki presented the 6 required elements in the Cost Containment report.

1. Historical data on tuition and mandatory fee levels and average on-campus and housing and meal plan fees 1999, 2004, 2009, 2014 and 2018 fiscal years. Tuition and mandatory fees showed for NAU and UA are the rates for the new students entering in that year.
2. The number of FTEs and total salaries of university employees differentiated between faculty, classified staff and administrators for the same fiscal years as the tuition and mandatory fees piece. Statute requires three categories: faculty, classified staff and administrators, an additional category “other staff” was added to account for all FTEs.
3. Action taken by each university to contain costs at the universities and savings associated with those actions. Each school provided a narrative about what has been done to contain costs including layoffs, holding positions vacant, contract renegotiations, debt refinancing and other organizational changes.
4. The allocation of faculty resources at each university based on the time needed to instruct students and to conduct other research activities. ASU and UA both reported 40% for teaching, 40% for research and 20% for other activities. NAU reported 50% for teaching, 30% for research and 20% for other activities.
5. The number of credit hours required for baccalaureate degrees for the previous academic year and the 2003-2004 academic year for the ten degree programs that had the largest increase in credit hours required for a degree. ABOR policy
requires any proposed program more than 120 credits be brought before the board in the academic strategic plan.
6. Detailed information on nontraditional or lower-cost degree options that each university currently offers, that are recently developed or pursuing.

Regent Taylor Robson asked how many students have access to the community college pathways for lower degree cost options. Dr. Crow responded that ASU will have 17,000 transfer students this year from the community colleges including online and on campus. The majority of students are from Arizona. Through the pathways program ASU has been able to expand capacity. There is a low demand for low-cost degrees. ASU continues to seek more low-cost degree options.

Regent Penley commented that low-cost degree options have been a topic of discussion with the presidents. Low-cost degree options cannot be for every degree program, although the university system needs to look for high demand degree programs that can be delivered at a lower expense.

Regent Manson expressed concern on UA staffing and asked that the university be prepared to provide an explanation of the difference in comparison to NAU and ASU. Gregg Goldman responded that he will forward the data behind those specific numbers.

Christy Farley commented that NAU has gone through an extensive process to identify what is offered on the community college campuses and what is needed in the workforce as well as reviewing programs where the demand is low and the pipeline has dried. They are in the process of identifying programs to no longer offer and transition out and replace with new programs and expand others. NAU is further working with the community colleges related to joint marketing and co-branding.

Regent Heiler commented that people don’t want low-cost degrees, they want low-cost tuition. Low cost tuition is a function of state support. Tuition costs bought down by state support have no impact on the perceived value of the credential. Degrees held out as low-cost are unattractive to the market place because they carry the inference that they are also low-value. Regent Heiler proposes that they eliminate the use of the term “low-cost degree” or “low-cost option.” There is a need for great diverse, accessible degree options all of high value, for students. Some degree programs may cost less, the universities merely has to deliver as efficiently as possible. Regent Heiler suggests that efficiency levels be added to the reports.

Regent Shoopman agreed with Regent Heiler’s comments and the board should look at high-value multiple pathways language rather than low cost.

A motion was made by Regent Shoopman, seconded by Regent Krishna to approve the FY2018 Cost Containment report as mandated pursuant to A.R.S. §15-1650.03(A). Regents Shoopman, Penley, Ridenour, Krishna, Heiler, Manson, Taylor Robson and DeGravina voted “Aye”, none opposed, none abstained. The motion carried.

Approval of the Report of the Free Expression Committee (Item 4)
The board office asks the board to approve the report prepared by the Free Expression Committee.
John Arnold provided an overview of the establishment of the Free Expression Committee and the requirement of an annual report due September 1, 2018. The committee has met twice, and is made up of 5 representatives from each university with a mix of students, general counsel, faculty and administrators. The report is required to describe any barriers to free expression and administrative approach to eliminate such barriers. It includes an assessment, criticisms, commendations or recommendations, an accounting of student fees and an accounting of student fees that support free expression; an outline of the board’s and universities’ policies on speech and declares that we do not tolerate barriers to or disruptions of protected speech. All three universities reported no barriers to or disruptions of protected speech over this last year. The report outlines free expression activities that are anticipated in the upcoming year and notes the work Regent Taylor Robson has done on the Regents’ Cup. ASU is in the process of adopting the core principals of the Chicago Statement. NAU is planning a 2-day seminar for faculty regarding free expression and UA is planning a number of workshops and panels related to free speech. In the section for the student activities fees, it is noted that the universities’ accounting systems were not structured to capture student fee expenditures, but will be implemented for next year.

President Crow shared that ASU has since approved the core principles of the Chicago Statement. Executive Director Arnold noted the report will be updated prior to submission.

Nancy Tribbensee thanked all the individuals at the universities who helped with the report. Nancy asked for the board’s permission to include additional resources that the universities might identify prior to submitting the report.

Regent Shoopman commented that the report provides an opportunity for the university enterprise to identify that the universities have been a leader nationally in maintaining a climate where people can truly have free expression.

Regent Taylor Robson commented that this report provides the opportunity to distinguish ourselves and she looks forward to showcasing Arizona’s leadership in this realm.

A motion was made by Regent Shoopman, seconded by Regent Krishna to approve the report prepared by the Free Expression Committee allowing for ongoing amendments by counsel as they become available. Regents Shoopman, Penley, Ridenour, Krishna, Heiler, Manson, Taylor Robson and DeGravina voted “Aye”, none opposed, none abstained. The motion carried.

**Proposed ABOR Policy 1-124 “Free Expression” (Second Reading) (Item 5)**

The board office asks the board to approve proposed ABOR Policy 1-124 “Free Expression.”

Nancy said that Policy 1-124 Free Expression tracks the statutory requirements, but the subsections on disciplinary procedures will be addressed in those board policies as described in the next item, for ease of reference. The proposed policy tracks the speech-related requirements of the statute and references the establishment of the Free Expression Committee.
Regent Penley is pleased with the effort made and complimented President Crow on adopting a modified statement similar to the University of Chicago’s. He asked the board to return to this issue to seek additional input from Presidents Cheng and Robbins on their progress on adopting similar statements. President Robbins commented that UA is working on obtaining a green Fire rating and anticipate moving forward with a statement soon. Christy Farley commented that NAU is waiting for the Fire’s rating to be reevaluated to update NAU’s rating and Dr. Cheng will report on NAU’s progress on adopting a statement similar to the Chicago principles.

A motion was made by Regent Shoopman, seconded by Regent Krishna to approve proposed ABOR Policy 1-124 “Free Expression.” Regents Shoopman, Penley, Ridenour, Krishna, Heiler, Manson, Taylor Robson and DeGravina voted “Aye”, none opposed, none abstained. The motion carried.

Proposed Revisions to ABOR Policies 5-308 “Student Code of Conduct,” 5-401 “Student Disciplinary Procedures” and 5-404 “Student Disciplinary Files and Records” (First Reading and Immediate Implementation) (Item 6)

The board office asks the board to review for first reading and immediate implementation proposed revisions to ABOR Policies 5-308 “Student Code of Conduct,” 5-401 “Student Disciplinary Procedures” and 5-404 “Student Disciplinary Files and Records” to clarify language to distinguish between educational interventions, disciplinary sanctions, and other administrative actions, as well as to define the term “Disciplinary Proceeding” for purposes of implementing A.R.S. § 15-1866(A)(5).

Nancy Tribbensee presented that the policy revisions align the board policies with the disciplinary procedures requirements in statute. The statute includes references to disciplinary proceedings, these changes to policy help to clarify our policies and separate what are educational interventions from disciplinary sanctions. These policies may be brought back in the future as they are refined.

A motion was made by Regent Shoopman, seconded by Regent Krishna to approve for immediate implementation proposed revisions to ABOR Policies 5-308 “Student Code of Conduct,” 5-401 “Student Disciplinary Procedures” and 5-404 “Student Disciplinary Files and Records” to clarify language to distinguish between educational interventions, disciplinary sanctions, and other administrative actions, as well as to define the term “Disciplinary Proceeding” for purposes of implementing A.R.S. § 15-1866(A)(5). Regents Shoopman, Penley, Ridenour, Krishna, Heiler, Manson, Taylor Robson and DeGravina voted “Aye”, none opposed, none abstained. The motion carried.

Annual Personnel Report (Item 7)

The board office asks the board to approve the Annual Personnel Report for the Arizona University System.

Gale Tebeau presented that all state personnel agencies are required to submit an annual personnel report to the legislature and governor by September 1. The prescribed data elements included in the report is the unmet salary needed to raise staff salaries to average, relative to labor markets, employee turnover and overtime pay in the prior fiscal year.
A motion was made by Regent Shoopman, seconded by Regent Krishna to approve the Annual Personnel Report for the Arizona University System. Regents Shoopman, Penley, Ridenour, Krishna, Heiler, Manson, Taylor Robson and DeGravina voted “Aye”, none opposed, none abstained. The motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Regent Shoopman, seconded by Regent Krishna to adjourn. Regents Shoopman, Penley, Ridenour, Krishna, Heiler, Manson, Taylor Robson and DeGravina voted “Aye”, none opposed, none abstained. The motion carried.

The meeting adjourned 3:06 p.m.

Submitted by:

Suzanne Templin
Assistant Secretary to the Board
The Arizona Board of Regents held a special executive session meeting at the Arizona State University Downtown Phoenix Campus Student Center at the Post Office Black Canyon Conference Room, L1-12, lower level in Phoenix, Arizona on November 1, 2018 at 11:00 p.m.

Present:    Regent Shoopman
            Regent Penley
            Regent Ridenour
            Regent Krishna
            Regent Myers (via phone)
            Regent Heiler
            Regent Manson
            Regent Taylor Robson
            Regent DeGravina (joined 12:10 p.m.)
            Regent L’Ecuyer (joined 12:25 p.m. via phone)

Absent:    Superintendent Douglas and Governor Ducey

Also present were John Arnold, Nancy Tribbensee and Jennifer Pollock from the board office. Dr. Robbins, Jon Dudas, Laura Todd Johnson and Dave Heeke from the University of Arizona.

Regent Shoopman called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

A motion was made by Regent Krishna, seconded by Regent Taylor Robson to move into executive session. Regents Shoopman, Penley, Ridenour, Krishna, Myers, Manson, Taylor Robson, and Heiler voted “Aye”, none opposed. The motion carried.

The board recessed to executive session at 11:01 a.m.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned 12:36 p.m.

Submitted by:

Suzanne Templin
Assistant Secretary to the Board
This page intentionally left blank
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Item Name: Report on Finance, Capital and Resources Committee Meeting

☐ Action Item

Requested Action: The board office asks the full board to review the report of the November 1, 2018 Finance, Capital and Resources Committee.

Agenda Highlights
Finance, Capital and Resources Committee
November 1, 2018

1. Approval of Minutes
   Outcomes and Assignments:
   • Minutes from May 31, 2018 Business and Finance Committee meeting, and public and executive sessions from September 13, 2018 Finance, Capital and Resources Committee meeting were approved.

2. FY 2019 Financial Status Report – Fall Update (ASU, NAU, UA)
   Outcomes and Assignments:
   • NAU noted that any budget shortfalls would be addressed through hiring adjustments.
   • The committee requested an update after NAU completes its financial aid review.

3. Property Acquisition of 624 N. 5th Street, Phoenix, Arizona (ASU)
   Outcomes and Assignments:
   • The committee forwarded the property purchase to the full board with a recommendation for approval. The item will be on the board consent agenda.

4. Amended Capital Development Plan (ASU)
   Outcomes and Assignments:
   • The committee noted that future plans should require fewer amendments.

Contact Information:
Lorenzo Martinez, ABOR 602-229-2525 lorenzo.martinez@azregents.edu
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- The committee requested future renovation projects include information on the use of any anticipated operating savings, and the impact on deferred maintenance needs.
- The committee forwarded the amended plan to the full board with a recommendation for approval. The item will be on the board consent agenda.

5. FY 2019 Capital Development Plan (UA)

Outcomes and Assignments:
- The UA provided an update on the anticipated timeline for accreditation of the Veterinary Medical Program, and Regent Manson requested an update be provided to the Research and Health Sciences Committee.
- The committee forwarded the plan to the full board with a recommendation for approval. The item will be on the board consent agenda.

6. Real Estate Consultant Report and Recommendations

Outcomes and Assignments:
- The committee noted the importance of developing an interface between the board and the universities in order to make the proposed process work.

7. Proposed ABOR Policy on Use of University Property for Commercial Purposes

Outcomes and Assignments:
- An update on the development of proposed policy that will include components of the property development principles adopted by the board, and a notification-review-approval process for long-term commercial leases was presented.
- The proposed policy will be presented for first reading at the full board meeting.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Item Name: Proposed Revisions to ABOR Policy Chapter 4—Relating to the Setting of Tuition and Fees (Second Reading) and Proposed Repeal of ABOR “Guidelines for Class Fees;” “Guidelines for Definitions Used in Setting Tuition and Fees;” and “Guidelines for Requesting Differential Tuition and Program Fee Additions or Modifications.”

Action Item

Requested Action: The board office asks the board to approve the proposed revisions to ABOR Policy Chapter 4 relating to the annual setting of tuition and fees for Arizona State University, Northern Arizona University and University of Arizona. The board office also asks the board to approve the repeal of ABOR “Guidelines for Class Fees;” “Guidelines for Definitions Used in Setting Tuition and Fees;” and “Guidelines for Requesting Differential Tuition and Program Fee Additions or Modifications.”

Background and Discussion

- In keeping with ABOR’s commitment to ensure greater accessibility, affordability and transparency, the board established a reform agenda regarding tuition and fee setting at Arizona’s public universities.

- During the past year, the board discussed the need to implement reforms to update fee development processes and policies to provide appropriate oversight over the continued growth of fees. A multi-phase process to implement changes to the tuition and fee process was presented to the board at its February 2018 meeting, and further discussed at its April 2018 meeting.

- In January 2018, the Arizona Auditor General issued its audit of the Arizona’s Universities Fee-Setting Process. The Auditor General’s audit concluded that ABOR and the universities have established fee-setting processes consistent with best practices, but could further enhance the process.

- During the 2018 legislative session, legislation passed (Laws 2018, Chapter 107) that amends A.R.S. § 15-1626, requiring the board to broaden its approval of fees to approve via a roll call vote any changes to academic fees or online program tuition rates. Current ABOR policy requires review of only changes to tuition (base, differential), mandatory fees, program fees and class fees greater than $100.

Contact Information: John Arnold 602.229.2505 john.arnold@azregents.edu
• The proposed policy revisions take into account prior tuition and fee discussions, the Auditor General’s observations and legislative amendments, and university input. The revisions are summarized below:

  o Moved definitions section from *Board Guidelines* to be included as part of policy and updated definitions. This action repeals the *Guidelines for Class Fees*, the *Guidelines for Definitions Used in Setting Tuition and Fees* and the *Guidelines for Requesting Differential Tuition and Program Fee Additions or Modifications* and will become effective upon final action by the board to approve the proposed policy revisions.

  o Language added to state explicitly what is to be included in each university’s tuition and fee proposals, which includes increases to base tuition, differential tuition, online tuition and academic fees.

  o Language added that better describes evidence of student consultation.

  o Description added for calculation of per unit tuition rate.

  o New section for process of setting academic fees (mandatory fees, program fees, class fees and other academic fees). This section identifies the type of factors that the board may consider when setting academic fees, provides direction for accounting of academic fee revenues and direction for retaining a portion of academic fee revenues for student financial aid.

  o New section for sunset review process of all academic fees.

  o The board reviewed this item on first reading at its September 2018 meeting.

• Some minor changes were made between first and second reading of the proposed policy revisions. Those changes include the following:

  o In 4-101(H), the definition for “non-academic fees” was revised to remove the reference to “orientation.”

  o In 4-103(E)(3), the language was revised to further clarify when a university may charge a per unit tuition rate and now states the following: A UNIVERSITY MAY CHARGE A PER UNIT TUITION RATE FOR STUDENTS TAKING FEWER CREDIT HOURS THAN REQUIRED FOR A FULL-TIME RATE. THE PER UNIT RATE IS PRORATED BASED ON
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

THE FULL-TIME RATE AND MAY VARY BY STUDENT LEVEL, RESIDENCY, SCHOOL OR COLLEGE

Committee Review and Recommendation

The Finance, Capital and Resources Committee reviewed this item at its September 13, 2018 meeting and recommended forwarding to the full board for first reading and subsequent approval.

Statutory/Policy Requirements

- A.R.S.§15-1626 – General administrative powers and duties of board
4-101 TUITION AND FEE DEFINITIONS

A. “ACADEMIC FEES” CONSIST OF MANDATORY, PROGRAM, CLASS, AND OTHER FEES LEVIED AS THE RESULT OF ENROLLMENT AS A STUDENT IN THE UNIVERSITY, IN A PROGRAM OF THE UNIVERSITY, OR IN A CLASS OFFERED BY THE UNIVERSITY.

B. “ACCELERATED PROGRAM TUITION” MEANS TUITION SET FOR A PROGRAM THAT ALLOWS A STUDENT TO ACHIEVE AN ACADEMIC DEGREE ON AN ACCELERATED SCHEDULE.

C. “BASE TUITION” MEANS THE AMOUNT OF TUITION SET FOR AN ACADEMIC YEAR FOR A FULL-TIME STUDENTS AT IDENTIFIED CAMPUSSES OR LOCATIONS OF ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHERN ARIZONA UNIVERSITY AND UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA.

D. “CLASS FEES” MEANS ADDITIONAL CHARGES FOR SPECIFIC CLASSES OR COURSES THAT HAVE DEMONSTRABLY HIGHER COSTS OF DELIVERING INSTRUCTION OVERALL BECAUSE OF THE NEED FOR OR USE OF SPECIAL EQUIPMENT, SUPPLIES, TECHNOLOGY, KEY PERSONNEL EXPENSES, FIELD TRIPS OR OTHER COSTS APPROVED BY THE BOARD.

E. “DIFFERENTIAL TUITION” MEANS TUITION THAT IS HIGHER OR LOWER THAN THE BASE TUITION ESTABLISHED FOR EACH UNIVERSITY CAMPUS OR LOCATION AND APPLIES TO ALL GRADUATE OR UNDERGRADUATE ACADEMIC PROGRAMS IN A COLLEGE OR SCHOOL.

F. “ELECTED STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES” MEANS THE STUDENTS ELECTED TO THE COLLEGE COUNCILS AND ASSOCIATED STUDENT GOVERNMENT.

G. “MANDATORY FEES” MEANS FEES CHARGED TO STUDENTS FOR A SPECIFIC PURPOSE, ACTIVITY, OR SERVICE. MANDATORY FEES CAN BE UNIVERSITY WIDE OR DIFFERENTIATED BY CAMPUS LOCATION DELIVERY-METHOD, ENROLLMENT LEVEL, OR OTHER
CRITERIA APPROVED BY THE BOARD. ALL MANDATORY FEES MUST BE APPROVED BY THE BOARD.

H. “NON-ACADEMIC FEES” ARE USER FEES LEVIED NOT AS THE RESULT OF ENROLLMENT AS A STUDENT IN THE UNIVERSITY, IN A PROGRAM OF THE UNIVERSITY, OR IN A CLASS OFFERED BY THE UNIVERSITY. EXAMPLES INCLUDE PARKING, ENTRY, EXTRACURRICULAR, GRADUATION, COPY AND OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE FEES.

I. “ONLINE TUITION” MEANS THE AMOUNT OF TUITION SET FOR STUDENTS IN A FULLY ONLINE ACADEMIC PROGRAM.

J. “PEER INSTITUTIONS” MEANS A BOARD APPROVED LIST OF HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS FOR EACH ARIZONA UNIVERSITY TO PROVIDE BENCHMARKS FOR ASSESSING INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS. THE CRITERIA FOR SELECTIONS MAY INCLUDE AN INSTITUTION’S SIZE, STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS, PROGRAM MIX, INSTITUTIONAL MISSION AND RESEARCH FOCUS.

K. “PROGRAM FEES” MEANS ADDITIONAL AMOUNTS CHARGED TO STUDENTS IN SELECT DEGREE PROGRAMS WITHIN COLLEGES, SCHOOLS OR DEPARTMENTS, INCLUDING HONORS COLLEGES OR PROGRAMS, THAT DEMONSTRATE ONE OR MORE OF THE FOLLOWING: HIGHER COSTS OF DELIVERING INSTRUCTION; THE NEED FOR OR USE OF SPECIAL EQUIPMENT, TECHNOLOGY, OR KEY PERSONNEL EXPENSES; MARKET CONDITIONS.
4-104 4-103 Authority to Set PROPOSALS FOR Tuition and Fees

A. The board is responsible for setting tuition and fees as described in this policy. Definitions used in this policy are provided in the board’s “Guidelines for Definitions Used in Setting Tuition and Fees.”

B. The Arizona constitution obligates the legislature to appropriate funds to insure the proper maintenance, development, and improvement of all state educational institutions.

C. The Arizona constitution requires that instruction furnished be as nearly free as possible. The board has the responsibility for making decisions regarding quality of instruction, including decisions regarding the quality of faculty and infrastructure necessary for instruction, as well as the resources necessary and available to support instruction.

D. Each university shall submit a tuition and fee proposal THAT MAY INCLUDE BASE, DIFFERENTIAL AND ONLINE TUITION AND AN ACADEMIC FEE PROPOSAL for board REVIEW approval. The BOARD MAY ALSO REVIEW proposal shall include:

1. The amount of state support;
2. The availability of student financial aid as outlined in the board’s financial aid policies;
3. The median of tuition and mandatory fees charged by the university’s peers;
4. Other student fees established by each university;
5. The cost of university attendance;
6. Revenues required to service bonded indebtedness;
7. Arizona’s median family income levels; and
8. Evidence of student consultation INCLUDING NOTIFICATION OF AND CONSULTATION WITH ELECTED STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES CONCERNING THE PROPOSED TUITION, MANDATORY FEES OR PROGRAM FEES. STUDENT
CONSULTATION IS NOT REQUIRED FOR CLASS FEES OTHER THAN THE PUBLIC HEARING REQUIRED BY BOARD POLICY 4-104. CLASS FEES SHOULD BE BASED ON THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE CLASS. On program fees and differential tuition, including:

a. Information and feedback from elected student representatives; and
b. Consideration of results from student fee referenda or of organized opinion-gathering from students that are likely to be assessed the tuition, mandatory fee, or program fee.

9. DIFFERENTIAL TUITION PROPOSALS SHALL INCLUDE INFORMATION RELATED TO COSTS AND MARKET CONDITIONS OF THE APPLICABLE COLLEGE OR SCHOOL TO SUPPORT THE REQUEST. REVENUES FROM DIFFERENTIAL TUITION MUST BE USED FOR BOARD APPROVED PURPOSES AND EACH MUST BE ACCOUNTED FOR SEPARATELY FROM OTHER UNIVERSITY REVENUES.

10. FEE PROPOSALS SHALL INCLUDE INFORMATION REQUIRED BY ABOR POLICY 4-105.

11. PROPOSALS WILL BE SUBMITTED IN A FORMAT ESTABLISHED BY THE BOARD’S EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR.

E. In setting colleges of medicine tuition, the board will consider:

1. The amount of state support provided to the university system;

2. The availability of student financial aid; and

3. The median of tuition and mandatory fees charged by colleges of medicine’s peers.

E-E. At the discretion of the university president, a university may use the resident per credit hour charge for students taking one through seven credit hours per semester.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. A UNIVERSITY MAY CHARGE A TUITION RATE LESS THAN THE ADOPTED RATES FOR CERTAIN SESSIONS OR PROGRAMS INCLUDING PROGRAMS FOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS.

2. A UNIVERSITY MAY CHARGE A TUITION RATE OR FEES DIFFERENT THAN THE ESTABLISHED RATES OR FEES FOR EDUCATION SERVICES PROVIDED THROUGH A CONTRACT WITH A THIRD PARTY.

3. A UNIVERSITY MAY CHARGE A PER UNIT TUITION RATE FOR STUDENTS TAKING FEWER CREDIT HOURS THAN REQUIRED FOR A FULL-TIME RATE. THE PER UNIT RATE IS PRORATED BASED ON THE FULL-TIME RATE AND MAY VARY BY STUDENT LEVEL, RESIDENCY, SCHOOL OR COLLEGE.

G-F. Prior board approval is required for:

1. Base tuition
2. All other tuition, except as expressly set forth in this policy.
3. Multiple-year tuition plans
4. All new program fees and all changes to program fees—ALL NEW ACADEMIC FEES OR INCREASES TO ACADEMIC FEES.
5. All new class fees over $100, all changes to class fees over $100, and any combined lecture/laboratory fees that result in a combined fee of over $100.00
6. Mandatory fees
7. Any other fee that is not a user fee

4. Residence hall rates
5. Meal plan rates
H. Board approval is not required for the following types of tuition if the proposed tuition is lower than board-approved base tuition:

1. Differential tuition, and

2. Tuition for on-line, accelerated, distributed or off-cycle programs

Universities are required to report to the board on an annual basis any tuition set by the universities in accordance with this provision and any changes to the tuition set in accordance with this provision.
4-104 Procedure for Setting and Distributing Tuition and Fees

A. Procedures for setting all tuition and ACADEMIC fees that require Board approval

1. At least one week prior to any board meeting at which the Board is asked to approve any increase in tuition or ACADEMIC fees, the Board will conduct at least one public hearing on proposed increases broadcast through a multi-site video conference to at least one location at each Arizona university and other locations throughout Arizona.

2. At least ten days prior to the public hearing, a notice of the date, time and location of the hearing will be published in general circulation newspapers in Maricopa, Coconino and Pima counties as required by statute. Notice will also be posted on the Board’s website and distributed state-wide.

3. At least ten days prior to the public hearing, each university will publicly disclose recommended increases to any tuition or ACADEMIC fee.

4. Any final Board action setting tuition or ACADEMIC fees will MUST be taken by roll call vote.

5. AFTER FINAL BOARD ACTION, THE BOARD AND EACH UNIVERSITY SHALL MAKE A PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF ANY CHANGES IN TUITION OR ACADEMIC FEES.

Prior to requesting any tuition, mandatory fee, or program fee increase, the universities will engage in student consultation, which must include:

a. Notification of and consultation with elected student representatives concerning the proposed tuition, mandatory fee or program fee increase; and

b. Consideration of student fee referenda or of organized opinion-gathering from students that are likely to be assessed the tuition, mandatory fee, or program fee.
B. Differential tuition, online tuition and fees, off-cycle program tuition, distributed program tuition, accelerated program tuition, program fees, and class fees

1. Differential tuition:

   a. Must allow access for qualified students who cannot afford the differential tuition amount;

   b. Must include a financial aid plan with a minimum of 14 percent of the differential tuition set aside for need-based aid; and

   c. Will be administered as one total sum out of which the standard deductions for the qualified tuition reduction program and need-based financial aid will be subtracted in the same way these are deducted from base tuition at each university.

   d. Any differential tuition request must be brought to the Board in accordance with the Board guidelines for requesting differential tuition and program fee additions and modifications.

2. Online, off-cycle, distributed programs, and accelerated programs

   a. The Board may set tuition on a per credit hour basis for online, off-cycle, distributed, and accelerated programs.

   b. Based on market rates and other factors, the Board may set tuition for online, off-cycle, distributed, and accelerated programs at a higher rate than the base tuition established for each university.

3. Program fees:

   a. Each university request for a program fee will describe the relevant considerations, including market conditions, in support of the fee.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

b. Any request for a program fee must be brought to the Board in accordance with the Board guidelines for requesting differential tuition and program fee additions and modifications.

e. Program fees:

   (1) Are not included as a part of the base tuition;

   (2) Program fees will be billed in the same fashion as other tuition and fees;

   (3) Must be used for Board-approved purposes.

   (4) Must allow access for qualified students who cannot afford the program fee. Each proposal for a program fee must include a financial aid plan with a minimum of 14 percent of the program fee set aside for need-based aid;

   (5) Program fees are not subject to waivers except as required by law. Each university may choose to offset the extra cost of a program fee with deductions for the qualified tuition reduction program and need-based financial aid set aside.

d. A master list of program fees shall be maintained at each university indicating the programs for which fees are paid, the fee amount, and the account where the funds are credited.

e. Each university must audit program fee expenditures to ensure that any fees are used for Board-approved purposes.

4. Class fees

a. Class fees may be imposed only for the items included in the Board guidelines on class fees. Class fees will be charged in accordance with those guidelines.
b. Class fees may not be charged for the cost of graduate research and teaching assistants who are instructors of record.

c. Each university will maintain a master list of class fees indicating the classes for which fees are paid, the fee amount, and the account where the funds are credited.

d. Class fees are to be published on all media used as part of each semester’s schedule of classes. Classes for which fees must be paid are to be noted in the course listings.

C. Tuition and fee distribution

1. As part of its annual operating budget, each university will submit to the Board the calculated amount of tuition and fee revenue required to be retained locally and distributed for debt service on Board-authorized bonding obligations, plant funds, financial aid, local fund activities, and activities to improve the quality of educational operations as approved by the Board.

2. The operating budget submitted shall reference all of the activities and specific bond issuances for which each university anticipates using the retained funds.

3. All funds not retained locally must be deposited with the State Treasurer.
4-105 FEES

A. MANDATORY FEES

1. WHEN SETTING MANDATORY FEES THE BOARD SHALL CONSIDER THE PURPOSE AND COST OF THE PROPOSED USE OF THE FEE AND STUDENT INPUT ON THE PROPOSED FEE.

2. REVENUES FROM MANDATORY FEES MUST BE USED FOR PURPOSES APPROVED BY THE BOARD AND EACH MANDATORY FEE MUST BE ACCOUNTED FOR SEPARATELY FROM OTHER UNIVERSITY REVENUES.

3. PROPOSALS FOR MANDATORY FEES SHALL INCLUDE ESTIMATED REVENUES FROM THE FEE, A DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED USE OF THE FEES, AN ESTIMATED COST OF THOSE USES, AND EVIDENCE OF STUDENT CONSULTATION.

B. PROGRAM FEES

1. WHEN SETTING PROGRAM FEES THE BOARD MAY CONSIDER THE COSTS OF A PROGRAM, OTHER FEES THAT WILL IMPACT STUDENTS WITHIN THE PROGRAM, MARKET CONDITIONS, STUDENT INPUT AND THE PRICE OF SIMILAR PROGRAMS AT PEER INSTITUTIONS. PROPOSALS FOR PROGRAM FEES SHALL ADDRESS EACH OF THESE ELEMENTS.

2. REVENUES FROM PROGRAM FEES MUST BE USED FOR BOARD-APPROVED PURPOSES AND EACH PROGRAM FEE MUST BE ACCOUNTED FOR SEPARATELY FROM OTHER UNIVERSITY REVENUES.

3. EACH PROPOSAL FOR A PROGRAM FEE MUST INCLUDE A SET ASIDE FOR FINANCIAL AID WITH A MINIMUM PERCENT EQUAL TO THE REGENTS SET ASIDE RATE IN ABOR POLICY 4-321 OF THE ESTIMATED GROSS PROGRAM FEE REVENUE.

4. PROGRAM FEES ARE NOT SUBJECT TO WAIVERS EXCEPT AS REQUIRED BY LAW.
5. A MASTER LIST OF PROGRAM FEES SHALL BE MAINTAINED AT EACH UNIVERSITY.

C. CLASS FEES

1. WHEN SETTING CLASS FEES THE BOARD SHALL CONSIDER THE COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH A SPECIFIC CLASS, INCLUDING ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.

2. CLASS FEES MAY BE USED FOR ANY PURPOSE APPROVED BY THE BOARD.

3. IF APPROVED BY THE BOARD, REVENUES FROM MULTIPLE CLASS FEES MAY BE POOLED TO FUND A SHARED RESOURCE, INCLUDING ADMINISTRATIVE RESOURCES.

4. EACH UNIVERSITY MUST MAINTAIN A MASTER LIST OF CLASS FEES AND PUBLISH CLASS FEES AS PART OF EACH SEMESTER’S SCHEDULE OF CLASSES AND COURSE LISTINGS.

5. BILLINGS AND PAYMENTS OF CLASS FEES

A. CLASS FEES SHALL BE BILLED IN THE SAME FASHION AS OTHER TUITION AND FEES, UNLESS PAYMENT OF THE FEES IS MADE DIRECTLY TO A NON-UNIVERSITY OPERATOR FOR EQUIPMENT OR FACILITIES. THE FACT THAT THE CLASS FEE WILL BE PAID DIRECTLY TO A NON-UNIVERSITY RECIPIENT MUST BE DISCLOSED PRIOR TO THE BOARD APPROVING THE FEE.

B. CLASS FEES ARE COLLECTED AT THE TIME OF TUITION PAYMENT AND WILL BE DISTRIBUTED BY THE UNIVERSITY TO LOCAL DEPARTMENT ACCOUNTS. EACH CLASS FEE SHALL BE ACCOUNTED FOR SEPARATELY. FEES THAT ARE USED FOR SHARED RESOURCES MAY BE DISTRIBUTED TO A POOLED ACCOUNT. ON-SITE PAYMENTS MAY NOT BE MADE TO THE COURSE INSTRUCTOR.
C. REFUNDS OF CLASS FEES AND DEPOSITS SHALL BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH ESTABLISHED UNIVERSITY POLICY AND ACADEMIC UNITS ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR MAINTAINING STUDENT DEPOSIT RECORDS.

6. A UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT MAY REDUCE OR ELIMINATE A CLASS FEE WITHOUT BOARD APPROVAL. THE UNIVERSITY SHALL REPORT ANY CLASS FEE REDUCTIONS OR ELIMINATIONS AS PART OF THE ANNUAL REPORT OF FEES REVIEWED.

7. PROPOSALS FOR CLASS FEES SHALL INCLUDE AN ESTIMATE AND DESCRIPTION OF ESTIMATED COSTS OF THE USES OF THE FEE INCLUDING ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS AND THE ESTIMATED REVENUE FROM THE FEE.

D. OTHER ACADEMIC FEES LEVIED AS A RESULT OF ENROLLMENT

1. WHEN SETTING OTHER ACADEMIC FEES, THE BOARD SHALL CONSIDER THE COST OF THE PROPOSED USE OF THE FEE AND STUDENT INPUT ON THE PROPOSED FEE.

2. PROPOSALS FOR OTHER ACADEMIC FEES SHALL INCLUDE ESTIMATED REVENUES FROM THE FEE, A DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED USE OF THE FEES AND AN ESTIMATED COST OF THOSE USES.

3. REVENUES FROM OTHER ACADEMIC FEES MAY BE USED FOR ANY PURPOSE APPROVED BY THE BOARD AND MUST BE ACCOUNTED FOR SEPARATELY FROM OTHER UNIVERSITY REVENUES.

E. NON-ACADEMIC FEES

1. UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS MAY CREATE INTERNAL PROCESSES TO SET NON-ACADEMIC FEES AS NECESSARY.

F. SUNSET REVIEW OF FEES
1. EACH UNIVERSITY WILL DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT A PLAN TO SYSTEMATICALLY REVIEW ALL FEES AS PART OF A SUNSET PROCESS. UNLESS OTHERWISE SPECIFIED BY THE BOARD, THE BOARD MUST REVIEW AND APPROVE EACH FEE AT LEAST ONCE EVERY 10 YEARS.

2. BY FEBRUARY 1 OF EACH YEAR, EACH UNIVERSITY WILL REPORT THE FEES REVIEWED IN THE PRIOR CALENDAR YEAR, THE RESULT OF THE REVIEW AND PROVIDE A RECOMMENDATION ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE FEE. CLASS FEES THAT HAVE BEEN DECREASED OR ELIMINATED IN THE PRIOR YEAR WILL BE LISTED IN THIS REPORT.

3. REPORTS WILL BE SUBMITTED ON A TEMPLATE PROVIDED BY THE BOARD OFFICE.

4. AS PART OF THE SUNSET REVIEW, EACH UNIVERSITY SHALL CONSIDER WHETHER MULTIPLE CLASS FEES WITHIN A PROGRAM SHOULD BE CONSOLIDATED INTO A PROGRAM FEE OR IF MULTIPLE PROGRAM FEES WITHIN A COLLEGE SHOULD BE CONSOLIDATED INTO A DIFFERENTIAL TUITION.

G. TRANSITION FROM PRIOR POLICY

1. ALL FEES IN EFFECT ON JULY 1, 2018 REMAIN IN EFFECT UNTIL THE ESTABLISHED SUNSET DATE.

2. BY JUNE 30, 2019, EACH UNIVERSITY WILL PROPOSE A PLAN TO REVIEW EXISTING ACADEMIC FEES OVER THE NEXT TEN YEARS. THE BOARD WILL ESTABLISH A SUNSET DATE FOR EACH FEE AS PART OF THE REVIEW.

3. OTHER THAN CLASS FEES, ACADEMIC FEES THAT DID NOT RECEIVE BOARD APPROVAL WILL SUNSET ON JULY 1, 2019 UNLESS A CONTINUANCE IS APPROVED BY THE BOARD.
Collection of OUTSTANDING OBLIGATIONS Fees

A. The universities shall collect at the time of registration, the payment or promise of payment of only those fees which are required for the proper operation of the universities and which are subject to the control of and disbursement by the universities.

B. Each university shall establish procedures to collect outstanding obligations owed by students and former students.

C. Each university shall maintain a system to record all delinquent financial obligations owed to that university by students and former students.

4. A university may take any or all of the following actions for delinquent student accounts:

1. a. Deny or cancel registration;

2. b. Withhold cash refunds (to the extent permitted by law) and the provision of services, grade reports, transcripts, diplomas, and graduation;

3. c. Terminate agreements for student or family housing and/or take other action when financial obligations relate to housing;

4. d. Use outside collection agencies, report to credit bureaus, and assess related fees;

5. e. Follow accepted accounting principles and business practices to determine when to write-off delinquent financial obligations; and

6. f. Other measures as permitted by law.
4-107 OPERATING BUDGETS

A. AS PART OF ITS ANNUAL OPERATING BUDGET, EACH UNIVERSITY WILL SUBMIT TO THE BOARD THE CALCULATED AMOUNT OF TUITION AND FEE REVENUE REQUIRED TO BE RETAINED LOCALLY AND DISTRIBUTED FOR DEBT SERVICE ON BOARD-AUTHORIZED BONDING OBLIGATIONS, PLANT FUNDS, FINANCIAL AID, LOCAL FUND ACTIVITIES, AND ACTIVITIES TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF EDUCATIONAL OPERATIONS AS APPROVED BY THE BOARD.

B. THE OPERATING BUDGET SUBMITTED SHALL REFERENCE ALL OF THE ACTIVITIES AND SPECIFIC BOND ISSUANCES FOR WHICH EACH UNIVERSITY ANTICIPATES USING THE RETAINED FUNDS.
Guidelines for Class Fees - REPEAL

Class fees may be charged, in accordance with Board policy 4-104 only for the following:

A. Group travel costs such as gas and mileage reimbursements not including food.

B. Admission and rental fees to off-campus educational facilities.

C. Rental or use fees for specialized equipment used exclusively for instruction.

D. Rental or use fees for on campus facilities where a usage fee is normally charged.

E. Off-campus field trips or specialized equipment and facilities use.

F. Private instruction such as one-on-one study with an instructor for music performance.

G. Expendable materials such as:

1. Materials of a specialized nature not readily available in retail stores.

2. Materials that can be purchased by the department in large quantities at significant cost savings to the students.

3. Materials that must conform to certain specifications and be identical for all students.

4. Expensive materials needed by each student in such small quantities that they could not normally be purchased economically in such quantities.
H. Technology expense fees that are beyond the expected basic technology services as defined by each university.

I. Selected expenses such as:

1. Art class models for hire, musical accompanists, and mock patients for clinical-practice classes.
2. Supervisory instruction (including travel) for in-context training classes such as onsite student teaching, social work practicum, and nursing clinical experience.
3. Special instructional support such as technological support for multimedia learning digital and graphic design, enhanced audio-visual development, and small breakout group assistants, recitation sections, materials preparation, chemicals, supplies essential for classroom instruction, and group learning facilitators.

J. Refundable deposits for expensive equipment or apparatus that is temporarily entrusted to the students' care.

Charges for class fees:

A. Class fees shall be billed in the same fashion as other tuition and fees, unless payment of the fees is made directly to a non-university operator for equipment or facilities. The fact that the class fee will be paid directly to a non-university recipient must be disclosed prior to the Board approving the fee.

B. Class fees are collected at the time of tuition payment and will be distributed by the university to local department accounts. On site payments may not be made to the course instructor.

Refunds of class fees and deposits shall be in accordance with established university policy and academic units are responsible for maintaining student deposit records.

Approved 04/2011
Guidelines for Definitions Used in Setting Tuition and Fees REPEAL

Throughout Board policy, unless the context otherwise provides or requires:

A. “Accelerated program tuition” means tuition set for a program that allows a student to achieve an academic degree on an accelerated schedule.

B. “Base tuition” means the amount of tuition set for Arizona State University’s Tempe, West, Polytechnic, and Downtown locations; Northern Arizona University’s Flagstaff location; and the University of Arizona’s primary Tucson location.

C. “Class fees” means additional charges for specific classes or courses that have demonstrably higher costs of delivering instruction overall because of the need for or use of special equipment, supplies, technology, key personnel expenses, or field trips.

D. “Differential tuition” means tuition that is higher or lower than the base tuition established for each university and applies to all graduate or undergraduate academic programs in a college, school, or campus.

E. “Distributed program tuition” means tuition charged for a program that is delivered at locations other than Arizona State University’s Tempe, West, Polytechnic, and Downtown locations; Northern Arizona University’s Flagstaff location; and the University of Arizona’s primary Tucson location.

F. “Elected student representatives” means the students elected to the college councils and associated student government.

G. “Mandatory fees” means Board-approved fees charged to all students at an Arizona university, unless specifically excluded by a university.

H. “Off-cycle tuition” means tuition set for a session that begins or ends at times other than the Board approved fall or spring academic calendar.
I. "Online tuition" means the tuition charged to students who are participating in programs fully delivered in an online format.

J. "Peer institutions" means a Board approved list of higher education institutions for each Arizona university. In approving the list of peer institutions, the Board may consider characteristics such as enrollment, research capability, academic programs, stated mission, and an institution’s overall size.

K. "Multiple-year tuition plan" means a Board approved tuition plan offered to freshmen for a four-year enrollment period that either remains fixed (flat rate) or increases at a set rate for students continuously enrolled over a four-year period. The multiple-year tuition program may allow for new or transfer students to participate based on cohort year.

L. "Program fees" means additional amounts charged to students in select degree programs within colleges, schools or departments, including honors colleges or programs, that have demonstrably higher costs of delivering instruction overall, or because of the need for or use of special equipment, technology, or key personnel expenses, or market conditions.
Guidelines for Requesting Differential Tuition and Program Fee Additions or Modifications - REPEAL

The following protocol is intended to guide submission to the full Board to consider additions or modifications to differential tuition and program fees.

A. Any request for a change or modification to differential tuition or program fees must address the following:

1. Whether the additional tuition or fee adds to the quality of the student experience.

2. How student access and affordability will be addressed.

3. The variance in cost of instruction for the college or school or campus requesting the tuition or fee increase. In determining the cost of instruction, the Board shall review whether the instruction requires markedly higher than university average expenditures, or market conditions warrant the additional tuition or fee.

4. Similar tuition, class fees, or program fees at peer institutions, the elasticity of demand for the class/program offered, and the probability the class/program will lead to employment possibilities that are demonstrably worth the higher price.

5. The extent to which the university requesting the differential tuition or program fee consulted with students likely to be assessed the tuition or fee. This consultation must include:

   a. Information and feedback from elected student representatives; and

   b. Consideration of student fee referenda or organized opinion-gathering from students that are likely to be assessed the differential tuition or program fee.
B. The likelihood of the college or program to enhance potential earnings for graduates.

C. Not all of these items will be applicable to all proposals.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Item Name: Proposed Revisions to ABOR Policy 7-203 “Purchase of Real Property” (Second Reading)

☑ Action Item

Requested Action: The board office asks the board to approve the proposed revisions to ABOR Policy 7-203 “Purchase of Real Property”, as described in this Executive Summary.

Background/History of Previous Board Action

- At the November 2017 meeting, the board approved a comprehensive elimination of committee authority to make any final decisions; however, the change to ABOR Policy 7-203 regarding purchase of real property between $500,000 and $1,000,000 created a redundant committee review requirement. The board reviewed this item on first reading at its September 2018 meeting.

Discussion

- The proposed revision eliminates a redundant committee review requirement and aligns policy on real property purchases with the board intent to have final approvals come to the full board for a vote.

Committee Review and Recommendation

The Finance, Capital and Resources Committee reviewed this item at its September 13, 2018 meeting and recommended forwarding to the full board for first reading and subsequent approval.

Statutory/Policy Requirements

- A.R.S. §15-1626(A)(1) General Administrative Powers and Duties of Board

- Board Policy 1-202 Procedures for Adoption of Rules by the Board

Contact Information:
Jennifer Pollock 602-229-2546 Jennifer.Pollock@azregents.edu
7-203 Purchase of Real Property

Except as noted below, purchases of real property by a university require prior review by the Finance, Capital and Resources Committee and approval of the Board, and compliance with all requirements of this section not explicitly waived by the Board.

A. A request for authorization to purchase property shall be accompanied by:
   1. the legal description of the property,
   2. the name of the sellers or other person having an interest in the property,
   3. a statement detailing the reason for such purchase,
   4. the amount and source of funds for the purchase,
   5. any other pertinent information,
   6. a notice to Board Counsel of the results of any appraisals(s) required which shall remain confidential until the purchase is either completed or canceled.

B. Board approval is not required for a purchase if:
   1. the property is located within the university planning boundary as defined in the master plan; and
   2. the purchase price is less than Five Hundred Thousand Dollars ($500,000)

C. The Finance, Capital and Resources Committee shall review and forward to the full board for approval purchases of real property when the purchase price is Five Hundred Thousand Dollars ($500,000) or greater but does not exceed One Million Dollars ($1,000,000). At the Committee’s discretion, any request to purchase property may be presented directly to the board as circumstances warrant.

D. The board office shall be notified of all purchases regardless of purchase price in accordance with procedures developed by the President of the Board.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**Item Name:** Proposed Revisions to ABOR Policies 3-808 “Intergovernmental Procurement,” 3-809 “Legal Remedies” and 3-811 “Significant Procurement Roles” of Chapter III, Article H--University Procurement Code (Second Reading)

☑ Action Item

**Requested Action:** The board office asks the board to approve the proposed revisions to ABOR Policies 3-808 “Intergovernmental Procurement,” 3-809 “Legal Remedies” and 3-811 “Significant Procurement Roles” of Chapter III, Article H--University Procurement Code.

**Background/History of Previous Board Action**

- The board approved substantial revisions to the University Procurement Code at its November 2016 meeting.

- The revisions proposed in this Executive Summary are intended to align certain definitions and policy language with university practices, to implement statutory changes, and maintain the Code’s substantial equivalence to the State Procurement Code.

The board reviewed this item on first reading at its September 2018 meeting.

**Discussion**

- Section 3-808(B)(7) is revised as follows (see Exhibit A for full text of Section 3-808, as revised):

"Nonprofit Corporation" means any STATE RECOGNIZED NONPROFIT OR NOT FOR PROFIT CORPORATION OR A nonprofit corporation as designated by the Internal Revenue Service under section 501(C)(3) through 501(C)(6) or under section 115, if created by two or more Local Public Procurement Units and includes certified nonprofit agencies that serve individuals with disabilities.

**Contact Information:**

Jennifer Pollock, ABOR 602-229-2546 Jennifer.Pollock@azregents.edu
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Section 3-809(A)(8), the definition of “Receipt” or “Received” is revised as follows (see Exhibit B for full text of Section 3-809, as revised):

"Receipt" or "Received" means delivery to the last known PHYSICAL OR ELECTRONIC MAILING address of the addressee to whom the document OR COMMUNICATION is sent. EVERY NOTICE, REQUEST, DOCUMENT OR OTHER COMMUNICATION SENT UNDER THIS ARTICLE SHALL BE DEEMED TO HAVE BEEN RECEIVED: i) IN THE CASE OF PERSONAL DELIVERY ON THE DATE DELIVERED; ii) IN THE CASE OF DELIVERY BY FAX OR DELIVERY BY E-MAIL ON THE DATE SENT, IF SENT TO THE ADDRESSEE’S LAST KNOWN ADDRESS AND NOT RETURNED; iii) IN THE CASE OF U.S. MAIL, UPS, FEDEX OR OTHER COMMON CARRIER FIVE DAYS FROM THE DATE OF MAILING, IF SENT TO THE ADDRESSEE’S LAST KNOWN ADDRESS AND NOT RETURNED. A document is deemed to have been received by the addressee if properly sent to the addressee’s last known address and not returned. The delivery date will be five (5) Days from the date of mailing unless the addressee can show otherwise.

Section 3-811 is revised to add a new section 3-811(A)(8), as follows (see Exhibit C for full text of Section 3-811, as revised):

SIGNIFICANT PROCUREMENT ROLE DOES NOT INCLUDE MAKING DECISIONS ON DEVELOPING SPECIFICATIONS AND THE SCOPE OF WORK FOR A PROCUREMENT IF THE DECISION IS BASED ON THE APPLICATION OF COMMONLY ACCEPTED INDUSTRY STANDARDS OR KNOWN PUBLISHED STANDARDS OF THE AGENCY AS APPLIED TO THE PROJECT, SERVICES, GOODS OR MATERIALS.

Committee Review and Recommendation

The Finance, Capital and Resources Committee reviewed this item at its September 13, 2018 meeting and recommended forwarding to the full board for first reading and subsequent approval.

Statutory/Policy Requirements

ARS § 41-2501, et. seq.- Arizona State Procurement Code. ARS § 41-2501 requires the board to adopt procurement policies and procedures for the state’s universities and the board that are “substantially equivalent” to the State Procurement Code.

ABOR Policy 3-801, et seq.- The University Procurement Code. ABOR Policies 3-801 through 3-811 establish the procedures that apply to university and board
procurements.

- Arizona Administrative Code (A.A.C), Title 2, Chapter 7 – Department of Administration State Procurement Office. The state procurement process is governed by the statutes discussed above and regulations, which are codified in the Arizona Administrative Code, Title 2, Chapter 7 and administered by the Arizona Department of Administration.
Exhibit A

Section 3-808, as revised

3-808 Intergovernmental Procurement

A. Authorization to Participate. Any University is authorized to participate in Intergovernmental Procurement pursuant to ARS 41-2631, et seq. and the implementing regulations as set forth in Arizona Administrative Code.

B. Definitions

1. In this ABOR Policy 3-808, unless the context otherwise requires:

2. "Certified Nonprofit Agency that Serves Individuals with Disabilities" means a nonprofit activity center that serves individuals with significant disabilities and that satisfies all of the following:

   a. Is organized under the laws of this state or another state, is operated in the interest of disabled individuals and the net income of which does not inure in whole or in part to the benefit of any shareholder or other individual.

   b. Complies with any applicable occupational health and safety standard required by the laws of the United States and this State.

3. "Disabled Individual" means an individual who, because of the nature of the individual's disabilities, is not able to fully participate in competitive employment and for whom specialized employment and training is necessary by a qualified nonprofit organization through the department of economic security or the department of health services.

4. "Cooperative Purchasing" means procurement conducted by, or on behalf of, one or more Public Procurement Units. This term does not mean any internal cooperative agreement or consortium agreement existing only between and among the Board and/or one or more Universities.
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5. "External Procurement Activity" means any buying organization not located in this state that would qualify as a Public Procurement Unit.

6. "Local Public Procurement Unit" means any political subdivision, any agency, board, department or other instrumentality of such political subdivision, and any nonprofit corporation created solely for the purpose of administering a cooperative purchase under state law.

7. "Nonprofit Corporation" means any STATE RECOGNIZED NONPROFIT OR NOT FOR PROFIT CORPORATION OR A nonprofit corporation as designated by the Internal Revenue Service under section 501(C)(3) through 501 (C)(6) or under section 115, if created by two or more Local Public Procurement Units and includes certified nonprofit agencies that serve individuals with disabilities.

8. "Public Procurement Unit" means either a Local Public Procurement Unit, the Arizona Department of Administration, any other state, or any agency of the United States.

C. Cooperative Purchasing Authorized

1. Any University may either participate in, sponsor, conduct or administer a Cooperative Purchasing agreement for the Procurement of any Materials, Services, Professional Services, Construction, or Construction Services with one or more Public Procurement Units, or External Procurement Activities, in accordance with an agreement entered into between the participants. The Cooperative Purchasing may include joint or multi-party contracts between Public Procurement Units and open-ended Public Procurement Unit contracts that shall be available to Local Public Procurement Units. A Nonprofit Corporation may enter into an agreement pursuant to this section if one or more of the parties involved is a Public Procurement Unit. An agreement entered into as provided in this ABOR Policy 3-808 is exempt from A.R.S. §11-952, subsection D.

2. If the Public Procurement Unit or University administering a Cooperative Purchase complies with the requirements of state law or this Code, any Public Procurement Unit or University participating in such a purchase is deemed to have complied with state law or this Code. A University may not participate in a Cooperative Purchasing agreement for the purpose of
circumventing this Code.

D. A University may purchase approved Materials and Services directly from Arizona Industries for the Blind and Arizona Correctional Enterprises without competitive bidding.

E. If a Procurement involves the expenditure of federal assistance or contract monies, the University involved in the Procurement shall comply with federal law and authorized regulations which are mandatorily applicable and which are not presently reflected in this Code.
A. Definitions. In this Article, unless the context otherwise requires:

1. "Affiliate" means any Person whose governing instruments require it to be bound by the decision of another Person or whose governing board includes enough voting representatives of the other Person to cause or prevent action, whether or not the power is exercised. It may also include Persons doing business under a variety of names, or where there is a parent-subsidiary relationship between Persons.

2. “Contract Claim or Controversy” means a dispute arising under a Contract governed by this Code between a University and a Contractor, including but not limited to a dispute regarding or pertaining to the obligations of parties to the Contract, a dispute regarding or pertaining to the performance of those obligations, or a claim that one party owes the other a payment of some kind.

3. "Debarment" means an action taken by the President, or his or her Designee, under subsection D below to prohibit a Person participating in Procurements with a University for a period of not less than one (1) year nor more than five (5) years.

4. "Filed" means delivery to the CPO, to the University President, or to the President of the Board, whichever is applicable. A time/date stamp affixed to a document by the office of the CPO, the University President or the President of the Board, whichever is applicable, will establish the time of delivery for purposes of filing.

5. “Governing Instruments” means those legal documents that establish the existence of a Business and define its powers, including articles of incorporation, organization or association, constitution, charter, bylaws and other similar documents.

6. “Protest” means a challenge, as authorized by the Code, of any University Procurement, Award, or proposed Award of a Contract.

7. “Protester” means a Person who files a Protest.
8. "Receipt" or "Received" means delivery to the last known physical or electronic mailing address of the addressee to whom the document or communication is sent. Every notice, request, document or other communication sent under this article shall be deemed to have been received: i) in the case of personal delivery on the date delivered; ii) in the case of delivery by fax or delivery by e-mail on the date sent, if sent to the addressee's last known address and not returned; iii) in the case of U.S. mail, UPS, FedEx or other common carrier five days from the date of mailing, if sent to the addressee's last known address and not returned. A document is deemed to have been received by the addressee if properly sent to the addressee's last known address and not returned. The delivery date will be five (5) days from the date of mailing unless the addressee can show otherwise.

9. "Suspension" means an action taken by a University President or Designee to prohibit a Person from participating in procurements with any University, for a period not to exceed one (1) year.

B. Protests

1. Delegation of Authority

   a. Initial review and resolution of protests shall be conducted by the CPO or Designee for a University.

   b. Final decision on appeal of protests shall be made by the University President or a Designee other than the CPO.

2. Filing of Protests

   a. Any interested party may protest a solicitation or the proposed award or the award of a contract by filing a protest.

   b. Time for filing protest

      (1) Protests concerning improprieties in a solicitation

      (a) In procurements inviting bids, protests based upon alleged errors, irregularities or
improprieties in a Solicitation that are apparent before the Bid Opening shall be filed before the Bid Opening.

(b) In all other Procurements, Protests based upon alleged errors, irregularities or improprieties in a Solicitation that are apparent before the closing date for receipt of initial Proposals shall be filed before the closing date for receipt of initial Proposals. Protests concerning improprieties that do not exist in the initial Solicitation, but that are subsequently incorporated into the Solicitation, shall be filed by the next closing date for receipt of Proposals following the date the improprieties were incorporated into the Solicitation.

(2) In cases other than those covered in subsection (1) above, Protests shall be filed no later than ten (10) Days after the earlier of a) the issuance of a Notice of Intent to Award or b) Award of a Contract in connection with the Procurement action.

(3) Failure to timely file a Protest shall be deemed a waiver of all rights under this Code.

c. Content of a Protest

(1) The Protest shall be in writing and shall include the following information:

(2) The name, address and telephone number of the Protester;

(3) The signature of the Protester or its representative;

(4) Identification of the University and the Solicitation or Contract number;

(5) A detailed statement of the legal and factual grounds of the Protest including copies of relevant documents; and

(6) The form of relief requested.
d. Upon receipt of the Protest, the CPO shall, within ten (10) business Days, give notice of the Protest to all Interested Parties.

e. Stay of Procurements During the Protest

(1) If a Protest is filed before the Award of a Contract, no Award shall be made until the Protest has been resolved, unless the CPO makes a written determination that there is not a reasonable probability that the Protest will be upheld or that Award of the Contract without delay is necessary to protect substantial interests of the University.

f. Protected Information

(1) Materials submitted by a Protester shall not be withheld from any Interested Party except to the extent that the withholding of information is required by law or is permitted by law and specifically requested by the Protester.

(2) If the Protester believes the Protest contains material that should be withheld, a statement advising the CPO of this fact shall accompany the notice of Protest and the information shall be so identified wherever it appears. The CPO shall review the statement and information and shall determine whether the information shall be withheld, as set forth in ABOR Policy 3-801D.

3. Decision by the Chief Procurement Officer or Designee

a. The CPO or Designee shall issue a written decision within twenty (20) Days of receipt of the Protest. The decision shall be sent to the Protester and to all Interested Parties by any method that provides evidence of receipt.

b. The decision shall contain an explanation of the basis of the decision and a statement explaining the Protester’s appeal rights.

c. The time limit for a decision may be extended by the CPO
for a reasonable time not to exceed thirty (30) Days. The CPO shall notify the Protester in writing that the time for the issuance of a decision has been extended and the date by which a decision will be issued.

d. If the CPO or Designee fails to issue a decision within the time limits set forth above, the Protester may proceed as if the CPO or Designee had issued an adverse decision.

e. Remedies

(1) If the CPO or Designee sustains the Protest in whole or in part and determines that a Solicitation, proposed Contract Award, or Contract Award does not comply with this Code or the University Policies and Procedures, the CPO shall implement an appropriate remedy.

(2) In determining an appropriate remedy, the CPO must consider all of the circumstances surrounding the Solicitation, the Procurement or the proposed Procurement, including, but not limited to:

(a) The seriousness of the Procurement deficiency;
(b) The degree of prejudice to Interested Parties or to the integrity of the procurement system;
(c) The good faith of the parties;
(d) The extent of performance;
(e) The costs to the University;
(f) The urgency of the Procurement;
(g) The impact on the University’s mission; and
(h) Other relevant issues.

(3) An appropriate remedy may include one or more of the following:
(a) Decline to exercise an option to renew under the Contract;

(b) Terminate the Contract;

(c) Amend or reissue the Solicitation;

(d) Issue a new Solicitation;

(e) Award a Contract consistent with this Code and the University Policies and Procedures;

(f) Reject all Bids or Proposals without further action; or

(g) Render such other relief as is determined necessary to ensure compliance with this Code or University Policies and Procedures.

4. Appeal to the President

   a. In the event that a Protest is denied, the Protester may appeal from the decision entered or deemed to be entered by the CPO to the University President within ten (10) Days from the date the decision is received.

   b. Final decision on an appeal to the President shall be made by the President or a Designee other than the CPO. Any hearing on appeal shall be conducted by the President or Designee who has the authority to make a final decision, or by a hearing officer appointed by the President or Designee.

   c. The notice of appeal shall contain:

      (1) The information set forth in ABOR Policy 3-809B.2.c, including the identification of any confidential information in the manner set forth in ABOR Policy 3-809B.2.f.

      (2) A copy of the decision of the CPO; and

      (3) The precise legal or factual error in the decision that forms the basis for the appeal.
d. The Person conducting the appeal shall immediately give written notice of the pending appeal to the apparent successful Contractor if Award has been made or, if no Award has been made, to all Interested Parties. Any Person so notified shall, upon request, be furnished with a copy of the notice of appeal filed in the matter.

e. Stay of Procurement during Appeal

(1) If an appeal is filed before an Award of Contract and the Award of the Contract was stayed by the CPO pursuant to ABOR Policy 3-809.B.2.e, the filing of an appeal shall automatically continue the stay unless the Person conducting the appeal makes a written determination that the Award of the Contract without delay is necessary to protect substantial interests of the University.

(2) Following a review of the CPO’s decision and the notice of appeal, the Person conducting the hearing may stay the Procurement if the Person determines that there is a reasonable probability the Protest will be upheld or that a stay is in the best interests of the University.

f. Dismissal before Hearing

The Person conducting the appeal may enter a written determination dismissing an appeal in whole or in part, if:

(1) The appeal does not state a valid basis for Protest; or

(2) The appeal is untimely.

(3) The appeal attempts to raise issues not raised in the Protest.

g. Hearing on Bid Protest Decision

If a hearing on an appeal of a Solicitation, Contract Award or proposed Contract Award decision is required, it shall be conducted pursuant to the provisions of ABOR Policy 3-809E and F, except that a Protester may waive his right to a hearing in favor of a review by the hearing officer based
solely on the documentation available to the CPO.

h. Remedies

If the appeal is sustained in whole or in part, and a determination is made that a Solicitation, proposed Award, or Award does not comply with this Code or University Policies or Procedures, an appropriate remedy shall be implemented pursuant to the provisions of ABOR Policy 3-809.B.3.e.

C. Contract Claims and Controversies

1. Application. This ABOR Policy 3-809 governs all contract claims and controversies arising out of a Contract or Procurement, regardless of whether they are initiated by a University or a Contractor.

2. Delegation of Authority

a. Initial review and efforts to resolve or settle a Contract Claim or Controversy shall be conducted by the CPO, except that any settlement of a Contract Claim or Controversy in excess of one hundred thousand ($100,000) requires the prior written approval of the President or a Designee other than the CPO.

b. Final decision on an appeal to the President shall be made by the President or a Designee other than the CPO. Any hearing on appeal shall be conducted by the official with authority to make a final decision, or by a hearing officer appointed by the official with authority to make a final decision.

3. Initiation of a Contract Claim or Controversy

a. A Contract Claim or Controversy initiated by a University shall be made in writing to the Contractor by the University’s CPO.

b. A Contract Claim or Controversy initiated by a Contractor shall be filed in writing with the CPO within the time period set forth in the Contract, but in no event later than one (1) year after the date on which the facts leading to the Contract
claim or Controversy occurred.

c. The CPO may require that the work or performance under the Contract proceed under a reservation of rights so as not to waive the right of any party in the matter.

d. The Contract Claim or Controversy shall include the following information:

(1) The name, address and telephone number of the Contractor;

(2) The signature of the Contractor or its representative, or the University’s representative if the Claim or Controversy is initiated by the University;

(3) Identification of the University and the Contract number;

(4) A detailed statement of the legal and factual grounds of the Contract Claim or Controversy including copies of relevant documents; and

(5) The form of relief requested.

4. Attempt to Resolve by Mutual Agreement

a. If a Contract Claim or Controversy initiated by the University is not resolved by mutual agreement, the CPO shall promptly refer the matter to the President for a hearing following the procedure for appeal of CPO decisions specified in ABOR Policy 3-809C.6, below.

b. If a Contract Claim or Controversy initiated by a Contractor cannot be resolved by mutual agreement, the CPO shall issue a final decision pursuant to ABOR Policy 3-809C.5, below.

5. CPO’s Decision

If a Contract Claim or Controversy cannot be resolved by mutual agreement the CPO shall issue a decision no more than one hundred and twenty (120) Days after receipt of the Contract Claim or Controversy by the non-initiating party. Before issuing a final decision, the CPO shall
review the facts pertinent to the Contract Claim or Controversy and secure any necessary assistance from legal, fiscal, and other advisors.

a. Where the Contract Claim or Controversy exceeds one hundred thousand dollars ($100,000), the time limit for a final decision may be extended for a reasonable time not to exceed thirty (30) Days. The CPO shall notify the Contractor in writing that the time for the issuance of a decision has been extended and the date by which a decision shall be issued.

b. The time limit for a decision involving a Contract Claim or Controversy amounting to one hundred thousand dollars ($100,000) or less may not be extended.

c. If the CPO fails to issue a decision within the permitted time period, the Contractor may proceed as if the CPO had issued an adverse decision and may appeal pursuant to ABOR Policy 3-809C.6.

d. The CPO shall furnish a copy of the decision to the Contractor by certified mail, return receipt requested, or by any other method that provides evidence of receipt. The decision shall include:

(1) A description of the Contract Claim or Controversy;

(2) A reference to the pertinent Contract provisions;

(3) A statement of the factual areas of agreement or disagreement;

(4) A statement of the CPO's decision, with supporting rationale;

(5) A paragraph substantially as follows:

This is the final decision of the CPO. This decision may be appealed to the President of the University or Board, as applicable. A Contractor shall mail or otherwise furnish written notice of appeal to the President within fifteen (15) Days from the date of receipt of this decision.
6. Hearing on Appeal to the President
   a. A written notice of appeal from a final decision of a CPO on a Contract Claim or Controversy must be filed with the University President within fifteen (15) Days of the receipt of the decision.
   b. Final decision on an appeal to the President shall be made by the President or a Designee appointed by the President. The President may not designate the CPO or any Procurement Officer to make the final decision, but may designate that the hearing officer do so.
   c. Hearings on appeals of decisions related to Contract Claims or Controversies shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of ABOR Policy 3-809E and F. Any hearing on appeal shall be conducted by the official with authority to make a final decision, or by a hearing officer appointed by that official.

D. Debarment or Suspension

1. Delegation of Authority
   a. A CPO or other Designee of the University President has authority pursuant to ABOR Policy 3-809D.2 to propose action to suspend or debar a Person, or affected Affiliate, from Procurement activity with any University.
   b. A final decision to debar or suspend a Person or an affected Affiliate from participating in Procurements shall be made by the President or Designee.

2. Grounds for Suspension or Debarment. A Person or Affiliate may be suspended or debarred where reasonable grounds are found to exist. A Suspension shall not exceed six (6) months, and a Debarment shall not exceed three (3) years.
   a. Reasonable grounds for Suspension or Debarment include the following:
      (1) Conviction of any Person or Affiliate for commission of a criminal offense arising out of obtaining or attempting to obtain a public or private contract or
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subcontract, or in the performance of such contract or subcontract.

(2) Conviction of any Person or Affiliate under any statute of the federal government, this state or any other state for embezzlement, theft, fraudulent schemes and artifices, fraudulent schemes and practices, bid rigging, perjury, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, receiving stolen property or any other offense indicating a lack of business integrity or business honesty which affects responsibility as a public contractor.

(3) Conviction or civil judgment finding a violation by any Person or Affiliate under state or federal antitrust statutes.

(4) Violations of Contract provisions of a character which are deemed to be so serious as to justify Debarment action, such as any of the following:

(a) Knowingly fails without good cause to perform in accordance with the specifications or within the time limit provided in the Contract.

(b) Failure to perform or unsatisfactory performance in accordance with the terms of one or more Contracts, except that failure to perform or unsatisfactory performance caused by acts beyond the control of the Contractor shall not be considered to be a basis for Debarment.

(c) Any other cause deemed to affect responsibility as a public contractor, including Suspension or Debarment of such Person or Affiliate by another governmental entity.

3. Imputed Knowledge

a. Improper conduct, as set forth in ABOR Policy 3-809D.42 above, may be imputed to an Affiliate for purposes of Suspension or Debarment where the impropriety occurred in connection with the Affiliate's duties for or on behalf of, or
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with the knowledge, approval, or acquiescence of, the Person.

b. Improper conduct, as set forth in ABOR Policy 3-809D.42 above, of a Person or Affiliate having a contract with a Contractor may be imputed to the Contractor for purposes of Debarment where the impropriety occurred in connection with the Person's duties for or on behalf of, or with the knowledge, approval, or acquiescence of, the Contractor.

4. Debarment

a. Initiation of Debarment action. Upon receipt of information concerning a possible cause for Debarment, the CPO shall investigate or have investigated the possible cause. If the CPO has a reasonable basis to believe that a cause for Debarment exists, the CPO may propose Debarment proceedings by filing a proposal for Debarment with the President or Designee.

b. Notice. If Debarment is proposed, the CPO shall notify the Person and affected Affiliates in writing within seven (7) Days by certified mail, return receipt requested, or any other method that provides evidence of receipt. The notice shall state that the person and affected Affiliates have the right to a hearing to contest the proposed Debarment.

c. Request for Hearing. The Person proposed for Debarment and any affected affiliates shall file a written request for a hearing within ten (10) Days of receipt of the CPO’s notice of proposed Debarment.

d. Hearing. The hearing shall be conducted as set forth in ABOR Policy 3-809E and F.

5. Suspension and Debarment. Except as provided in ABOR Policy 3-809D.5.b below, if Suspension or Debarment is proposed, the CPO shall notify the Person and affected Affiliates in writing within seven (7) Days by certified mail, return receipt requested, of the proposed Suspension or Debarment. The notice of Suspension or Debarment shall state:

(1) The basis for Suspension or Debarment;
(2) The period, including dates, of the Suspension or Debarment;

(3) That Offers received from the person will not be considered; and

(4) That the Person is entitled to a hearing on the Suspension or Debarment if the person files a written request for a hearing with the CPO within thirty (30) Days after receipt of the notice.

a. Except as provided in ABOR Policy 3-809D.5.b below, if Suspension or Debarment of an Affiliate is also proposed in the notice of Suspension or Debarment, the Affiliate shall have a right to appear in any hearing on the proposed Suspension or Debarment to show mitigating circumstances. The Affiliate must advise the CPO in writing, within thirty (30) Days of receipt of the notice, of its intention to participate in the Suspension or Debarment process. Failure to provide written notice of participation within this period shall be a waiver of the right to participate.

b. The CPO, upon notice, may suspend or debar a Person or Affiliate under Suspension or Debarment by the State or any federal procurement agency who has had a prior opportunity for hearing in connection with the Suspension or Debarment by the State or any federal procurement agency. The period of such Suspension or Debarment from Procurement with the University shall run concurrently with the Suspension or Debarment by the State or federal procurement agency.

6. Reinstatement After Debarment

a. A request for reinstatement shall not be considered until at least one (1) year after the effective date of the Debarment. At that time, the CPO may reinstate a debarred Person or Affiliate or rescind the Debarment upon a determination that the cause upon which the Debarment is based no longer exists or has been substantially mitigated.

b. Any debarred Person or Affiliate may request reinstatement by submitting a petition to the CPO supported by documentary evidence showing that the cause for Debarment no longer exists or has been substantially
mitigated.

c. The CPO may require a hearing on the request for reinstatement.

d. The CPO shall make a written decision on reinstatement within thirty (30) Days after the request is filed and specify the factors on which it is based.

e. Decisions on reinstatement requests are not subject to appeal.

7. Limited Participation

(1) A University may allow a debarred Person or Affiliate to participate in Contracts with the University on a limited basis during the Debarment period upon a written determination that participation is advantageous to the University. The determination shall specify the factors on which it is based and define the extent of the limits imposed.

8. Hearing Procedure

(1) Hearings required or permitted under this ABOR Policy 3-809 shall be conducted pursuant to the provisions of ABOR Policy 3-809.E below.

E. Authority of Hearing Officer or Official Conducting Hearing

1. Any hearing required or permitted under this ABOR Policy 3-809 shall be conducted by the official with authority to make a final decision, or by a hearing officer appointed by that official.

2. A decision by a hearing officer or by the official with authority to make a final decision shall be based on the evidence presented at hearing and shall include findings of fact and conclusions of law. If the hearing officer does not have authority to make a final decision, the hearing officer’s decision and findings of fact and conclusions of law will be in the form of a recommendation to the official with authority to make the final decision.

3. A decision by a hearing officer shall only constitute a recommendation to be submitted to the official with authority to
make a final decision unless the President, when appointing the hearing officer, also authorizes the hearing officer to make a final decision.

4. A hearing officer or other official conducting any hearing under this Code shall have such powers and duties as are set forth in this ABOR Policy 3-809 and shall have all other powers and authority that an administrative law judge possesses under A.R.S. 41-1092.07

F. General Hearing Procedures

1. All hearings required or permitted under these rules shall be conducted as contested cases pursuant to these rules and the provisions of A.R.S. 41-1092 et seq.

2. It is the intention of this ABOR Policy 3-809.F to implement a hearing process substantially equivalent to that provided in A.R.S. 41-1092, et seq., and the regulations adopted thereunder, for hearings conducted by the Office of Administrative Hearings. If a procedure or process is not provided by this ABOR Policy 3-809F, the Prehearing and Hearing Procedures used by the Office of Administrative Hearings may be consulted for guidance and the hearing officer shall have the authority to use those Prehearing or Hearing Procedures in the hearing on the Contract Claim or Controversy.

3. Proper and adequate written notice of the time, date and place of hearings shall be made by the hearing officer.

4. All hearings shall be recorded manually or by a recording device. A transcribed record of the hearing shall be made available at cost to the requesting party.

5. The hearings shall be conducted in an informal manner without formal rules of evidence or procedure.

6. The hearing officer may:

   a. Hold pre-hearing conferences to settle, simplify, or identify the issues in the proceeding, or to consider other matters that may aid in the expeditious disposition of the proceeding;

   b. Require parties to state their positions concerning the
various issues in the proceedings;

c. Require parties to produce for examination those relevant witnesses and documents under their control.

d. Issue subpoenas to compel the production of testimony and documents.

e. Rule on motions, and other procedural items pending before such officer;

f. Regulate the course of the hearing and conduct of participants;

g. Establish time limits for submission of motions or memoranda;

h. Impose appropriate sanctions against any Person failing to obey an order under these procedures, which may include:

(1) Refusing to allow the Person to assert or oppose designated claims or defenses, or prohibiting that person from introducing designated matters in evidence.

(2) Excluding all testimony of an unresponsive or evasive witness; and

(3) Expelling any person from further participation in the hearing.

i. Take official notice of any material fact not appearing in evidence in the record, if the fact is among the traditional matters of judicial notice;

j. Administer oaths or affirmations; and

k. Take such other actions and exercise such other powers and authority as may be necessary for a fair, expeditious, and complete hearing.

7. Unless the hearing officer has been authorized to make a final decision, in accordance with this Code, the recommendation of the hearing officer shall be transmitted to the official with authority to
make a final decision. The official may affirm, modify or reject the recommendation and order further appropriate proceedings. The recommendation, when affirmed or modified, signed by the official with authority to make a final decision, and filed, shall constitute the decision on the matter, which shall be final.

8. The decision shall be sent to all parties by certified mail, return receipt requested. The decision shall state that a party aggrieved by the decision may within ten (10) Days of mailing request a rehearing.

G. Rehearing or Review of Final Decision

1. Any party who is aggrieved by a final decision of the official with authority to make a final decision may file with the official, not later than ten (10) Days after mailing of the decision, a written request for rehearing of the decision specifying the particular grounds. A supporting affidavit shall accompany the request and shall provide the factual basis of the cause on which rehearing exists.

2. Parties to the hearing shall be notified of the request. A response may be filed by any Party to the hearing within five (5) Days after receipt of the notice. The official with authority to make a final decision may require the filing of written briefs and may provide for oral argument.

3. A rehearing of the decision may be granted for any of the following causes, when such causes have materially affected the requesting party's rights:

a. Irregularity in the proceedings or any order or abuse of discretion, whereby the requesting party was deprived of a fair hearing;

b. Misconduct of the official with authority to make a final decision, the hearing officer, or any party;

c. Accident or surprise that could not have been prevented by ordinary prudence;

d. Newly discovered material evidence that could not with reasonable diligence have been discovered and produced at the original hearing;
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e. Excessive or insufficient penalties or remedies;

f. Abuse of discretion in the admission or rejection of evidence or other error of law occurring;

g. A showing that the decision is not justified by the evidence or is contrary to law.

4. A decision concerning a request for rehearing shall be in writing and state the basis for the decision. A decision granting a rehearing shall specify with particularity the basis on which the rehearing is granted, and the rehearing shall cover only those matters so specified.

5. The official with authority to make a final decision, within the time for filing a motion for rehearing under this ABOR Policy 3-809.G, may on his own initiative order a rehearing or review of the decision for any reason for which he might have granted a rehearing on motion of a party.

H. Master List

1. The Board shall maintain a master list of Debarments and Suspensions under this ABOR Policy 3-809. The master list shall show the following:

2. The names of those Persons and Affiliates whom the Universities or the Board have debarred or suspended under this ABOR Policy 3-809.

3. The period of Debarment or Suspension, including the expiration date;

4. The basis for the Debarment or Suspension; and

5. A separate section listing Persons or Affiliates voluntarily excluded from participation in University Procurements.

I. Miscellaneous

1. Notwithstanding any law to the contrary, including the provisions of A.R.S. §§ 12-820, et seq., this ABOR Policy 3-809 and the procedures provided by this section shall be the exclusive procedures for asserting a claim against a University arising out of
or in relation to any Procurement conducted or Contract awarded under this Code.

2. Any final decision of an official with authority to make a final decision in a matter referred to in this ABOR Policy 3-809 is subject to judicial review pursuant to A.R.S.§ 12-904 by any party to the proceedings before that official, including the University or Procurement Officer.

3. Any complaint seeking judicial review of a final decision shall be served upon the Board within the time prescribed pursuant to A.R.S. 12-904.

4. The applicable procedures set forth in this ABOR Policy 3-809, including the procedure on rehearing set forth in ABOR Policy 3-809G, if grounds for a rehearing exist, is a jurisdictional prerequisite to obtaining a final decision for which judicial review may be sought. The failure to complete any applicable procedure shall constitute a failure to exhaust administrative remedies.
Section 3-811, as revised

Significant Procurement Role

A. “Significant Procurement Role” means any role that includes any of the following duties:

1. Participating in the development of a Procurement.
2. Participating in the development of an evaluation tool.
3. Approving a Procurement or new evaluation tool.
4. Soliciting quotes greater than ten thousand dollars ($10,000) for the provisions of Materials, Services, Construction, or Construction Services.
5. Serving as a technical advisor or an evaluator who evaluates a Procurement.
6. Recommending or selecting a Person that will provide Materials, Services, Construction, or Construction Services.
7. Serving as a decision maker or designee on a Protest or an appeal by a party regarding a Procurement selection or decision.
8. SIGNIFICANT PROCUREMENT ROLE DOES NOT INCLUDE MAKING DECISIONS ON DEVELOPING SPECIFICATIONS AND THE SCOPE OF WORK FOR A PROCUREMENT IF THE DECISION IS BASED ON THE APPLICATION OF COMMONLY ACCEPTED INDUSTRY STANDARDS OR KNOWN PUBLISHED STANDARDS OF THE AGENCY AS APPLIED TO THE PROJECT, SERVICES, GOODS OR MATERIALS.

B. Prohibited Activity.

1. It is unlawful for a Procurement Officer or an employee having a Significant Procurement Role to accept any position or have employment discussions with a Person lobbying or potentially responding to the Solicitation beginning on signature of the first nondisclosure agreement pertaining to a particular Solicitation or at the time of request for a Sole Source Procurement or any other
Procurement for which competition is impracticable and ending at the time of Contract Award. It is unlawful for a Procurement Officer or an employee having a Significant Procurement Role to accept any position or have employment discussions with the successful Offeror or Offerors and their lobbyists beginning on signature of the first nondisclosure agreement pertaining to a particular Solicitation or at the time of request for a Sole Source Procurement or any other Procurement for which competition is impracticable, and ending one (1) year after the purchased materials are delivered or the purchase of Services or Construction begins, if the Procurement Officer or employee had a Significant Procurement Role in the particular Procurement.

2. It is unlawful for a Procurement Officer or an employee having a Significant Procurement Role to solicit an employment opportunity, regardless of who would receive such an opportunity, from any Person lobbying or potentially responding to a Solicitation for the Procurement of Materials, Services or Construction beginning on signature of the first nondisclosure agreement pertaining to a particular Solicitation or at the time of request for a Sole Source Procurement or any other Procurement for which competition is impracticable and ending at the time of Contract Award. It is unlawful for a Procurement Officer or an employee having a Significant Procurement Role to solicit an employment opportunity, regardless of who would receive such an opportunity, from the successful Offeror or Offerors and their lobbyists beginning on signature of the first nondisclosure agreement pertaining to a particular Solicitation or at the time of request for a Sole Source Procurement or any other Procurement for which competition is impracticable and ending one (1) year after the purchased Materials are delivered or the purchase of Services or Construction begins, if the Procurement Officer or employee had a significant role in the particular Procurement.

3. It is unlawful for a Person lobbying or potentially responding to a Solicitation for the Procurement of Materials, Services or Construction to offer employment to a Procurement Officer or an employee having a Significant Procurement Role beginning on signature of the first nondisclosure agreement pertaining to a particular Solicitation or at the time of request for a Sole Source Procurement or any other Procurement for which competition is impracticable and ending at the time of Contract Award. It is unlawful for the successful Offeror or Offerors and their lobbyists to offer employment to a Procurement Officer or an employee having
C. Waiver. The CPO may waive any or all of the waiting period required pursuant to this ABOR Policy 3-811B.1, B.2, or B.3 in excess of twenty-four (24) months for a Procurement Officer or an employee with a Significant Procurement Role if the period of time that follows the signature of the nondisclosure agreement exceeds twenty-four (24) months. A Procurement Officer or an employee seeking a waiver shall make a written request to the CPO. The CPO shall provide a written decision and justification within fifteen (15) business Days after the receipt of the complete request. The CPO may not approve waiver requests for matters still in evaluation or within six (6) months following the Contract Award. If the requesting party is the CPO, the request for a waiver and all written materials must be forwarded to the University President for a final decision.

D. In response to a written request from an employee seeking clarification on whether the employee has played a significant role in a Procurement, the CPO shall issue a determination in writing within fifteen (15) Days after receiving the request. The CPO may make a determination in writing that this section does not apply if a particular Solicitation, Sole Source Procurement or any other Procurement for which competition is impracticable has been canceled.

E. It is unlawful for a Procurement Officer or an employee who was previously employed by a Person responding to a Solicitation to serve in a Significant Procurement Role for a period of one (1) year following the person’s previous employment.

F. If a University uses a qualified list of Persons that are eligible to be selected to design, develop, implement or construct any form of project associated with the list, any Procurement Officer who was assigned to work evaluating or approving the list of eligible Persons or any employee having a Significant Procurement Role in developing the list shall not accept an offer of employment from or have employment discussions with a Person on the list within one (1) year after the initial publication of the list or accept an offer of employment from or have employment discussions with a newly added Person on the list within one (1) year after the Person
is added to the original list. If a Person from an approved list of qualified Persons is awarded a Contract that is associated with the list, a Procurement Officer involved in selecting the Person or an employee having a Significant Procurement Role in selecting the Person shall not accept an offer of employment from or have employment discussions with that Person within one (1) year after that Person is awarded the Contract.

G. On signature of a nondisclosure agreement pertaining to a particular Solicitation, or at the time of a request for a Sole Source Procurement or any other Procurement for which competition is impracticable, a Procurement Officer or an employee having a significant role in the Procurement shall provide written disclosure of any financial interest the officer or employee, or the spouse of the officer or employee, may hold.

H. This section does not apply to a Procurement Officer or employee who in good faith relies on a determination issued by the CPO pursuant to subsection D of this section that the Procurement Officer or employee has not had a Significant Procurement Role.
Item Name: Amended Capital Development Plan (ASU)

☐ Action Item

Requested Action: Arizona State University (ASU) asks the board to approve its Amended Capital Development Plan, which includes three new projects, as described in this Executive Summary.

Previous Board Action

- Annual Capital Development Plan (CDP) February 2018
  - ASU’s $590.0 million CDP included six projects.
  - Of the $590.0 million total CDP, $550.0 million will be debt-financed.
  - Details on the ongoing and completed capital projects are included in Exhibit 1.

- Amended Capital Development Plan June 2018
  - ASU’s $36.0 million Amended CDP included one new internally-funded project, the Novus Place Parking Structure.

- Amended Capital Development Plan September 2018
  - ASU’s $32.0 million Amended CDP included one new debt-financed project, Information Technology (IT) Infrastructure Improvements.

Overview and Alignment with Enterprise and University Goals and Objectives

- This ASU Amended CDP includes three new projects totaling $57.0 million.

- ASU has developed this Amended CDP to align with the university’s campus master plan and the ABOR enterprise and university strategic goals and objectives.

Contact Information:
Morgan R. Olsen, Executive Vice President, Treasurer and CFO • (480) 727-9920 • Morgan.R.Olsen@asu.edu
• These institutional priorities are supported by this Amended CDP:
  
  o **Academic Success:** The proposed projects will contribute to advancing the university’s twin pillars of academic success—leadership in academic excellence and accessibility and national standing in academic quality. These projects will provide essential support to achieving the following goals and metrics by 2025:
    
    ▪ Increase total enrollment to 125,000
    ▪ Improve the freshman retention rate to 90 percent
    ▪ Increase the six-year graduation rate to 75 percent
    ▪ Increase bachelor’s degrees awarded to 21,430 and graduate degrees awarded to 10,670.
  
  o **Research and Development:** The proposed projects also will support the university’s research goals, including the enhancement of its research competitiveness to more than $815 million in annual research expenditures by 2025. University research expenditures are used in part to advance the state of knowledge in various fields; purchase local goods and services; help create new companies and jobs; support the development of next-generation scientists and innovators; and attract top research talent to the faculty. Research and development expenditures also support the state’s competitive advantage in science, technology and medicine.
  
  o **Campus Operations and Infrastructure Priorities:** To advance the university’s academic and research goals, its facilities and related infrastructure must be maintained in a safe operational condition. The proposed projects will ensure the efficient, reliable and safe operation of all essential campus infrastructure and systems that support the mission and goals of the university.
  
  o **Life Safety and Code Compliance:** Life safety and code compliance matters assume the highest priority in ensuring a safe environment for students, faculty, staff and visitors and in supporting the achievement of the university’s academic and research goals. These projects will support the safety and security of the university’s learning environments and ensure compliance with current standards and codes.
  
  o **Capital Infrastructure Fund:** The amended CDP includes the Building and Infrastructure Enhancements and Modifications project that will benefit from the recently enacted Capital Infrastructure Fund (CIF) to provide annual funding for capital projects, matched with university funds.
Capital Development Plan Projects

- Following are the previously-approved CDP projects:
  - Biomedical Research Laboratory Building Improvements
  - Durham Language and Literature Building Renovation
  - Hayden Library Reinvention
  - Health Solutions Innovation Center
  - Interdisciplinary Science and Technology Building (ISTB) 7
  - Wells Fargo Arena Renovation and New Multi-Purpose Arena
  - Novus Place Parking Structure
  - Information Technology (IT) Infrastructure Improvements

- The following additional projects are proposed for Amended CDP approval:
  - Building and Infrastructure Enhancements and Modifications
  - Classroom and Academic Renovations
  - Research Laboratories and Faculty Startup

  - Additional details on the scope, costs and financing of these projects are included in the Project Justification Reports attached hereto.

Fiscal Impact and Management

- The Amended CDP, if fully implemented, includes $57.0 million in total project costs and will be debt-financed with system revenue bonds.

- ASU:
  (a) will sell one or more series of System Revenue Bonds to finance the projects, as identified in Exhibit 2, costs of issuance, and payments to a bond insurer or other credit enhancer, provided such payments result in a benefit that exceeds the amount of such payments;
  (b) will sell bonds at a price at, above or below par, on a tax-exempt or taxable basis, in one or more series, at a fixed or variable rate of interest;
  (c) will enter into necessary agreements, including those related to bond insurance or other credit enhancement agreements; and,
  (d) upon approval of this item, the following are each separately authorized in the name and on behalf of the Board to take all appropriate actions to finalize negotiations and to sign and deliver all documents and agreements necessary to consummate the transaction described in this Executive Summary on substantially the terms described herein: the ASU President, the ASU Executive Vice President, Treasurer and Chief Financial Officer and the Vice President for Finance and Deputy Treasurer, or any successor titles to such positions.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- **Debt Ratio Impact:** The projected incremental debt ratio impact on system revenue bond debt service is 0.14 percent.

- The tables in Exhibits 2 and 3 provide details on projection information, funding sources and debt ratio impact.

Committee Review and Recommendation

The Finance, Capital and Resources Committee reviewed this item at its November 1, 2018 meeting and recommended forwarding to the full board for approval.

Statutory/Policy Requirements

- Pursuant to Arizona Board of Regents Policy Chapter 7-107, each university shall submit an annual Capital Development Plan for the upcoming twelve-month period in accordance with the calendar approved by the president of the Board. Capital Development Plans are reviewed by the Finance, Capital and Resources Committee and approved by the Board.

- Pursuant to Arizona Board of Regents Policy Chapter 7-107, amendments to the Capital Development Plan may be reviewed at regular Finance, Capital and Resources Committee meetings and considered for approval at regular Board meetings for new projects added outside of the regular Capital Development Plan schedule.
### Ongoing Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Gross Square Feet</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>Percent Work Completed</th>
<th>Percent Total Expended</th>
<th>Percent to Gift Target</th>
<th>Date Last Board Approval</th>
<th>Original/Revised Occupancy Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Research Laboratory Building Improvements</td>
<td>112,000</td>
<td>$40,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2/8/2018</td>
<td>7/31/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham Language and Literature Building Renovation</td>
<td>137,000</td>
<td>$45,000,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2/8/2018</td>
<td>1/11/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Conservation I</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$12,950,000</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>11/16/2017</td>
<td>8/30/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayden Library Reinvention</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>$90,000,000</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2/8/2018</td>
<td>12/31/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Solutions Innovation Center</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>$80,000,000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2/8/2018</td>
<td>10/30/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology (IT) Infrastructure Improvements</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$32,000,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9/28/2018</td>
<td>3/31/2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary Science and Technology Building (ISTB) 7</td>
<td>258,000</td>
<td>$175,000,000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2/8/2018</td>
<td>6/7/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novus Place Parking Structure</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>$36,000,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6/14/2018</td>
<td>1/31/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells Fargo Arena Renovation and New Multi-Purpose Arena</td>
<td>405,000</td>
<td>$160,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2/8/2018</td>
<td>9/30/2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ongoing Third-Party Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Gross Square Feet</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>Percent Work Completed</th>
<th>Percent Total Expended</th>
<th>Percent to Gift Target</th>
<th>Date Last Board Approval</th>
<th>Original/Revised Occupancy Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sun Devil Energy Center, LLC</td>
<td>21,989</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6/7/2017</td>
<td>5/31/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Completed Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Gross Square Feet</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>Percent Work Completed</th>
<th>Percent Total Expended</th>
<th>Percent to Gift Target</th>
<th>Date Last Board Approval</th>
<th>Original/Revised Occupancy Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong Hall/ Ross-Blakley Library Renovation 1</td>
<td>167,000</td>
<td>$26,000,000</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2/2/2017</td>
<td>5/18/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodesign C</td>
<td>188,447</td>
<td>$120,000,000</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4/6/2016</td>
<td>5/1/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Plant Chilled Water System Optimization</td>
<td>21,989</td>
<td>$10,380,000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6/9/2016</td>
<td>2/28/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Leadership Village Community Center</td>
<td>30,666</td>
<td>$14,000,000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6/9/2017</td>
<td>7/3/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Pavilion</td>
<td>74,653</td>
<td>$39,900,000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>11/19/2015</td>
<td>8/7/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Devil Stadium Renovation 2</td>
<td>813,953</td>
<td>$307,600,000</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>9/28/2017</td>
<td>8/31/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Completed Third-Party Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Gross Square Feet</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>Percent Work Completed</th>
<th>Percent Total Expended</th>
<th>Percent to Gift Target</th>
<th>Date Last Board Approval</th>
<th>Original/Revised Occupancy Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fulton Schools Residential Community at Toeker House</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6/4/2015</td>
<td>8/15/2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Leadership Village</td>
<td>309,000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>11/17/2016</td>
<td>7/31/2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This exhibit reflects the status of Arizona State University capital projects effective October 1, 2018.

1. The Board approved the combination of these projects to capture efficiencies in the project design and construction process.
2. This project budget and schedule reflects all phases of the overall Sun Devil Stadium Renovation project. The Sun Devil Stadium Renovation project will be completed in three phases with a total budget of $307,600,000.
## EXHIBIT 2
Arizona State University
FY 2019 Amended Capital Development Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Board Approval Status</th>
<th>Gross Square Footage</th>
<th>Project Cost</th>
<th>Amount Financed</th>
<th>Funding Method</th>
<th>Annual Debt Service</th>
<th>Debt Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASUT - Building and Infrastructure Enhancements and Modifications</td>
<td>CIP Sept 2018</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$32,000,000</td>
<td>$32,000,000</td>
<td>System Revenue Bonds</td>
<td>$2,151,300</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASUT - Classroom and Academic Renovations</td>
<td>CIP Sept 2018</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>System Revenue Bonds</td>
<td>$745,500</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASUT - Research Laboratories and Faculty Startup</td>
<td>CIP Sept 2018</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>System Revenue Bonds</td>
<td>$1,118,200</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Project Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>$57,000,000</td>
<td>$57,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,015,000</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Amended CDP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>$57,000,000</td>
<td>$57,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,015,000</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## EXHIBIT 3
Arizona State University
Annual Debt Service and Operations and Maintenance by Funding Source

### CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN - ANNUAL DEBT SERVICE BY FUNDING SOURCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Amount Financed</th>
<th>CIF</th>
<th>TUI</th>
<th>AUX</th>
<th>ICR</th>
<th>OLF</th>
<th>SLP</th>
<th>FGT</th>
<th>DFG</th>
<th>OTH</th>
<th>TOTAL ANNUAL DEBT SERVICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Academic/Support Project</td>
<td>$57,000,000</td>
<td>$1,075,650</td>
<td>$2,939,350</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,015,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASU - Building and Infrastructure Enhancements and Modifications</td>
<td>$32,000,000</td>
<td>$1,075,650</td>
<td>$1,075,650</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,151,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASU Classroom and Academic Renovations</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$745,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$745,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASU - Research Laboratories and Faculty Startup</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,118,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,118,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Project Total</td>
<td>$57,000,000</td>
<td>$1,075,650</td>
<td>$2,939,350</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,015,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE BY FUNDING SOURCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>TOTAL ANNUAL O&amp;M</th>
<th>CIF</th>
<th>TUI</th>
<th>AUX</th>
<th>ICR</th>
<th>OLF</th>
<th>GFA</th>
<th>FGT</th>
<th>DFG</th>
<th>OTH</th>
<th>TOTAL ANNUAL O&amp;M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Academic Support Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASU Building Infrastructure Enhancements and Modifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASU Classroom and Academic Renovations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASU Research Laboratories and Faculty Startup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously Approved Academic Support Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Arizona Board of Regents
Arizona State University
Amended Capital Development Plan – Project Justification Report
Building and Infrastructure Enhancements and Modifications

Previous Board Action
- FY 2020-2022 Capital Improvement Plan
- September 2018

Project Justification/Description/Scope
- This project bundle will address the university’s primary areas of concern for buildings and infrastructure at all campuses, such as the upgrade and replacement of aging mechanical, electrical and other critical building systems, the renewal of aging elevators and the repair and replacement of timeworn roofs. Additionally, the university plans to map out the underground utilities for the Tempe and Polytechnic campuses to support the development of a master plan and to prioritize the required replacement of its aging utility infrastructure.

- Many components of the ASU built environment, including much of the underground infrastructure, have exceeded their useful life and are incapable of effectively supporting the advancement of the university’s mission of academic and research excellence. The planned projects will ensure the efficient, reliable and safe operation of all essential campus infrastructure and systems, including those that must continue without interruption to support the university’s critical academic and research initiatives.

- These projects not only will enhance the quality of the campus infrastructure and systems, but also will keep the university in compliance with code requirements and address ABOR directives to reduce deferred maintenance. Projects essential for life safety, code compliance and the advancement of university strategic initiatives will be given top priority.

Project Delivery Method and Process
- Depending on the nature of the work, components of this project bundle may be delivered through the Design Build (DB), Construction Manager at Risk (CMAR) or Job Order Contracting (JOC) methods.

- ASU has not yet selected a DB, CMAR, JOC contractor or design professional firm for any components of this project bundle. Contractors and design professionals will be selected according to ABOR policy and Arizona law.
Project Status and Schedule

- Design Professionals (DPs) will be selected after CDP approval. The project design will be complete approximately six to twelve months after the DP contract has been awarded for that component of work.

- General construction is scheduled to begin when the design is complete and after all approvals are in place. Construction on all project components is targeted for completion by December 2021.

Project Cost

- The total budget for this project bundle is $32.0 million.

- For this CDP phase, no preliminary external cost estimates have been provided by third-party consultants. The DP and DB, CMAR or JOC contractor teams have not yet been selected for these project components. Independent cost estimates will be provided by the DP, DB, CMAR or JOC contractor after these selections are complete.

- For projects selected to use the DB or CMAR delivery method, the construction manager will be at risk to provide the completed project within the agreed-upon Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP).

Fiscal Impact and Financing Plan

- This $32.0 million project bundle will be funded with system revenue bond proceeds. The annual debt service of approximately $2.2 million will be funded by the State of Arizona Capital Infrastructure Fund and matched by university tuition.

- There are no expected increases in operation and maintenance costs associated with this project bundle.

- **Debt Ratio Impact:** The projected incremental debt ratio impact for this project bundle is 0.07 percent.

Occupancy Plan

- These projects will not affect occupancy or programs but will renew building and campus infrastructure and support the advancement of the university’s academic and research initiatives.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Statutory/Policy Requirements

- ABOR Policy 7-102 requires that all capital projects with an estimated total project cost of $10.0 million or more shall be included in the Capital Development Plan.

- ABOR Policy Chapter 7-107 requires Amended Capital Development Plan approval for new projects added outside of the regular Capital Development Plan.
Capital Project Information Summary

**University:** Arizona State University  
**Project Name:** Building and Infrastructure Enhancements and Modifications

**Project Description and Location:** This project bundle will address the university’s primary building and infrastructure areas of concern at all campuses, such as the upgrade and replacement of aging mechanical, electrical and other critical building systems, the renewal of aging elevators and the repair and replacement of timeworn roofs. The university also plans to map out the underground utilities for the Tempe and Polytechnic campuses to support the development of a master plan and to prioritize the required replacement of its aging utility infrastructure.

**Project Schedule:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>June 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Start</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Start</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Completion</td>
<td>December 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Budget:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td>$32,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Construction Cost</td>
<td>$17,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost per GSF</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost per GSF</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Change in Annual O & M Cost:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Operating</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funding Sources:**

**Capital**

A. System Revenue Bonds $32,000,000

Debt Service Funding Sources:
- Tuition
- Capital Infrastructure Fund

**Operation/Maintenance** $0

Funding Sources: Not Applicable
Previous Board Action

- FY 2020-2022 Capital Improvement Plan September 2018

Project Justification/Description/Scope

- ASU intends to renovate existing classrooms, create new classrooms of various sizes and add smaller instructional spaces at all campuses. Plans call for the renovation of approximately 50,000 gross square feet of classrooms and academic space, including faculty and student space. Building components, such as heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC), plumbing, electrical systems, flooring, ceilings, roofs, windows, doors, internal walls and partitions, elevators, and fire prevention equipment may be upgraded in these projects. The Classroom and Academic Renovations project bundle will comprise multiple components at each ASU campus.

- The ASU Strategic Enterprise Framework identifies several goals, including improved retention and graduation performance, curricular reform, and improved student outcomes, that will be aided by this project. Resources needed to achieve these goals include continued investment in faculty, as well as space renovations to support teaching innovations. These projects will provide renovated and growth space for academic programs, allowing better student and faculty interaction and learning experiences. The work will create attractive spaces for student learning and renovate worn areas that distract from teaching and learning effectiveness, resulting in improved and updated space for new faculty hires.

- These project components will enhance the quality of the built environment, with improved space for faculty and a better classroom experience for students, compliance with code requirements for safety, and reduced deferred maintenance. Project components essential for life safety, code compliance and those that support university strategic initiatives will be given top priority.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Project Delivery Method and Process

- Depending on the nature of the work, components of this project bundle may be delivered through either the Construction Manager at Risk (CMAR) or Job Order Contracting (JOC) method.

- ASU has not yet selected a CMAR, JOC contractor or design professional firm for any components of this project bundle. Contractors and design professionals will be selected according to ABOR policy and Arizona law.

Project Status and Schedule

- Design Professionals (DPs) will be selected after CDP approval. The design will be complete within approximately six to nine months after the DP contract is awarded.

- General construction is scheduled to begin when the design is complete and after all approvals are in place. Construction on all project components is targeted for completion by December 2021.

Project Cost

- The total budget for this project bundle is $10.0 million. This budget represents an estimated construction cost of $150 per gross square foot. The estimated total project cost is $200 per gross square foot.

- For this CDP phase, no preliminary external cost estimates have been provided by third-party consultants. DP and CMAR or JOC contractor teams have not yet been selected for these projects. Independent cost estimates will be provided by the DP, CMAR or JOC contractor after these selections are complete.

- For projects selected to use the CMAR delivery method, the construction manager will be at risk to provide the completed project within the agreed-upon Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP).

Fiscal Impact and Financing Plan

- This $10.0 million project bundle will be funded with system revenue bond proceeds. The annual debt service of approximately $0.7 million will be funded by tuition.

- There are no expected increases in operation and maintenance costs associated with this project bundle.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- **Debt Ratio Impact**: The projected incremental debt ratio impact for this project bundle is 0.03 percent.

**Occupancy Plan**

- These project components will reconfigure and renew spaces for classroom and academic areas. Programs may be temporarily displaced as spaces are renovated.

**Statutory/Policy Requirements**

- ABOR Policy 7-102 requires that all capital projects with an estimated total project cost of $10.0 million or more shall be included in the Capital Development Plan.

- ABOR Policy Chapter 7-107 requires Amended Capital Development Plan approval for new projects added outside of the regular Capital Development Plan.
Capital Project Information Summary

**University:** Arizona State University  **Project Name:** Classroom and Academic Renovations

**Project Description and Location:** This project bundle includes the renovation of approximately 50,000 gross square feet of classrooms and academic space, including faculty and student space at all campuses. Building components, such as HVAC, plumbing, electrical systems, flooring, ceilings, roofs, windows, doors, internal walls and partitions, elevators, and fire prevention equipment may be upgraded in these projects.

**Project Schedule:**

- **Planning:** June 2018
- **Design Start:** December 2018
- **Construction Start:** March 2019
- **Construction Completion:** December 2021

**Project Budget:**

- **Total Project Cost:** $10,000,000
- **Total Project Construction Cost:** $7,500,000
- **Total Project Cost per GSF:** $200
- **Construction Cost per GSF:** $150

**Change in Annual O & M Cost:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Operating</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funding Sources:**

- **Capital**
  
  A. **System Revenue Bonds** $10,000,000
  
  **Debt Service Funding Sources:** Tuition

- **Operation/Maintenance** $0
  
  **Funding Sources:** Not applicable
Arizona Board of Regents  
Arizona State University  
Amended Capital Development Plan – Project Justification Report  
Research Laboratories and Faculty Startup

Previous Board Action

- FY 2020-2022 Capital Improvement Plan  
  September 2018

Project Justification/Description/Scope

- The Research Laboratories and Faculty Startup project bundle will involve the renovation of approximately 40,000 gross square feet of laboratories to meet new and current research requirements within existing facilities. Multiple wet and dry lab spaces will be upgraded, as well as infrastructure and building systems, in order to maximize adaptable and flexible technologies. Renovation activities will involve building systems, such as heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC), electrical and mechanical, as well as fume hoods, laboratory gas lines, and code-required life safety upgrades.

- Many existing university laboratories and building systems are inadequate, due to age and the requirements of emerging technologies. The poor condition of the spaces and age of the building systems constrain the development of these strategically important areas. This project bundle will ensure facility systems meet research demands and areas are maintained in code compliance. The projects will convert inadequate classroom laboratories, research laboratories and research building systems into state-of-the-art research facilities.

- Increasing research activity and the resultant arrival of new faculty continue to make laboratory renovation projects an imperative. Spaces must be updated and renovated to address the needs of incoming researchers and successful grant applications. These laboratories will provide the core infrastructure from which faculty and students can compete in the global marketplace of ideas, not only stimulating advances in science and human health, but also potentially advancing the regional economy.

- The 2012 campus master plan update identified a need for additional research space totaling 350,000 gross square feet. This project bundle will contribute to meeting this need and accomplishing the research goals of the university.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Project Delivery Method and Process

- Depending on the nature of the work, components of this project bundle may be delivered through either the Construction Manager at Risk (CMAR) or the Job Order Contracting (JOC) methods.

- ASU has not yet selected a CMAR, JOC contractor or design professional firm for any components of this project bundle. Contractors and design professionals will be selected according to ABOR policy and Arizona law.

Project Status and Schedule

- Design Professionals (DPs) will be selected after CDP approval. The design will be complete within approximately six to nine months after the DP contract is awarded.

- General construction is scheduled to begin when the design is complete and after all approvals are in place. Construction on all project components is targeted for completion by December 2021.

Project Cost

- The total budget for this project bundle is $15.0 million. This budget represents an estimated construction cost of $260 per gross square foot. The estimated total project cost is $375 per gross square foot.

- For this CDP phase, no preliminary external cost estimates have been provided by third-party consultants. DP and CMAR or JOC contractor teams have not been selected yet for these project components. Independent cost estimates will be provided by the DP, CMAR or JOC contractor after these selections are complete.

- For project components selected to use the CMAR delivery method, the construction manager will be at risk to provide the completed project within the agreed-upon Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP).

Fiscal Impact and Financing Plan

- This $15.0 million project bundle will be funded with system revenue bond proceeds. The annual debt service of approximately $1.1 million will be funded by tuition.

- There are no expected increases in operation and maintenance costs associated with this project bundle.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- **Debt Ratio Impact:** The projected incremental debt ratio impact for this project bundle is 0.04 percent.

**Occupancy Plan**

- These project components will not affect occupancy or programs but will renew research spaces and support the advancement of the university’s research initiatives.

**Statutory/Policy Requirements**

- ABOR Policy 7-102 requires that all capital projects with an estimated total project cost of $10.0 million or more shall be included in the Capital Development Plan.

- ABOR Policy Chapter 7-107 requires Amended Capital Development Plan approval for new projects added outside of the regular Capital Development Plan.
Capital Project Information Summary

University: Arizona State University  Project Name: Research Laboratories and Faculty Startup

Project Description and Location: This project bundle will involve the renovation of approximately 40,000 gross square feet of existing laboratory space required to establish the university as a leading center for interdisciplinary research and discovery. Multiple wet and dry lab spaces will be upgraded, as well as infrastructure and building systems, in order to maximize adaptable and flexible technologies.

Project Schedule:

Planning: June 2018
Design Start: December 2018
Construction Start: March 2019
Construction Completion: December 2021

Project Budget:

Total Project Cost: $15,000,000
Total Project Construction Cost: $10,400,000
Total Project Cost per GSF: $375
Total Construction Cost per GSF: $260

Change in Annual O & M Cost:

Utilities: $0
Personnel: $0
All Other Operating: $0

Subtotal: $0

Funding Sources:

Capital

A. System Revenue Bonds: $15,000,000

Debt Service Funding Sources: Tuition

Operation/Maintenance: $0

Funding Sources: Not Applicable
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Item Name: FY 2019 Capital Development Plan (UA)

☑️ Action Item

**Requested Action:** The University of Arizona asks the board to approve its FY 2019 Capital Development Plan (CDP), and financing, which includes four (4) new projects and two (2) previously approved projects. The CDP total project budget is $352 million. The financing request is $314.7 million for the projects in the financing plan outlined in the CDP. The FY 2019 CDP does not include any third-party projects, as presented in this Executive Summary.

**Previous Board Action**
- Capital Improvement Plan FY 2020-2022  
  September 2018
- FY 2018 Capital Development Plan  
  June 2017

**Prior Year Activity**
- Four capital projects totaling $185 million were substantially completed in the last 12 months.
- Eight capital projects, totaling $325.55 million, began or were under construction activity in the last 12 months. Additionally, a third – party project is under construction.
- One capital project of $16 million with CDP approval has not yet started.

**Overview and Alignment with Enterprise and University Goals and Objectives**
- The UA FY 2019 CDP includes six projects totaling $352 million, and no third-party projects.
- The UA has developed the CDP to align with the University’s campus master plan, and the Enterprise and University strategic goals and objectives.
- The primary institutional priorities supported by the CDP include:
  - **Academic Success:** Facility investment and development are targeted toward student success, academic excellence, diversity and accessibility as measured by our strategic plan goals for enrollment, retention, graduation rates and degrees awarded. The Student Success District is specifically targeted toward these goals.
  - **Research & Development:** University research greatly contributes to the quality of life and economic vitality of our state. Sponsored research expenditures include the purchase of local goods and services which help to create new companies and employment benefits. Research and development
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

provides hands-on experience for students while attracting top research talent and giving the state a competitive advantage in core areas such as science, technology and medicine. Facilities, research faculty and sponsored grants are key to meeting the objectives of the ABOR 2025 Vision Plan. The proposed Applied Research Building and Grand Challenges Research Building are targeted to most favorably position the University to meet these goals.

– Campus Operations and Infrastructure Priorities: To advance our academic success and research goals, our facilities and related infrastructure must be safe, reliable and operational. Building and utility systems must be efficient to operate and maintain to reduce the burden on reduced operational funds. Spaces and systems must maximize functionality and performance while minimizing investments. As proposed, Campus Deferred Maintenance 2019 project and the Campus Research Infrastructure projects are targeted to meet these goals.

– Life Safety & Code Compliance: Life safety is our highest priority in ensuring a safe, functional and serviceable environment for students, faculty, staff and visitors. This priority is established for new and existing facilities alike. All of our projects are targeted to meet these goals and the Deferred Maintenance 2019 project will work to bring existing facilities into compliance as well.

– Community Service Opportunities: Engaging and serving Arizona communities are integral to the University’s mission and land grant responsibilities. Our community outreach and service efforts are focused on the quality of life and economic prosperity in Arizona.

– Construction Market Conditions: The current construction market is active with increasing labor shortages and accompanying price escalations for the foreseeable future. It is advisable to proceed with projects and lock-in prices to minimize additional escalation for the University.

– Funding Sources & Financing Options: Project funding and financing are carefully considered on a project-by-project basis and take advantage of opportunities to minimize impacts to tuition. State appropriations, gift funding and indirect cost recovery are leveraged and maximized while fees, tuition and operational funding are carefully metered for highest yield. At all times the University’s financial strength, standing and ratings are considered to ensure long term stability and success.

Capital Development Plan Projects

• The following lists the new and previously approved proposed for CDP approval. See Exhibit 5 for map.

New Projects
  o Applied Research Building
  o Grand Challenges Research Building (previously submitted as IRIB 2)
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Campus Deferred Maintenance 2019
- Phoenix Biomedical Sciences Partnership Building 3rd & 4th Floor Finish Shell Space

Previously Approved Projects
- Student Success District (Revised)
- Campus Research Infrastructure (previously submitted as North Campus Infrastructure Phase 2)

Fiscal Impact and Management

- The UA CDP includes 4 new projects (Applied Research Building, Grand Challenges Research Building, Biomedical Sciences Partnership Building 3rd & 4th Floor Finish Shell Space, and Campus Deferred Maintenance 2019) and two revised projects (Student Success District and Campus Research Infrastructure). The UA CDP, if fully implemented, will cost a total of $352 million.

- Of the total $352 million CDP budget, $314.7 million will be financed using debt. The remaining amount will be financed using $11 million in state capital infrastructure appropriations, $16.3 million in University local funds, and $10 million in gifts.

- The estimated annual debt service on projects to be financed with debt totals $22.9 million. The annual debt payments are based on financing terms of approximately 20-25 year maturities and estimated 4.35-5.85 percent interest rates. The financing terms are based on differing types of issuance, including both tax-exempt and taxable System Revenue Bonds and SPEED Revenue Bonds, final maturity, and the timing of the debt issuance. Detailed financing information is presented in Exhibits 2 & 3.

- The total operating and maintenance (O&M) cost associated with the projects in the CDP is estimated to be $2.9 million. The UA plans to use indirect cost recovery, student fees, and space rental income to pay the O&M cost.

- UA will:
  - Sell one or more series of System Revenue Bonds and SPEED Revenue Bonds to finance the projects as outlined in the CDP, costs of issuances, and payments to a bond insurer or other credit enhancer provided such payments result in a benefit that exceeds the amount of such payments;
  - Sell bonds at a price at, above, or below par, on a tax-exempt or taxable basis, in one or more series, at a fixed or variable rate of interest; and
  - Enter into necessary agreements, including those related to bond insurance or other credit enhancement agreements.

  - The UA intends to utilize a financial advisor, a bond counsel, and bond trustee(s) for the financing. The SRBs and SPEED Bonds will be marketed and sold on a negotiated basis either to one or more investment banking firms currently in a pool of bond underwriters procured by the three State universities or by the State of Arizona or by a direct sale to a bank or banks or other financial institutions.

•
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- **Debt Ratio Impact**: The debt service associated with projects in the CDP will increase the debt ratio to the highest level of 5.4 percent in FY 2020, excluding SPEED Bonds, and 6.6 percent, including SPEED Bonds.

- The tables in Exhibits 2 and 3 provide detail project financing, funding sources and debt ratio impact.

Committee Review and Recommendation

The Finance, Capital and Resources Committee reviewed this item at its November 1, 2018 meeting and recommended forwarding to the full board for approval.

Statutory/Policy Requirements

- Pursuant to Arizona Board of Regents Policy Chapter 7-107, each university shall submit an annual Capital Development Plan for the upcoming year in accordance with the calendar approved by the President of the Board.

- Capital Development Plans are reviewed by the Finance, Capital and Resources Committee and approved by the Board.

- Approval of the CDP allows universities to complete design, execute construction and financing agreements, and begin construction as outlined in policy.
## EXHIBIT 1
THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
FY 2019 CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN
CAPITAL PROJECT STATUS REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Square Feet</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>Percent Work Completed*</th>
<th>Percent Total Expended*</th>
<th>Gift Target</th>
<th>Percent to Gift Target*</th>
<th>Date Last Board Approval</th>
<th>Original/Revised Occupancy Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg. 90 Deferred Maintenance</td>
<td>59,914</td>
<td>$18,000,000</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Jun 17</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences Innovation Building</td>
<td>247,155</td>
<td>$165,000,000</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Jun 16</td>
<td>Nov 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICA Indoor Sports Center</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>$16,300,000</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Nov 17</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillenbrand Aquatic Center Improvements</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>$13,250,000</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Nov 17</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillenbrand Softball Facility Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Nov 17</td>
<td>Feb 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oro Valley Veterinarian Medical Program Improvement</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Nov 17</td>
<td>May 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Pharmacy Skaggs Building Addition and Renovation</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>$26,000,000</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Feb 18</td>
<td>Jan 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Success District</td>
<td>173,425</td>
<td>$71,000,000</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>Jun 17</td>
<td>Jun 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
CAPITAL PROJECT STATUS REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Square Feet</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>Percent Work Completed*</th>
<th>Percent Total Expended*</th>
<th>Gift Target</th>
<th>Percent to Gift Target*</th>
<th>Date Last Board Approval</th>
<th>Original/Revised Occupancy Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ongoing Third-Party Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA Honors Village</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,325,100</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Jun 17</td>
<td>Jul 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Completed Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Stadium Parking Structure</td>
<td>282,000</td>
<td>$22,000,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Nov 16</td>
<td>Sep 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioscience Research Lab including infrastructure component</td>
<td>150,200</td>
<td>$123,500,000</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Sep 14</td>
<td>Dec 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAHS Building 201 Renovations</td>
<td></td>
<td>$14,500,000</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Nov 17</td>
<td>Apr 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Stadium Renovation</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000,000</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Nov 17</td>
<td>Aug 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projects Not Yet Started</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Research Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jun 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Value as of September 30, 2018
## UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
### CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Capital Projects</th>
<th>Board Approval Status</th>
<th>Gross Square Footage</th>
<th>Project Cost</th>
<th>Amount Financed</th>
<th>Funding Method</th>
<th>Annual Debt Service</th>
<th>Final Maturity</th>
<th>Debt Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied Research Building</td>
<td>CIP FY 2020-2022</td>
<td>60,000 GSF</td>
<td>$50,000,000</td>
<td>$50,000,000</td>
<td>System Revenue Bonds</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
<td>June 2043</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Challenges Research Building</td>
<td>CIP FY 2020-2022</td>
<td>170,000 GSF</td>
<td>$150,000,000</td>
<td>$150,000,000</td>
<td>System Revenue Bonds</td>
<td>$11,100,000</td>
<td>June 2043</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Deferred Maintenance 2019</td>
<td>CIP FY 2020-2022</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$21,000,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>State Capital Infra Aprops and University Local Funds</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix Biomedical Sciences Partnership Building 3rd &amp; 4th Floor Finish Shell Space</td>
<td>CIP FY 2020-2022</td>
<td>46,100 GSF</td>
<td>$34,000,000</td>
<td>$34,000,000</td>
<td>System Revenue Bonds and SPEED Revenue Bonds</td>
<td>$2,600,000</td>
<td>June 2044</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Previously Approved Projects Total |             |                      |             | $255,000,000  | $234,000,000  | $17,200,000        |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previously Approved Projects</th>
<th>Board Approval Status</th>
<th>Gross Square Footage</th>
<th>Project Cost</th>
<th>Amount Financed</th>
<th>Funding Method</th>
<th>Annual Debt Service</th>
<th>Final Maturity</th>
<th>Debt Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Success District (Revised)</td>
<td>CIP FY 2017-2019</td>
<td>SSD: 60,000 GSF</td>
<td>$81,000,000</td>
<td>$64,700,000</td>
<td>System Revenue Bonds</td>
<td>$4,400,000</td>
<td>June 2045</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIP FY 2018-2020</td>
<td>BDG: 60,000 GSF (reno)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CDP June 2017</td>
<td>Main Library: 56,000 GSF (reno); Science Library 19,000 GSF (reno)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Research Infrastructure (Revised)</td>
<td>CDP June 2017</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$16,000,000</td>
<td>$16,000,000</td>
<td>System Revenue Bonds and SPEED Revenue Bonds</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td>June 2040</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Previously Approved Projects Total |             |                      |             | $97,000,000  | $80,700,000  | $5,700,000         |

| Total |             |                      |             | $352,000,000 | $314,700,000| $22,900,000      |
### EXHIBIT 3
THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
FY 2019 CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNUAL DEBT SERVICE BY FUNDING SOURCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>AMOUNT FINANCED</th>
<th>TUI</th>
<th>SFE</th>
<th>ICR</th>
<th>OLF</th>
<th>SCI</th>
<th>SLP</th>
<th>OTH</th>
<th>TOTAL ANNUAL DEBT SERVICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Capital Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Research Building</td>
<td>$50,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Challenges Research Building</td>
<td>$150,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Deferred Maintenance 2019</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix Biomedical Sciences Building – 3rd &amp; 4th Floor Build-Out</td>
<td>$34,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$862,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>$950,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$787,500 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Capital Project Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$234,000,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$17,200,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previously Approved Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Success District (Revised)</td>
<td>$64,700,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,550,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Research Infrastructure (Revised)</td>
<td>$16,000,000</td>
<td>$1,225,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previously Approved Project Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$80,700,000</strong></td>
<td>$1,225,000</td>
<td>$3,550,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$5,700,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$314,700,000</strong></td>
<td>$1,225,000</td>
<td>$3,550,000</td>
<td>$9,012,500</td>
<td>$7,300,000</td>
<td>$1,025,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$22,900,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Debt Service Funding Source Codes
(TUI) Tuition (SFE) Student Fees (ICR) Indirect Cost Recovery (OLF) Other Local Funds (SCI) State Capital Infrastructure Appropriations HB2547 (SLP) State Lotter Allocation Proceeds (OTH) Other
(1) The (OTH) for BSPB is space rental income
**EXHIBIT 3**
**FY 2019 CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN**
**ANNUAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE BY FUNDING SOURCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>TOTAL ANNUAL O&amp;M</th>
<th>TUI</th>
<th>SFE</th>
<th>ICR</th>
<th>OLF</th>
<th>GFA</th>
<th>FGT</th>
<th>DFG</th>
<th>OTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Capital Project</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Research Building</td>
<td>$518,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Challenges Research Building</td>
<td>$1,529,120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Deferred Maintenance 2019</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix Biomedical Sciences Building – 3rd &amp; 4th Floor Build-Out</td>
<td>$416,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$208,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$208,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Capital Project Total</strong></td>
<td>$2,463,520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previously Approved Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Success District (Revised)</td>
<td>$478,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Research Infrastructure (Revised)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previously Approved Project Total</strong></td>
<td>$478,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$2,941,920</td>
<td>$478,400</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,255,520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$208,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Operation and Maintenance Funding Source Codes
(TUI) Tuition (SFE) Student Fees (ICR) Indirect Cost Recovery (OLF) Other Local Funds (GFA) General Fund Appropriations (FGT) Federal Grant (DFG) Debt Financed by Gifts (OTH) Other
(1) The (OTH) for BSPB is space rental income
EXHIBIT 4
Debt Capacity Report

PURPOSE

To demonstrate The University of Arizona’s ability to finance additional capital investment through debt instruments and to fund the related debt service (principal and interest).

PROJECTED DEBT CAPACITY

This debt capacity report includes five projects from this Capital Development Plan (CDP): Applied Research Building, Grand Challenges Research Building, Campus Research Infrastructure, Biomedical Sciences Partnership Building 3rd & 4th Floor Finish Shell Space, and Student Success District. With the financing of the projects listed, the projected highest debt ratio is 5.4 percent in FY 2020, relative to the ABOR policy and statutory debt limit of 8 percent. The University outstanding debt in that year is projected to be $1.61 billion. The year with the highest debt service will be FY 2022 at $121.8 million. The 5.4 percent ratio is within the range used by the bond rating firms to judge an institution’s creditworthiness to service debt.

The UA projects outstanding debt (issued) to decline from $1.1 billion in FY 2018 to $591.1 million in FY 2027 as debt is retired. Planned debt includes financing of the projects listed in the table below. Additional debt capacity represents debt that can be issued in any given year based on the statutory 8 percent debt ratio limit.
FUTURE PROJECTS

Future debt-financed projects include five projects from the current CDP. These planned projects are included in the future Debt Capacity assumptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Amount to be Financed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grand Challenges Research Building*</td>
<td>150,000,000</td>
<td>150,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Success District</td>
<td>81,000,000</td>
<td>64,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Research Building*</td>
<td>50,000,000</td>
<td>50,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Sciences Partnership Building 3rd &amp; 4th Floor Build Out</td>
<td>34,000,000</td>
<td>34,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Research Infrastructure</td>
<td>16,000,000</td>
<td>16,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 331,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 314,700,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* State Capital Appropriation HB2547

CREDIT RATINGS

UA’s current credit rating is Aa2 (Moody’s) and AA-(S&P). Positive rating factors include the UA as the flagship and land-grant institution, as well as its important role in the provision of medical education for the State of Arizona. UA continues to see robust tuition revenue growth, sizable sponsored research funding with diverse sources, and substantially improved philanthropic support.

Offsetting factors include high leverage; low spendable cash and investments to debt compared to comprehensive universities median, relatively weak state operating and capital support, and increasingly competitive researching funding environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Moody’s Rating</th>
<th>Moody’s Outlook</th>
<th>Standard &amp; Poor’s Rating</th>
<th>Standard &amp; Poor’s Outlook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Aa2</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>AA-</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Aa2</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>AA-</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Aa2</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>AA-</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Aa2</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>AA-</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Aa2</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>AA-</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RATIO OF DEBT SERVICE TO TOTAL EXPENSES

Annual debt service on System Revenue Bonds (SRBs) and Certificates of Participation (COPs) is projected to increase from $101.7 million in FY 2018 to a maximum of $121.8 million in FY 2022. The ratio of debt service to total expenses is projected to peak in FY 2020 at 5.4 percent relative to the 8 percent statutory limit. The peak planned debt ratio includes debt service for the projects listed on the previous page.
The Stimulus Plan for Economic and Educational Development (SPEED) bonds are funded up to 80 percent by state lottery revenues, with the balance funded by the University. SPEED debt service is excluded from the statutory debt ratio. If SPEED debt were included, the year with the highest debt ratio would be FY 2020 at 6.6 percent of total projected expenditures. The year with the highest annual debt service would be FY 2022 at $149.5 million.
Exhibit 5
Project Site Map

New Projects

1. Student Success District $81.0M
2. Applied Research Building $50.0M
3. Grand Challenges Research Building $150.0M
4. Campus Research Infrastructure (Multiple Sites) $16.0M
5. Campus Deferred Maintenance 2019 (Steward Observatory and Other Sites) $20.0M
6. Phoenix Biomedical Sciences Building 3rd and 4th Floor Build-Out (Phoenix) $34.0M
Previous Board Action
- Capital Improvement Plan FY 2020-2022 (submitted as IRIB1) September 2018

Statutory and Policy Requirements
- Pursuant to Arizona Board of Regents Policy Chapter 7-102 (B)(1), all capital projects with an estimated total project cost of $10,000,000 or more, including information technology and third-party projects, shall be included in the Capital Development Plan.

Project Justification, Description and Scope
- A new $50 million building that is critically needed for the continued success of, and grant revenue generation related to, cross-campus research programs focused on applied research. This facility will consolidate a number of strategic interdisciplinary programs in one location, including the University of Arizona Applied Research Corporation (UA-ARC), advanced manufacturing, cubesat design and testing, long-duration balloon payload integration, high performance materials, and human performance optimization. The program will benefit by being located adjacent to the existing Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering building and near other interdisciplinary programs in the Keating Bioresearch and Medical Research buildings.

- This 60,000 GSF facility is envisioned as a multi-story building with a mix of space types including high bay and secure access to accommodate export controlled and classified projects to facilitate cubesat fabrication/testing, advance manufacturing and payload integration research.

The primary institutional priorities supported by this project are:

- **Academic and Research Needs**
  The new Applied Research Building (ARB) will improve competitiveness and research revenues while driving new industry partnerships and regional economic development. It expands interdisciplinary applied physical sciences and engineering research focused on imaging, space systems, additive manufacturing, sensors, and targeted applications in the defense and biomedical sectors. At the same time, it will become a central asset in UA’s ability to both
recruit and retain high-performing faculty whose research is focused on systematic study of specific, practical challenges.

The ARB will include advanced facilities such as clean rooms, vacuum controlled chambers, and advanced fabrication, prototyping, testing, and characterization facilities with high precision equipment to support research for use by industry. The building will also be home to the new University of Arizona Applied Research Corporation, a non-profit corporation formed for the purposes of furthering the University’s research mission in areas that would be impracticable to accomplish in traditional University Labs, and that will strategically expand upon and further the University’s existing research expertise and resources.

Project Delivery Method and Process
• This project is being delivered through a Design-Build (D-B) delivery method. This approach was selected for this project because it can provide early cost control, save time through project scheduling while providing contractor constructability and design input and coordination throughout the project, improving potentially adversarial project environments and still allowing for the selection of the most qualified architect-contractor team for this project. Through peer review of the D-B’s cost estimate at each phase, and low-bid subcontractor work for the actual construction work, this method also provides a high level of cost and quality control.

• The Design-Builder provides a Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) based on the amount previously agreed upon in the Design-Build agreement. In the selection of major subcontractors, the Design-Builder uses a qualification-based selection process prescribed by the ABOR Procurement Code to allow major subcontractors a design-assist role during the design phase. All remaining subcontractor work is awarded on the basis of the lowest responsive and responsible subcontractor bids. For this work, a minimum of three subcontractor bids will be required, except for specialty items or instances where proprietary systems are required.

• The Design-Build Team will be selected through the appropriate project selection committee process prescribed by the ABOR Procurement Code. A licensed contractor will be included on the selection committee as required by ABOR Policy.

Project Status and Schedule
• Programming is underway. This project is scheduled to commence design in the winter of 2018.

• Project construction is scheduled to commence in summer of 2020 and scheduled to be completed in fall of 2021.
Project Cost
- The total project budget is $50 million, with a construction cost of $35.5 million.
- The construction budget for this project was developed by in-house University professionals using cost data from industry-standard cost databases and from completed comparable projects. As the project progresses, peer reviews of the Design-Builder’s estimates will be reconciled by the Project Team.

Fiscal Impact and Financing Plan
- The University plans to issue $50 million of System Revenue Bonds (SRBs) to fund the Applied Research Building. The annual debt service payments on the SRBs is estimated to be $3.5 million. The UA plans to use state appropriations tied to the Capital Infrastructure Fund established in ARS 15-1671 to pay for half of the debt service, and UA local matching funds to pay the other half.
- The estimated operations and maintenance (O&M) cost for the Applied Research Building is $518,400. The UA plans to fund the O&M with indirect cost recovery revenues.

Debt Ratio Impact:
- The estimated annual debt service of $3.5 million on this project SRBs would increase the UA debt ratio by 0.15 percent.

Occupancy Plan
- This facility will provide new space for new researchers, it is not anticipated that space will be released.
**Capital Project Information Summary**

**University:** The University of Arizona  
**Project Name:** Applied Research Building

**Project Description / Location:**  
This project will create a new applied research facility, and will be located adjacent to the Aerospace & Mechanical Engineering Building lot north of Speedway Blvd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2019 Capital Development Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Project Cost                | $ 50,000,000 |
| Total Project Cost per GSF       | $ 833        |
| Direct Construction Cost - New   | $ 35,500,000 |
| Construction Cost per GSF - New  | $ 592        |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in Annual Oper. / Maint. Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Capital:**  
- System Revenue Bonds $ 50,000,000  
  *(Debt service paid by State Appropriations and UA Local Matching Funds)*

**Operation/Maintenance:**  
- Indirect Cost Recovery $ 518,400
## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### Capital Project Budget Summary

**University:** The University of Arizona  
**Project Name:** Applied Research Building

**FY 2019 Capital Development Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Budget Estimate</th>
<th>November 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Land</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Construction Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. New Construction</td>
<td>$34,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Renovation</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Fixed Equipment</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Site Development</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Parking &amp; Landscaping</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Utilities Extensions</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Other (asbestos only)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Construction Cost</strong></td>
<td>$35,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Consultant Fees
   - A. Construction Manager $800,000
   - B. Architect/Engineering Fees $3,600,000
   - C. Other (Programming, Special Consult.) $400,000
   - **Subtotal Consultant Fees** $4,800,000

4. Furniture Fixtures and Equipment $2,200,000
5. Contingency, Design Phase $1,800,000
6. Contingency, Construction Phase $1,800,000
7. Parking Reserve $900,000
8. Telecommunications Equipment $800,000
   - **Subtotal Items 4-8** $7,500,000

9. Additional University Costs
   - A. Surveys and Tests $250,000
   - B. Move-in Costs $100,000
   - C. Public Art $0
   - D. Printing/Advertisement $10,000
   - E. Univ. Facilities & Project Management $1,540,000
   - F. State Risk Mgt. Ins $300,000
   - **Subtotal Additional University Costs** $2,200,000

**TOTAL CAPITAL COST** $50,000,000
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
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Grand Challenges Research Building (GCRB)

Previous Board Action
- Capital Improvement Plan FY 2020-2022 (submitted as IRIB2) September 2018

Statutory and Policy Requirements
- Pursuant to Arizona Board of Regents Policy Chapter 7-102 (B)(1), all capital projects with an estimated total project cost of $10,000,000 or more, including information technology and third-party projects, shall be included in the Capital Development Plan.

Project Justification, Description and Scope
- A new $150 million interdisciplinary research facility within the overall theme of tackling critical problems at the edge of human endeavor. Supporting research strengths at the core of UA’s 2018 strategic plan, this new building will leverage both public and private sector engagements providing space for new researchers and new sponsored projects.

- This 170,000 square foot facility is envisioned as a 10 story facility (2 level basement, 8 stories above grade) in close proximity to other research entities to foster additional collaboration.

The primary institutional priorities supported by this project are:

- **Academic and Research Needs**
  Rapid advances in mobile digital processing, sensing, imaging, medicine, networked informatics, artificial intelligence, and machine learning are converging to dramatically impact the human experience in the 4th Industrial Revolution.

  The University of Arizona will leverage its core strengths in astronomy, space and optical sciences, biosciences, medicine, and the study of the earth’s environment through a strategic investment in this new building to drive high-impact interdisciplinary research programs that will broadly benefit the UA mission and the state of Arizona. By fostering new and sustainable collaboration
in these strategic domains, this building will accelerate the University’s impact on our economy through advances in medicine and public health, defense and national security, financial and cybersecurity, communications networking and mobility, education and lifestyle technologies, transportation, agriculture, manufacturing, and basic science.

UA’s Grand Challenges Research Building will bring together students and faculty from engineering, physical and health sciences, and other programs to position Arizona as a national leader in space, natural and built environments, precision health, and the nexus of human and intelligent systems. Consistent with UA’s long-term strategic imperatives, the colocation synergy of this building will support application demonstrators, translational research and cooperative commercial application development partnerships, and education.

The GCRB will provide a strong return on investment in research awards, as well as human and intellectual capital. The broadly recognized impact and potential of the advances at the core of UA’s strategic research initiatives have resulted in a highly favorable investment climate for public and private sector extramural research partnerships that will provide an outstanding venue for student research experiences and workforce development at the cutting edge of science and technology. In addition to advancing mathematics and science, the building will have major reputational impact on the University by bringing leading thinkers to our campus and fostering collaborations between scientists, engineers, and members of the health science community.

The majority of the GCRB facility will be dedicated to interdisciplinary and collaborative laboratory space to execute these, and other, research partnerships, with highly-efficient faculty and shared student spaces for the participating colleges and potential visiting private-sector partners. Potential programming initiatives may include:

- High-impact growth areas in networked imaging technologies, including applications in medicine and remote healthcare for underserved populations, astronomy, mobile systems, AR/VR, spatial computing and AI-supported autonomous systems.
- UA’s new Quantum Information Science (QIS) team, which is addressing applications in secure communications and networking, sensing, and computing, and has already secured $4M in one year towards the goal of large-scale national QIS awards.
- A precision aging center that will leverage faculty expertise and modern computational meta-omics to drive advances in cognitive aging, and develop and commercialize novel diagnostic tools designed to match an individual’s risk profile with a customized therapeutic plan.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Innovative advanced materials technologies, with targets including a major NSF STC award for the Science of Sound providing new chip functionality based on vibrational properties of integrated solid-state materials.
- An advanced mathematics research institute focused on quantitative solutions to the grand challenges detailed in UA’s strategic plan: water, energy, climate change, precision medicine, neuroscience, space exploration, quantum information, and material science.

Student Support Requirements
Infrastructure to support research is critical to providing students with research educational experiences and is essential to workforce development. A principal function of the research laboratory and student office and cubicle space is providing the project venue for hands-on student participation and innovation. Students with strong experience working on multidisciplinary, and often application-driven project teams, are unquestionably the most highly sought after students in today’s economy.

Project Delivery Method and Process
- This project is being delivered through a Design-Build (D-B) delivery method. This approach was selected for this project because it can provide early cost control, save time through project scheduling while providing contractor constructability and design input and coordination throughout the project, improving potentially adversarial project environments and still allowing for the selection of the most qualified architect-contractor team for this project. Through peer review of the D-B’s cost estimate at each phase, and low-bid subcontractor work for the actual construction work, this method also provides a high level of cost and quality control.

- The Design-Builder provides a Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) based on the amount previously agreed upon in the Design-Build agreement. In the selection of major subcontractors, the Design-Builder uses a qualification-based selection process prescribed by the ABOR Procurement Code to allow major subcontractors a design-assist role during the design phase. All remaining subcontractor work is awarded on the basis of the lowest responsive and responsible subcontractor bids. For this work, a minimum of three subcontractor bids will be required, except for specialty items or instances where proprietary systems are required.

- The Design-Build Team will be selected through the appropriate project selection committee process prescribed by the ABOR Procurement Code. A licensed contractor will be included on the selection committee as required by ABOR Policy.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Project Status and Schedule
- Programming is underway. This project is scheduled to commence design early 2019.
- Project construction is scheduled to commence mid-2020 and scheduled to be completed late-2022.

Project Cost
- The total project budget is $150 million, with a construction cost of $109 million.
- The construction budget for this project was developed by in-house University professionals using cost data from industry-standard cost databases and from completed comparable projects. As the project progresses, peer reviews of the CM@Risk’s estimates will be reconciled by the Project Team.

Fiscal Impact and Financing Plan
- The University plans to issue $150 million of System Revenue Bonds (SRBs) to fund the Grand Challenges Research Building. The annual debt service payments on the SRBs is estimated to be $11.1 million. The UA plans to use state appropriations tied to the Capital Infrastructure Fund established in ARS 15-1671 to pay for half of the debt service, and UA local matching funds to pay the other half.
- The estimated operations and maintenance (O&M) cost for the Grand Challenges Research Building is $1.5 million. The UA plans to fund the O&M with indirect cost recovery revenues.

Debt Ratio Impact:
- The estimated annual debt service of $11.1 million on this project would increase the UA debt ratio by 0.46 percent.

Occupancy Plan
- This facility will provide new space for new researchers, it is not anticipated that space will be released.
Capital Project Information Summary

University: The University of Arizona  
Project Name: Grand Challenges Research Building

Project Description / Location:
This project will create a new interdisciplinary research facility, and will be located along Cherry Avenue just south of the main mall and the Meinel Optical Sciences Building.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2019 Capital Development Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Total Project Cost: $150,000,000  
- Total Project Cost per GSF: $882  
- Direct Construction Cost - New: $109,000,000  
- Construction Cost per GSF - New: $641  
- Change in Annual Oper. / Maint. Cost  
  - Utilities: $619,920  
  - Personnel: $608,600  
  - Other: $300,600

Capital:  
- System Revenue Bonds: $150,000,000  
  (Debt service paid by State Appropriations and UA Local Matching Funds)

Operation/Maintenance:  
- Indirect Cost Recovery: $1,529,120
**Capital Project Budget Summary**

**University:** The University of Arizona  
**Project Name:** Grand Challenges Research Building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 2019 Capital Development Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Construction Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>$105,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Renovation</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Fixed Equipment</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Site Development (exclude 2.E.)</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Parking &amp; Landscaping</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>Utilities Extensions</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Other (asbestos only)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Construction Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>$109,000,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Consultant Fees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Construction Manager</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Architect/Engineering Fees</td>
<td>$11,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Other (Programming, Special Consilt.)</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Consultant Fees</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13,000,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Furniture Fixtures and Equipment</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Contingency, Design Phase</td>
<td>$5,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Contingency, Construction Phase</td>
<td>$5,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Parking Reserve</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Telecommunications Equipment</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Items 4-8</strong></td>
<td><strong>$22,000,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Additional University Costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Surveys and Tests</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Move-in Costs</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Public Art</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Printing/Advertisement</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Univ. Facilities &amp; Project Management</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>State Risk Mgt. Ins</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Additional University Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,000,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL CAPITAL COST** | **$150,000,000**
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Project Justification Report  

Campus Deferred Maintenance 2019

Previous Board Action
- Capital Improvement Plan FY 2020-2022          September 2018

Statutory and Policy Requirements
- Pursuant to Arizona Board of Regents Policy Chapter 7-102 (B)(1), all capital projects with an estimated total project cost of $10,000,000 or more, including information technology and third-party projects, shall be included in the Capital Development Plan.

Project Justification, Description and Scope
- This $21 million project prioritizes $11 million to address deferred maintenance in the Steward Observatory Building and $10 million in critical system replacements across campus.

- Steward Observatory Deferred Maintenance Project - Critical deferred maintenance needs will be addressed throughout the entire building. These needs include replacing aging mechanical, electrical and plumbing infrastructure that are beyond their serviceable life. These needs were prioritized through a building Facility Condition Assessment.

- Campus Wide Deferred Maintenance Upgrades – Will address critical life safety needs on campus along with replacements of mechanical, electrical and plumbing infrastructure that are beyond their serviceable lives. These needs were prioritized through a ten-year plan.

- Addressing this deferred maintenance will allow for a more effective and efficient operation reducing unplanned breakdowns and enhancing the overall indoor air quality within various campus buildings and restoring the functionality of the buildings.
Executive Summary

Project Delivery Method and Process

- This project is being delivered through a Design-Build (D-B) delivery method. This approach was selected for this project because it can provide early cost control, save time through fast-track project scheduling while still providing contractor design input and coordination throughout the project, improving potentially adversarial project environments and still allowing for the selection of the most qualified architect-contractor team for this project. Through peer review of the D-B’s cost estimate at each phase, and low-bid subcontractor work for the actual construction work, this method also provides a high level of cost and quality control.

- The Design-Builder provides a Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) based upon the amount previously agreed upon in the Design-Build agreement. In the selection of major subcontractors, the Design-Builder uses a qualification-based selection process prescribed by the ABOR Procurement Code to allow major subcontractors a design-assist role during the design phase. All remaining subcontractor work is awarded on the basis of the lowest responsive and responsible subcontractor bids. For this work, a minimum of three subcontractor bids will be required, except for specialty items or instances where proprietary systems are required.

- The Design-Build Team will be selected through the capital project selection committee process prescribed by the ABOR Procurement Code. A licensed contractor will be included on the selection committee as required by ABOR Policy.

Project Status and Schedule

- Programming is underway. This project is scheduled to commence design during fall of 2018.

- Project construction is scheduled to commence during winter of 2018, and will be completed winter 2019.

Project Cost

- The total project budget is $21 million, with a construction cost of $17.7 million.

- The construction budget for the Steward Observatory Deferred Maintenance project was developed by in-house University professionals and outside engineering firms conducting detailed Facility Condition Assessments using cost data from industry-standard cost databases and from completed comparable projects. As the project progresses, peer reviews of the Design-Build’s estimates will be reconciled by the Project Team.
Fiscal Impact and Financing Plan
- The University plans to finance the Campus Deferred Maintenance 2019 project using $11 million in state appropriations tied to the Capital Infrastructure Fund established in ARS 15-1671 and $10 million in UA local matching funds.

- The operations and maintenance (O&M) cost for the space effected is already included in the UA’s current budget.

Debt Ratio Impact:
- This project will have no impact on the University’s debt ratios because no debt will be issued to finance the project.
### Capital Project Information Summary

**University:** The University of Arizona  
**Project Name:** Campus Deferred Maintenance 2019

**Project Description / Location:**  
This project will address deferred maintenance needs and critical life safety needs on campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2019 Capital Development Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Project Cost              | $ 21,000,000 |
| Total Project Cost per GSF      | $ N/A |
| Direct Construction Cost - New  | $ N/A |
| Construction Cost per GSF - New | $ N/A |
| Change in Annual Oper. / Maint. Cost |
| Utilities                       | $ N/A |
| Personnel                       | $ N/A |
| Other                           | $ N/A |

**Capital:**  
- State Appropriations: $ 11,000,000  
- UA Local Funds: $ 10,000,000

**Operation/Maintenance:**  
- N/A $ N/A
## Capital Project Budget Summary

**University:** The University of Arizona  
**Project Name:** Campus Deferred Maintenance 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2019 Capital Development Plan</th>
<th>November 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Land</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Construction Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. New Construction</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Renovation</td>
<td>$15,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Fixed Equipment</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Site Development (exclude 2.E.)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Parking &amp; Landscaping</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Utilities Extensions</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Other (asbestos only)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Construction Cost</strong></td>
<td>$17,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Consultant Fees</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Construction Manager</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Architect/Engineering Fees</td>
<td>$1,861,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Other (Programming, Special Consilt.)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Consultant Fees</strong></td>
<td>$2,041,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Furniture Fixtures and Equipment</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Contingency, Design Phase</strong></td>
<td>$538,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Contingency, Construction Phase</strong></td>
<td>$538,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Parking Reserve</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Telecommunications Equipment</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Items 4-8</strong></td>
<td>$1,076,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. Additional University Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Surveys and Tests</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Move-in Costs</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Public Art</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Printing/Advertisement</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Univ. Facilities &amp; Project Management</td>
<td>$94,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. State Risk Mgt. Ins</td>
<td>$88,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Additional University Costs</strong></td>
<td>$183,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CAPITAL COST</strong></td>
<td>$21,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Phoenix Biomedical Sciences Partnership Building (BSPB)  
3rd and 4th Floor Finish Shell Space

Previous Board Action  
- Capital Improvement Plan FY 2020-2022  
  September 2018

Statutory and Policy Requirements  
- Pursuant to Arizona Board of Regents Policy Chapter 7-102 (B)(1), all capital projects with an estimated total project cost of $10,000,000 or more, including information technology and third-party projects, shall be included in the Capital Development Plan.

Project Justification, Description and Scope  
- This $34 million project will build out the 3rd and 4th floors of current 'shell space' of the Biomedical Sciences Partnership Building (BSPB) for wet lab and administrative research spaces to support additional faculty recruitment for the College of Medicine-Phoenix (COM-P). These floors were constructed as shell space with the objective of building out the space as needed. Building out the 3rd and 4th floors at the same time will provide us with economies of scale and reduce the duration of impacts to current occupants of the building.

- In keeping with the partnership intent of BSPB, the Phoenix Veterans Affairs Medical Center is seeking to lease the existing research space on the 7th floor of BSPB. Leasing the already built out BSPB 7th floor laboratory and support spaces will allow the VA to relocate their existing research operations which will free up space on their landlocked campus so they can improve access to clinical services there. In addition, the lease to the VA, and co-location with COM-P researchers and faculty, provides partnership opportunities and will foster improved collaborative relationships. As was originally envisioned, the utilization of the existing BSPB built out research space for partnerships triggers the need to build out current shell space to allow for growing the COM-P research enterprise.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- COM-P is actively recruiting 30 research faculty and has plans for additional 39 faculty recruitments by 2020. The build out of the two floors (46,100 GSF) of research space will accommodate these pending and future recruitments. The VA lease, increased indirect cost recovery funds from sponsored research, and a modest investment from COM-P and UA will support the debt service for the use of SPEED and System Revenue Bonds.

Project Delivery Method and Process
- This project is being delivered through the Construction Manager at Risk (CM@Risk) method. This approach was selected for the project because it can save time and cost through fast-track project scheduling, provides contractor design input and coordination throughout the project, improves potentially adversarial project environments and allows for the selection of the most qualified contractor leadership team for this project. Through peer-review of the CM@Risk’s cost estimates at each phase, and low-bid subcontractor pricing for the actual construction work, this method also provides a high level of cost and quality control.

- The CM@Risk was selected through the appropriate project selection committee process prescribed by the ABOR Procurement Code. A licensed contractor was on the selection committee as required by ABOR policy. The design team has been selected through a similar ABOR process.

Project Status and Schedule
- This project was reviewed by the PBC Coordinating Council on October 16, 2018, and no issues or concerns were identified in this review. Any input that might result from future EEC discussions of the project will be reported to the Board at that time

- Programming is underway. This project is scheduled to commence design during November 2018.

- Project construction is scheduled to commence during June 2019, and scheduled to be completed during February 2020.

Project Cost
- The total project budget is $34 million, with a construction cost of $29 million.

- The construction budget for this project was developed by in-house University professionals and outside consultants, using cost data from industry-standard
cost databases and from completed comparable projects. As the project progresses, peer reviews of the CM@Risk’s estimates will be reconciled by the Project Team.

Fiscal Impact and Financing Plan
- The University plans to issue $18.6 million of System Revenue Bonds (SRBs) and $15.4 million of SPEED Revenue Bonds to fund the BSPB 3rd and 4th Floor Finish Shell Space project. The annual debt service payments on the SRBs is estimated to be $1.4 million. The UA plans to fund the debt service payments on the SRBs with University local funds and space rental income. The annual debt service payments on the SPEED Bonds is estimated to be $1.2 million. Up to 80% of the SPEED debt service is planned to be paid using State Lottery Proceeds and not less than 20% is planned to be paid using University local funds.

- The estimated operations and maintenance (O&M) cost for the BSPB 3rd and 4th Floor Finish Shell Space project is $416,000. The UA plans to fund the O&M with indirect cost recovery funds and space rental income.

Debt Ratio Impact:
- The total estimated annual debt service of $2.6 million on this project would increase the UA debt ratio by 0.06 percent.

Occupancy Plan
- This facility will provide new space for new researchers, it is not anticipated that space will be released.
Capital Project Information Summary

University: The University of Arizona  
Project Name: Phoenix Biomedical Sciences Partnership Building (BSPB) – 3rd and 4th Floor Finish Shell Space

Project Description / Location:
This project will finish the shell space into wet lab space in the existing BSPB building on the 3rd and 4th floors, and will be located on the Phoenix Biomedical Campus at 475 N. 5th Street, Phoenix, AZ 85004.

FY 2019 Capital Development Plan

- Planning: September 2018
- Design: November 2018
- Construction: June 2019
- Occupancy: March 2020

Total Project Cost: $34,000,000
Total Project Cost per GSF: $738
Direct Construction Cost - New: $29,000,000
Construction Cost per GSF - New: $629
Change in Annual Oper. / Maint. Cost:
  - Utilities: $193,600
  - Personnel: $148,900
  - Other: $73,500

Capital:
- SPEED / System Revenue Bonds: $34,000,000
  (Debt service paid by UA Local Funds, State Lottery Proceeds, and Space Rental Income)

Operation/Maintenance:
- Indirect Cost Recovery: $208,000
- Space Rental Income: $208,000
**Capital Project Budget Summary**

**University:** The University of Arizona  
**Project Name:** Phoenix Biomedical Sciences Partnership Building (BSPB) – 3rd and 4th Floor Finish Shell Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Budget Estimate</th>
<th>November 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. **Land**  
   0

2. **Construction Cost**
   - A. New Construction: $28,700,000
   - B. Renovation: 0
   - C. Fixed Equipment: $300,000
   - D. Site Development (exclude 2.E.): 0
   - E. Parking & Landscaping: 0
   - F. Utilities Extensions: 0
   - G. Other (asbestos only): 0
   **Subtotal Construction Cost:** $29,000,000

3. **Consultant Fees**
   - A. Construction Manager: $235,000
   - B. Architect/Engineering Fees: $1,450,000
   - C. Other (Programming, Special Conslt.): $150,000
   **Subtotal Consultant Fees:** $1,835,000

4. **Furniture Fixtures and Equipment**  
   $750,000

5. **Contingency, Design Phase**  
   $615,000

6. **Contingency, Construction Phase**  
   $615,000

7. **Parking Reserve**  
   $

8. **Telecommunications Equipment**  
   $350,000

   **Subtotal Items 4-8:** $2,330,000

9. **Additional University Costs**
   - A. Surveys and Tests: $50,000
   - B. Move-in Costs: $50,000
   - C. Public Art: 0
   - D. Printing/Advertisement: $10,000
   - E. Univ. Facilities & Project Management: $550,000
   - F. State Risk Mgt. Ins: $175,000
   **Subtotal Additional University Costs:** $835,000

**TOTAL CAPITAL COST:** $34,000,000
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
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Phoenix Biomedical Sciences Partnership Building (BSPB) – 3rd and 4th Floor Finish
Shell Space
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Arizona Board of Regents
The University of Arizona
FY 2019 Capital Development Plan (CDP)
Project Justification Report

Student Success District

Previous Board Action
- Capital Improvement Plan FY 2017-2019 September 2015
- Capital Improvement Plan FY 2018-2020 September 2016
- Capital Development Plan FY 2018 June 2017

Statutory and Policy Requirements
- Pursuant to Arizona Board of Regents Policy Chapter 7-102 (B)(1), all capital projects with an estimated total project cost of $10,000,000 or more, including information technology and third-party projects, shall be included in the Capital Development Plan.

Project Justification, Description and Scope
- This revised CDP for the Student Success District project increases the project budget by ten million dollars and adds 16,000 gross square feet to incorporate additional student service programs under the Office of the Provost. The revised project has a total budget of $81,000,000, and is approximately 200,000 gross square feet.

- The Student Success District is a project that redefines a central area of the main campus at the University of Arizona with a focus on our students. The Office of the Provost and the University Libraries have collaborated to create this District, an integrative approach to supporting student achievement by weaving together revitalized services in upgraded and new facilities. The intent of creating this District is to improve student success through direct connections between student services, academic support, and amenities in the heart of campus near other important student centered activities. The Student Success District will be a distinctive element of the UA experience, supporting student engagement and playing an important role in attracting and retaining students.

- Facility improvements within the Science & Engineering Library, Main Library and Bear Down Gym, coupled with a new Student Success Building will strategically co-locate a range of services at the students point-of-need. This will improve
utilization and access and create a student hub to meet, learn, engage and innovate.

- The project includes the following physical facilities improvements:
  - renovations to Bear Down Gym
  - renovations to the Main Library, portions of levels one and two
  - renovations and an entry addition to the Science-Engineering Library, portions of levels two and three
  - a new 60,000 gsf student services building for Office of the Provost programs and advising services
  - redevelopment of adjacent exterior areas in a half block area into student focused outdoor environments
  - new linkages between buildings

- The Libraries programs support all students. Improvements to the Main Library and the Science-Engineering Library include a new and larger makerspace to provide students access to a variety of equipment and technologies for physical project development. Study areas within the two libraries will be enhanced, including reallocating floor area adjacent to outdoor environments to student study and collaboration spaces.

- Office of the Provost programs provide direct student academic support through tutoring, advising and services from other academic focused units that will now all be centrally located within the District. This direct connection to students will develop a more streamlined and seamless delivery of services.

- Programs in the Office of the Provost provide direct student academic support through tutoring, advising and services from other academic focused units that will now all be centrally located within the District. This direct connection to students will develop a more streamlined and seamless delivery of services. Advising services and special programs from some of the colleges will have a presence in the Student Success District as well. Co-locating these functions with the programs from the Office of the Provost will create a complementary relationship to the other services within the District.

- The District will also include Student Recreation programming, healthy food choices, Campus Health programs and student gathering/lounge areas. This combination of services and the creation of a central space on campus that is open and welcoming to all students provides student support related to wellness and community.

- Re-development of outdoor space is a key component to the District. The exterior environment will contribute to a cohesive zone on campus that will clearly communicate the connections between buildings and services, as well as
provide additional student centered spaces. Quiet meditative spaces, study zones and larger gathering areas will provide a variety of spaces to allow for different student experiences.

- Centralizing student support is the focus of creating the Student Success District. The location, services, amenities and visibility all contribute to the goal of creating an environment that nurtures the success of University of Arizona students.

**Project Delivery Method and Process**
- This project is being delivered through a Design-Build (D-B) delivery method. This approach was selected to provide early cost control, save time through fast-track project scheduling, provide contractor design input and coordination throughout the project, improve potentially adversarial project environments and still allow for the selection of the most qualified architect-contractor team for this project. Through peer review of the D-B’s cost estimate at each phase, and low-bid subcontractor work construction work, this method also provides a high level of cost and quality control.

- The Design-Builder provides a Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) based on the amount previously agreed upon in the Design-Build agreement. In the selection of major subcontractors, the Design-Builder uses a qualification-based selection process prescribed by the ABOR Procurement Code to allow major subcontractors a design-assist role during the design phase. All remaining subcontractor work is awarded on the basis of the lowest responsive and responsible subcontractor bids. For this work, a minimum of three subcontractor bids will be required, except for specialty items or instances where proprietary systems are required.

- The Design-Build Team was selected through the appropriate capital project selection committee process prescribed by the ABOR Procurement Code. A licensed contractor was included on the selection committee as required by ABOR Policy.

**Project Cost**
- The total project budget is $81.0 million, with a construction cost of $55.2 million.

- The construction budget for this project was developed by outside construction professionals. As the project progresses, peer reviews of the Design-Builder’s estimates will be reconciled with the Project Team.
Project Status and Schedule
- Design phase work is underway per previous CDP approval.
- Construction of Phase I is scheduled to commence January, 2019 and Phase II in May 2020, with all work scheduled to be completed for late 2021 occupancy.

Fiscal Impact and Financing Plan
- The University plans to issue $64.7 million of System Revenue Bonds (SRBs) to finance the Student Success District project. The remaining $16.3 million will be financed with gifts of $10 million and University local funds of $6.3 million. The annual debt service payments on the SRBs is estimated to be $4.4 million. The UA plans to use student fees and University local funds to pay the debt service.
- The estimated operations and maintenance (O&M) cost of the 60,000 new square feet for the Student Success District project is $478,400. The UA plans to fund the O&M with student fees. The additional 135,000 square feet of affected space is already included in the UA’s current budget.

Debt Ratio Impact:
- The estimated annual debt service of $4.4 million on this project SRBs would increase the UA debt ratio by 0.18 percent.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Capital Project Information Summary

University: The University of Arizona  
Project Name: Student Success District

Project Description / Location:  
This project will provide centrally located student services, located in the area between Fourth Street and University Avenue, and Cherry and Highland Avenues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2018 Capital Development Plan</th>
<th>FY 2019 Capital Development Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>March 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>June 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Phase One</td>
<td>July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Phase Two</td>
<td>August 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy Phase One (multiple increments)</td>
<td>July 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy Phase Two</td>
<td>July 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Schedule (Beginning Month/Year):

Project Budget:

- Total Project Cost: $71,000,000, $81,000,000
- Total Project Cost per GSF: $409, $405
- Direct Construction Cost/GSF - New: $386, $410
- Direct Construction Cost/GSF - Renovation: $178, $179
- Direct Construction Cost per GSF - Site: $24, $24
- Change in Annual Oper. / Maint. Cost:
  - Utilities: $173,000, $189,000
  - Personnel: $175,000, $193,700
  - Other: $84,000, $95,700

Funding Sources:

Capital:
- System Revenue Bonds: $68,000,000, $64,700,000  
  (Debt service paid by student fees and UA local funds)
- Gifts: $3,000,000, $10,000,000
- University Local Funds: $6,300,000

Operation/Maintenance:
- Student Fees: $432,000, $478,400
### Capital Project Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University: The University of Arizona</th>
<th>Project Name: Student Success District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Date of Budget Estimate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>FY 2018 Capital Development Plan</th>
<th>FY 2019 Capital Development Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 2017</td>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1. Land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2. Construction Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. New Construction</td>
<td>$18,300,000</td>
<td>$24,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Renovation</td>
<td>$22,400,000</td>
<td>$23,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Fixed Equipment</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Site Development (exclude 2.E.)</td>
<td>$7,100,000</td>
<td>$7,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Parking &amp; Landscaping</td>
<td>Included in 2D</td>
<td>Included in 2D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Utilities Extensions</td>
<td>Included in 2D</td>
<td>Included in 2D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Other (asbestos only)</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal Construction Cost**

| Subtotal Construction Cost        | $48,100,000 | $55,200,000 |

#### 3. Consultant Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Construction Manager</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Architect/Engineering Fees</td>
<td>$5,820,000</td>
<td>$6,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Other (Programming, Special Consil.)</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal Consultant Fees**

| Subtotal Consultant Fees             | $6,670,000 | $7,600,000 |

#### 4. Furniture Fixtures and Equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Furniture Fixtures and Equipment</td>
<td>$6,600,000</td>
<td>$7,400,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5. Contingency, Design Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contingency, Design Phase</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6. Contingency, Construction Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking Reserve</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7. Telecommunications Equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications Equipment</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal Items 4-8**

| Subtotal Items 4-8                 | $13,100,000 | $14,500,000 |

#### 9. Additional University Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Surveys and Tests</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Move-in Costs</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Public Art</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Printing/Advertisement</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Univ. Facilities &amp; Project Management</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$2,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. State Risk Mgt. Ins</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal Additional University Costs**

| Subtotal Additional University Costs | $3,130,000 | $3,700,000 |

**TOTAL CAPITAL COST**

| TOTAL CAPITAL COST                  | $71,000,000 | $81,000,000 |
Student Success District
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Arizona Board of Regents
The University of Arizona
FY 2019 Capital Development Plan (CDP)
Project Justification Report

Campus Research Infrastructure

Previous Board Action
- Capital Improvement Plan FY 2013-2015 (previously submitted as North Campus Infrastructure Phase 2)  September 2011
- Capital Development Plan FY 2013, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18  May 2012

Statutory and Policy Requirements
- Pursuant to Arizona Board of Regents Policy Chapter 7-102 (B)(1), all capital projects with an estimated total project cost of $10,000,000 or more, including information technology and third-party projects, shall be included in the Capital Development Plan.

Project Justification, Description and Scope
- The proposed $16 million Campus Research Infrastructure project is a multi-element expansion of the UA’s existing infrastructure capacity. The project will ensure that the necessary infrastructure systems are provided to support and accommodate the planned research growth.

- Major elements will include capacity upgrades and expansion of existing chilled water, steam, electrical, storm drainage, sewer and tele data systems. The project will be designed in accordance with the UA Design & Specification Standards and will maximize operational and maintenance efficiencies.

Project Delivery Method and Process
- This project is being delivered through the Construction Manager at Risk (CM@Risk) method. This approach was selected for the project because it can save time and cost through fast-track project scheduling, provides contractor design input and coordination throughout the project, improves potentially adversarial project environments and allows for the selection of the most qualified contractor leadership team for this project. Through peer-review of the CM@Risk’s cost estimates at each phase, and low-bid subcontractor pricing for the actual construction work, this method also provides a high level of cost and quality control.

- The CM@Risk was selected through the capital project selection committee process prescribed by the ABOR Procurement Code. A licensed contractor was included on the selection committee as required by ABOR policy. The design team has been selected through a similar ABOR process.
Project Status and Schedule
- Programming is underway. This project is scheduled to commence design during the spring of 2019.

- Project construction is scheduled to commence during the spring of 2020 and scheduled to be completed during the spring of 2021.

Project Cost
- The total project budget is $16,000,000, with a construction cost of $12.55 million.

- The construction budget for this project was developed by in-house University professionals and outside consultants, using cost data from industry-standard cost databases and from completed comparable projects. As the project progresses, peer reviews of the CM@Risk’s estimates will be reconciled by the Project Team.

Fiscal Impact and Financing Plan
- The University plans to issue $14.9 million of System Revenue Bonds (SRBs) and $1.1 million of SPEED Revenue Bonds to fund the Campus Research Infrastructure project. The annual debt service payments on the SRBs is estimated to be $1.2 million. The UA plans to fund the debt service payments on the SRBs with tuition revenues. The annual debt service payments on the SPEED Bonds is estimated to be $0.1 million. Up to 80% of the SPEED debt service is planned to be paid using State Lottery Proceeds and not less than 20% is planned to be paid using tuition revenues.

- The operations and maintenance (O&M) cost for the space effected is already included in the UA’s current budget.

Debt Ratio Impact:
- The total estimated annual debt service of $1.3 million on this project would increase the UA debt ratio by 0.05 percent.
## Capital Project Information Summary

**University:** The University of Arizona  
**Project Name:** Campus Research Infrastructure

### Project Description / Location:
This infrastructure project will include capacity upgrades and expansion of existing chilled water, steam, electrical, storm drainage, sewer and tele-data systems across main campus.

### Project Schedule (Beginning Month/Year):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>FY 2013 Capital Development Plan</th>
<th>FY 2019 Capital Development Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>June 2012</td>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>August 2012</td>
<td>Spring 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>August 2013</td>
<td>Spring 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy</td>
<td>August 2014</td>
<td>Spring 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 2013 Capital</th>
<th>FY 2019 Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td>$ 32,000,000</td>
<td>$ 16,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost per GSF</td>
<td>$ N/A</td>
<td>$ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Construction Cost - New</td>
<td>$ 24,400,000</td>
<td>$ 12,550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost per GSF - New</td>
<td>$ N/A</td>
<td>$ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Annual Oper. / Maint. Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>$ N/A</td>
<td>$ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>$ N/A</td>
<td>$ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$ N/A</td>
<td>$ N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Funding Sources:

**Capital:**
- System Revenue Bonds & SPEED Bonds  
  (Debt service paid by tuition revenues and State Lottery Proceeds)
  - $ 32,000,000  
  - $ 16,000,000

**Operation/Maintenance:**
- N/A  
- $ N/A  
- $ N/A
## Capital Project Budget Summary

**University:** The University of Arizona  
**Project Name:** Campus Research Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2013 Capital Development Plan Phase I and II May 2012</th>
<th>FY 2019 Capital Development Plan Revised Phase II November 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of Budget Estimate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Land</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Construction Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. New Construction</td>
<td>$23,000,000</td>
<td>$12,450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Renovation</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Fixed Equipment</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Site Development (exclude 2.E.)</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Parking &amp; Landscaping</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Utilities Extensions</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Other (asbestos only)</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Construction Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>$24,400,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,550,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Consultant Fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Construction Manager</td>
<td>$244,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Architect/Engineering Fees</td>
<td>$2,440,000</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Other (Programming, Special Conslt.)</td>
<td>$414,800</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Consultant Fees</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,098,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,375,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Furniture Fixtures and Equipment</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Contingency, Design Phase</td>
<td>$1,220,000</td>
<td>$627,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Contingency, Construction Phase</td>
<td>$1,977,000</td>
<td>$627,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Parking Reserve</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Telecommunications Equipment</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Items 4-8</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,397,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,310,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Additional University Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Surveys and Tests</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$112,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Move-in Costs</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Public Art</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Printing/Advertisement</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Univ. Facilities &amp; Project Management</td>
<td>$488,000</td>
<td>$553,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. State Risk Mgt. Ins</td>
<td>$180,200</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Additional University Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,104,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>$765,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CAPITAL COST</strong></td>
<td><strong>$32,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16,000,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Item Name: Property Acquisition of 624 N. 5th Street, Phoenix, Arizona

☑ Action item

Requested Action: Arizona State University (ASU) asks the board to approve its request to purchase the 7,500 square foot site located at 624 N. 5th Street (SWC Pierce Street and 5th Street) in Phoenix, Arizona (Property), as described in this Executive Summary.

Background/History of Previous Board Action

- The Board previously approved an IGA with the City of Phoenix for a partnership with ASU to develop a destination Health Solutions Center on City-owned land located on the Phoenix Biomedical Campus (PBC).

- Phase 1 of the Health Solutions Center consists of an approximately 225,000 square foot facility to be developed by Wexford Science & Technology, LLC.

- ASU has the right under the IGA to develop the Health Solutions Center on the PBC in phases.

Discussion

- ASU desires to acquire this strategically located Property so it can control what is developed on the Property, and it will allow ASU to create a larger and more developable parcel for this future phase of the Health Solutions Center.

- This Property will become part of the Health Solutions Center project.

- The purchase price of this Property is $500,000 ($66.67/SF), plus customary transaction costs, which is in line with fair market value.

- ASU obtained an appraisal of the Property in accordance with Board policy. The appraised value exceeds the purchase price.

- The Property is within the PBC Master Plan boundary.

- The funds to purchase this Property will come from general university funds.

Contact Information:
Morgan R. Olsen, Executive Vice President, Treasurer and CFO, (480) 727-9920, Morgan.R.Olsen@asu.edu
Upon approval of this item, the following are each separately authorized in the name and on behalf of the Board to take all appropriate actions to finalize negotiations and to sign and deliver all documents and agreements necessary to consummate the transaction described in this Executive Summary on substantially the terms described herein: the ASU President, the ASU Executive Vice President, Treasurer and Chief Financial Officer, and the ASU Assistant Vice President for Real Estate Development, or any successor titles to such positions.

Committee Review and Recommendation

The Finance, Capital and Resources Committee reviewed this item at its November 1, 2018 meeting and recommended forwarding to the full board for approval.

Statutory/Policy Requirements

- ABOR Policy 7-203(B) requires Board approval for purchases of real property if (1) the Property is not within the university planning boundary as defined in the master plan; and (2) the purchase price is $500,000 or greater.

- ABOR Policy 7-206(B) requires one appraisal for the purchase of real property with an anticipated sale price of $100,000 or more but less than $1,000,000. All appraisals shall be independent, unilaterally requested and paid for by the University.

Exhibits

EXHIBIT A – Location Map
EXHIBIT A – LOCATION MAP OF THE PROPERTY

624 N. 5th Street, Phoenix, Arizona (Red)
Phoenix Biomedical Campus (Yellow), Health Solution Center (Blue)
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Agenda Highlights
Academic Affairs and Educational Attainment Committee
November 1, 2018

1. Arizona Community College Transfer Discussion and Review of the 2018 Annual Report on Articulation and Transfer for Arizona Postsecondary Education

Outcomes and Assignments:

Each year, in accordance with Arizona statute, the board sends a report developed by AZTransfer to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee. The committee used the 2018 report as an opportunity to discuss the Enterprise’s community college transfer operations with the Provosts and Ms. Kelly Robles from AZTransfer.

Kelley Robles presented the report highlighting the work of the Articulation Task Force Members, the transfer enrollment and graduation rates of transfer students. Regents asked the board office to work with the universities to address the community college relationship, including reviewing Arizona community colleges’ structure, organization, and transfer articulation best practices.

Regents also asked the board office to work with the universities to address the issue of community college student aspiration towards obtaining a four-year degree and what actions can be taken to make a substantial change to improve those aspirations.

Regents asked the board office to ascertain the effectiveness of inviting certain community college presidents to address the board on some of the issues discussed such as access to student data and changes in organizational structure.

The committee recommended forwarding to the full board for acceptance the 2018 Annual Report on Articulation and Transfer for Postsecondary Education.
2. Request for New Academic Programs for Arizona State University

**Outcomes and Assignments:**

ASU presented twenty-three new program requests for committee review. ASU is proposing 23 new programs (4 undergraduate programs and 19 graduate programs) that will begin in 2019-2020. Ten will be located Downtown, 12 in Tempe, and 1 at Polytechnic.

Regents asked that the universities continue to analyze as part of their new program requests how student outcomes will be assessed and include more information regarding those assessment methods in the write-up going forward.

Regents asked that the board office work with the universities to address how to link the information provided in the new program requests to the seven year program reviews.

The committee recommended forwarding to the full board to approve ASU’s the new program requests effective in the 2019-2020 catalog year. Board policy requires the universities to obtain approval for any new program requests that the university has indicated will be funded with program fees. The board is not approving the fee, just authorizing the universities to offer the programs that require fees. If the programs are approved, the fees will be presented during the tuition and fees process in the spring.

4. Fall Enrollment Report

**Outcomes and Assignments:**

Each year the board receives an enrollment report that is later submitted to the auditor general. This year, the committee used the report as an opportunity to engage with the Provosts regarding the university’s fall enrollment.

The committee recommended forwarding to the full board for acceptance the 2018 fall enrollment report.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Item Name: Request for New Academic Programs for Arizona State University

☑ Action Item

Requested Action: Arizona State University asks the board to approve the new program requests effective in the 2019-2020 catalog year.

Background/History of Previous Board Action
As provided in the board policy, new program requests may be submitted throughout the year with the approval of the Academic Affairs and Educational Attainment Committee.

Discussion
Arizona State University seeks to add new programs for implementation in the 2019-2020 Academic Year. This request is for new academic programs:

- Bachelor of Arts in Community Development
- Bachelor of Science in Natural Resource Management
- Bachelor of Science in Sports Science and Performance Programming
- Bachelor of Science in Sustainable Food Systems
- Master of Arts in Classical Liberal Education and Leadership
- Executive Master in Community Development
- Master of Professional Studies in Community Development Practice
- Doctor of Philosophy in Data Science, Analytics and Engineering
- Master of Education in Early Childhood Education
- Master of Science in Environmental Engineering
- Doctor of Philosophy in Geographic Information Science
- Master of Global Leadership and Strategy
- Master of Science in Health Care Simulation
- Master of Science in Innovation and Venture Development
- Master of Arts in International Affairs and Leadership
- Master of Arts in Investigative Journalism
- Master of Arts in Language Teaching
- Master of Science in Natural Resource Management

Contact Information:

Mark S. Searle, ASU  (480) 965-9585  mark.searle@asu.edu
Chad Sampson, ABOR  (602) 229-2512  chad.sampson@azregents.edu
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Master of Science in Organizational Leadership
- Master of Arts in Policy Advocacy
- Doctor of Philosophy in Spanish Linguistics
- Master of Science in Supply Chain Management
- Master of Science in Sustainable Food Systems

Degree planning at ASU is founded on the Charter: ASU is a comprehensive public research university, measured not by whom it excludes, but by whom it includes and how they succeed; advancing research and discovery of public value; and assuming fundamental responsibility for the economic, social, cultural and overall health of the communities it serves.

All academic degree programs go through multiple review and approval processes to ensure their currency, quality, and relevance. Each year, the Provost initiates the academic planning process. The academic deans, in consultation with the directors of the academic units, submit information on all proposed new degrees, concentrations, minors, and certificates for the ensuing year, as well as changes to existing degree titles, program disestablishments, and creation of new organizations, organizational changes and disestablishments. Once reviewed and approved by the Provost, these initiatives begin the review process, including, as applicable, the curriculum committees in the academic unit, college, Graduate College, and University Senate. At each level, a substantive review of the proposed program is completed to ensure quality and to avoid redundancy with other programs. At any step in the approval process, programs can be tabled and/or returned to the academic unit for further clarification and/or revision.

The new degree programs advance issues of community development, health, education, language and linguistics, sustainability, leadership and innovation, and natural resources. In keeping with the 2018 Operational and Financial Review Enterprise Plan, the degree proposals are aligned strategically with our design aspirations to leverage our place, transform society, value entrepreneurship, include use-inspired research, enable student success, fuse intellectual disciplines, be socially embedded, and engage students with issues locally, nationally and internationally.

Committee Review and Recommendation

The Academic Affairs and Educational Attainment Committee reviewed this item at its November 1, 2018 meeting, and recommended forwarding the item to the full board for approval.

Statutory/Policy Requirements

ABOR Policy 2-223.A, “The Academic Strategic Plan”
### Arizona State University

**Proposed New Program Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed New Programs</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>College/School</th>
<th>Page Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergraduate Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Watts College of Public Service and Community Solutions</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resource Management</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Watts College of Public Service and Community Solutions</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Science and Performance Programming</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>College of Health Solutions</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Food Systems</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>School of Sustainability</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical Liberal Education and Leadership</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>College of Liberal Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Practice</td>
<td>MPS</td>
<td>Watts College of Public Service and Community Solutions</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Science, Analytics and Engineering</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>Ira A. Fulton Schools of Engineering</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>MED</td>
<td>Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Engineering</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Ira A. Fulton Schools of Engineering</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Information Science</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>College of Liberal Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Leadership and Strategy</td>
<td>MGLS</td>
<td>Thunderbird School of Global Management</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care Simulation</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>College of Nursing and Health Innovation</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>College/Institution</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innovation and Venture Development</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Herberger Institute for Design and the Arts</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Affairs and Leadership</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>College of Liberal Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative Journalism</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Walter Cronkite School of Journalism and Mass Communication</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Teaching</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>College of Liberal Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resource Management</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Watts College of Public Service and Community Solutions</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Leadership</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>College of Integrative Sciences and Arts</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Advocacy</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Watts College of Public Service and Community Solutions</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Linguistics</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>College of Liberal Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply Chain Management</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>W. P. Carey School of Business</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Food Systems</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>School of Sustainability</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 - Proposed New Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Proposed Degree (degree type and major), College/School, Location, Anticipated Catalog Year</th>
<th>Program Fee Required? (Yes or No)</th>
<th>Brief Description and Justified Identified Market Need</th>
<th>Learning Outcomes and Assessment Plan</th>
<th>Projected 3rd Year Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Undergraduate Degrees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Bachelor of Arts in Community Development        | No                                              | Description and Justification: The BA in Community Development teaches students how to plan, develop, implement, monitor and evaluate community projects. It also provides students with an understanding of policy analysis, program and project management and community/social research. Community Development is a long-established, global, professionally based academic discipline currently not incorporated into ASU’s degree-granting portfolio. There are 32 universities offering graduate Community Development degree programs in the U.S. alone, and a myriad of institutions offering undergraduate degree programs and concentrations in such diverse academic hubs as human development, rural sociology, social work, economics, regional planning and anthropology. Learning Outcome 1: Students will demonstrate an understanding of sustainable community and human service principles as a foundation for the integration of economic, social and environmental dimensions of community development.  
  - **Concepts:** Leadership; sustainability; economics and social change in community development.  
  - **Competencies:** Graduates will be able to create communities that employ sound leadership principles key to developing decisions relative to community development.  
  - **Assessment Method:** Student projects from CRD 301 Sustainable Communities will be assessed with a faculty designed rubric, developed in accordance with professional standards, incorporating sustainable communities, leadership, and social change in community development. Students in NLM 160 Voluntary Action and Community Leadership will be required to complete an assessment demonstrating | 50 |
<p>| Watts College of Public Service and Community Solutions (Downtown Phoenix) | 2019-2020 | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This Community Development degree will advance dimensions of workforce development, housing, small business development, transportation, health care and financial capital development, adding value to the students and mission of the school, and thus serve the user-inspired, community-embeddedness design principles of ASU.</td>
<td>their knowledge of community leadership, teamwork, and conflict resolution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Market Need:</strong> According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, employment for social and community service managers is projected to grow at a rate of 10 percent between 2014 and 2024. Current Community Development (CD) salaries range from $65,000 to $134,000, with an average base pay of $41,656 for CD coordinators, $48,397 for community developers, $71,094 for a CD Representatives 1, $84,960 for CD managers and $107,742 for CD specialists (Glassdoor.com; Payscale.com; Salary.com). The Community Development degree will serve students seeking to enter the workforce immediately upon graduation as well as those seeking graduate study. Students completing this program could be expected to go into a variety of occupations from social and community service to real estate and property development.</td>
<td><strong>Measures:</strong> The curriculum will be monitored and refined based on student ability to draw a critical connection between sustainability at the organizational and community levels to prevailing principles of community development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Outcome 2: Students will demonstrate an understanding of the theory and techniques involved in applied ethics and social justice in the context of sustainable communities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● <strong>Concepts:</strong> Ethics, social justice, development of sustainable communities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● <strong>Competencies:</strong> Graduates will be proficient in articulating the importance of a human rights perspectives in community development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● <strong>Assessment Methods:</strong> Students in CRD 46x Community Development Ethics will be required to write a final paper focusing on the role of ethics in sustainable community development. The paper will be assessed with a faculty designed rubric, developed in accordance with professional standards, incorporating applied ethics and social justice in community development. Students in CRD 41x Theoretical Perspectives on Community will complete a written assessment that demonstrates their knowledge of community justice theory.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- **Measures:** The curriculum will be monitored and refined based on measures indicating student ability to compare and contrast the different roles that social justice plays in community building, communicate the importance of ethical leadership to diverse audiences, and articulate the relationships among ethics, justice, and development.

**Learning Outcome 3:** Graduates of the program will be able to synthesize research and think critically about research in diverse subjects including workforce development, housing, small business development, transportation, health care, and financial capital development.

- **Concepts:** Economic development, public services, outcomes-based community development.

- **Competencies:** The graduates will be able to analyze community resources within social, historical, and economic contexts; understand the complex interplay between workers and worker needs, opportunities, and impediments; and the role of private and public resources in the development of core and peripheral community services.

- **Assessment Method:** Students in CRD 22x Principles of Economic Development will complete a written assessment that demonstrates their mastery of content related to workforces, business development, and access to capital.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bachelor of Science in Natural Resource Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Watts College of Public Service and Community Solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Community Resources and Development (Downtown Phoenix)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Description and Justification: |
| The BS in Natural Resource Management degree provides a transdisciplinary education that prepares students for careers in natural resource management in the public and private sectors. Natural resource management has historically emerged from a science-based curriculum. However, with an increased understanding of the role of humans in shaping natural environments, the profession recognizes the importance of social science in natural resource management. |

| Learning Outcome 1: |
| Graduates of the program will master the integration of managerial, social, and natural sciences to make informed decisions regarding natural resources. |

- **Concepts:** The BLM management model, competing values, tradeoffs.
- **Competencies:** The graduates will understand how natural resource policy decisions are made; how research, information, and communication can shape public sentiment and regulation.
- **Assessment Methods:** Students in CRD 42x Decision Making in Natural Resource Management will complete an assessment.
## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>This Natural Resource Management degree incorporates the natural sciences, but has a strong focus on the social sciences aspect of natural resource management. Students learn to integrate managerial, social and natural sciences to make informed decisions regarding natural resources. The degree speaks to ASU's design aspirations of the fusion of intellectual disciplines, community-embeddedness and use-inspired research.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| | **Market Need:**
| | Natural resources related employment is often obtained in federal and state management offices including USDA, agencies such as Forestry and Fish and Wildlife, and the National Parks Services. Other employers may include public and private institutions or non-governmental and international organizations. The job growth rate for a career in this field is about 7% – 11% between now and 2024 (BusinessManagementDegree.net). The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) reports in 2017 that conservation scientists, including natural resource managers, earn a median annual wage of $60,970 (www.bls.gov). The top-paying industry was scientific research and development, with an average wage of $84,970. Most of a major natural resource debate. The assessment will be evaluated by a faculty-designed rubric that gauges student understanding of competing values and resource claims. In CRD 48x Social Dimensions of Natural Resource Management, students will complete a final assessment that evaluates their grasp of the literature regarding social influence on natural resource planning. |
| | **Learning Outcome 2:** Graduates of the program will be able to compare and contrast the different roles that leisure plays in society as well as the roles that leisure plays within a natural resource setting. |
| | **Concepts:** The role of leisure in society, sustainable communities, natural environments, critical analysis. |
| | **Competencies:** Students will understand and be able to articulate the importance of leisure to individuals and groups within natural environmental communities. |
| | **Assessment Methods:** Students in PRM 120 Leisure and Quality of Life will be required to take a written exam or complete a final project to assess their
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>conservation scientists are employed by federal, state and local governments (Learn.org).</th>
<th>knowledge of varying roles of leisure impacts on quality of life. In CRD 301 Sustainable Communities, students will complete a final project that will be assessed against a faculty-designed rubric focusing on the roles of leisure in society, sustainable communities and natural environments.</th>
<th>● <strong>Measures:</strong> The curriculum will be refined based on measures indicating student ability to compare and contrast different roles leisure plays in society, communicate the importance of leisure to diverse audiences, and articulate the relationships among leisure, sustainable communities, and natural environments.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Outcome 3:</strong> Graduates of the program will demonstrate an understanding of the role of humans in shaping natural environments, incorporating social science aspects of natural resource management, in order to solve natural resource management problems through ethical reasoning, teamwork, and collaboration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concepts:</strong> Human behavior in natural environments, preservation and interpretation of natural resources, ethical dimensions of natural resources, collaborative problem solving.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competencies:</strong> The graduates will demonstrate effective collaboration, utilization of social science data sets to understand how humans shape natural environments, the use of statistical models</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

and proper testing methodologies to provide insight into real-world natural resource problems.

- **Assessment Methods:** In PRM 38x Principles of Natural Resource Management, students will complete a final project that demonstrates their understanding of natural resource management challenges, and a holistic, faculty-designed rubric focusing on the role of humans in shaping natural environments. Students in PRM 470 Environmental Communication will complete a resource use interpretation project for an existing public lands organization, assessed by the course instructor using a faculty-designed rubric.

- **Measures:** The curriculum will be refined based on measures indicating student ability to understand and apply social science aspects of natural resource management; utilize real-world data sets in a team setting to interpret, evaluate and present recommended solutions to natural resource problems; ability to work in groups and apply principles of critical thinking, statistical models, and methodologies for testing results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bachelor of Science in Sports Science and Performance Programming</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>$300 per semester</th>
<th><strong>Description and Justification:</strong> The BS in Sports Science and Performance Programming focuses on understanding and optimizing physical abilities for active groups ranging from sports to occupational and tactical</th>
<th><strong>Learning Outcome 1:</strong> Graduates of the BS in Sports Science and Performance Programming (SSP) will be able to assess the physical performance and movement efficiency of clients involved in high performance sports or activities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

College of Health Solutions
## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### (Downtown Phoenix)

**2019-2020**

The ability to work with individuals at close to maximum effort requires specialized knowledge and skills related to these specific populations. The National Strength and Conditioning Association identifies the need for the sports and tactical performance coach to be knowledgeable about all areas of human physiology and movement mechanics in order to keep up with the ever-expanding technologies used to track and monitor the participants. Jobs in this field, ranging from collegiate and professional sports to private industry, require a specific understanding of the human body’s capabilities under intense physical and psychological workloads reaching the far end of the health continuum, the quest for optimal performance. As humans push closer to reaching maximum potential, the risk for serious and routine injuries rises as does the need for field experts with the requisite knowledge to minimize those injuries while still optimizing performance. These topics represent a specialized area within the broader field of exercise science but rely on a knowledge base not currently covered by existing coursework which focuses predominantly on generally healthy, but inactive, populations. Sports Science and Performance Programming will also provide more

### Concepts:

Biomechanical analysis of movement and application of bioenergetics and metabolism with appropriate physiological tests to assess both current and potential optimal performance levels.

### Competencies:

Application of scientific principles in anatomy, physiology and biomechanics to individual clients and teams; communication that leads to determining appropriate levels of participation and determining correct programming for improvement.

### Assessment Methods:

In SSP 423 Performance Testing and Technology, and SSP 325 Applied Anatomy and Biomechanics of Sport and Movement, students will be assessed against a faculty designed rubric that measures critical thinking, problem solving and effective communication on the case studies presented. SSP 423 will have a final review project that will be graded from a faculty designed rubric that will evaluate a student’s creative thinking, problem solving and ability to use quantitative reasoning to decipher information typically generated by health and movement tracking devices and effectively generate reports of information easily understandable by participants and coaches.

### Measures:

The curriculum will be refined based on measures indicating student...
specific coursework for those preprofessional students enrolled in kinesiology who want to focus their rehabilitation careers in the sports medicine or athletics arena. This new degree allows the college to reach out to a new sector of students desiring to work with active populations or directly in the sports field.

**Market Need:**
Based on data compiled from Emsi analytics, the market for graduates in sports science is robust. The demand for graduates far exceeds supply, with over 70,000 annual openings for jobs associated with the degree, yet only 40,000 new degrees were conferred in this area in 2016. Specifically, the category of fitness trainer has over 23,000 annual openings, coaching over 17,000 annual openings, athletic trainer nearly 10,000 annual openings, and exercise physiologists over 3,000 annual openings. The projected job growth is over 8% from 2017 to 2022. The skills deemed as necessary for success in the careers reviewed include exercise physiology, movement analysis and biotechnology, all of which are key class components for the Sports Science and Performance Programming degree. Both the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and ability to apply principles of anatomy, physiology and biomechanics to evaluate individual performance, reduce injury, and communicate effectively with clients; and the ability to make evidence based recommendations using critical analysis of results in real-life experiences as well as the ability to interpret large data sets and determine relevant information required for reporting purposes.

**Learning Outcome 2:** Graduates of the BS in Sports Science and Performance Programming will be able to properly plan a program with the goal of optimizing the physical performance of the participant while making ethical recommendations that keep in mind the health and safety of the participant.

- **Concepts:** Physiological, neuromuscular and hormonal adaptations to exercise; physiological, biomechanical and anatomical differences in athletes; psychological aspects to performance coaching; nutritional factors affecting health and performance; ensuring physical health; ethical reasoning.

- **Competencies:** Applications of the principles of planned, progressed programming, including individual adaptations and methods to monitor the health and well-being of participants, proper communication strategies to enable optimal performance and determining appropriate nutritional needs.
Emsi report that median salaries for graduates in athletic training earn a median annual wage of $56,000 to $60,000 (www.bls.gov).

The Sports Science and Performance Programming degree is targeted towards those students with an interest in working with highly active, top-performing teams and individuals. The degree will adequately prepare students to attain certification from the National Strength and Conditioning Association to work as Certified Strength and Conditioning Specialists (CSCS) or Tactical Strength and Conditioning (TSAC) specialists. Recent legislation passed by the National Collegiate Athletics Association (NCAA) requires all sports performance coaches to hold the CSCS credential. Many other organizations, including Major League Baseball and the National Basketball Association have similar requirements with more to follow in the near future as liability related to injuries and deaths occurring in conditioning sessions have become a reality for today’s athlete. These certifications represent the “gold standard” in the sports performance coaching industry and students graduating from the Sports Science and Performance Programming degree will based on the goals of the participant; appropriate decision making skills to determine the intensity of programs based on environmental conditions and appropriate determination of athlete workload, nutrition and hydration status to avoid poor health decisions.

- **Assessment Methods:** In SSP 460 Resistance Training Application and Theory, and SSP 434 Sports Movement and Conditioning, final projects will be assessed with a faculty designed rubric that incorporates a variety of planned programming models and promotes critical analysis by the student to determine the appropriate choices based on the specific physical and physiological characteristics of the participant and including a demonstration of effective communication to educate the participant on appropriate choices for nutritional and recovery factors to maximize results and monitor overall health; the rubric will also evaluate a student’s ability to adequately determine workload demands and build in appropriate adjustments and progressions to ensure the health and safety of participants.

- **Measures:** The curriculum will be refined based on the student demonstrating the understanding of physiological and neuromuscular adaptation to exercise, consider the implications of physiological, anatomical and biomechanical differences
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</strong></th>
<th>be prepared for these certification exams.</th>
<th>in those decisions and properly demonstrate an ability to determine appropriate workload to ensure an effective and safe performance program design.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Outcome 3:</strong> Graduates of the BS in Sports Science and Performance Programming will be able to demonstrate an understanding of appropriate communication (coaching) techniques that take in consideration of gender, race, socio-economic status and human behavior influence knowing that successful execution of a long term performance program is dependent on the ability of the coach to properly get the best performances and practices from their athletes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concepts:</strong> Socio-economic, demographic and behavioral differences related to participation in performance based programs; psychological theory related to sports performance; coaching cues and communication strategies to improve motivation and participation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competencies:</strong> Effective understanding of psycho-social principles as related to sport and performance related behaviors, including effective communication strategies and coaching cues with considerations of individual differences due to the backgrounds of participants and the situation (environment) provided; interpretation of social science data related to sports and human behavior.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Assessment Methods:** In KIN 348 Psychological Skills for Optimal Performance, case studies will be evaluated using faculty designed rubrics, which assess the ability of students to demonstrate ethical and effective coaching strategies, taking into consideration the psychological techniques and demographic differences of participants as well as data interpretation of human behavior related to health and performance, to improve the effectiveness and participation rates of the overall program. These case studies will review better coaching communication strategies and allow students to make appropriate choices for program decisions based on the needs of the individual.

**Measures:** The curriculum will be refined based on the student demonstrating an understanding of the psychological, demographic and socio-economic impacts on the design of performance based programs for participants and the ability to effectively lead participants from diverse backgrounds and with individual motivations through a successful program.

**Learning Outcome 4:** Graduates of the BS in Sport Science and Performance Programming will be able to effectively incorporate principles of nutrition, psychology, coaching and health promotion into applied performance projects.

- **Concepts:** Nutritional and psychological factors affecting human performance;
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

| Bachelor of Science in Sustainable Food Systems  
School of Sustainability (Tempe) | No | **Description and Justification:** The BS in Sustainable Food Systems will equip the next generation of students to understand the current food systems landscape from an interdisciplinary perspective and then participate in shaping it. Students from diverse backgrounds will:**

| **Learning Outcome 1:** Graduates of the program will apply their knowledge of sustainable food systems by developing and implementing strategies within a real-world context through inquiry and analysis, problem solving, quantitative reasoning, teamwork and collaboration. | 200 |
| 2019-2020 | backgrounds with an interest in any area related to food systems including business, social and natural sciences, and policy maximize the program's scope and reach. As part of the educational mission of the Swette Center for Sustainable Food Systems, this degree will be a collaboration of the School of Sustainability, College of Health Solutions and Morrison School of Agribusiness. The program will feature a core curriculum covering policy, science, social justice, economic development, health and wellness, governance, sustainability and agribusiness that introduces students to the complexity of food systems. It will be designed to take advantage of the strengths of the Tempe, Polytechnic, and Downtown Phoenix campuses by including focus areas that are specific to each campus. It will appeal to students from both rural and urban areas with demonstrated interest in food systems and a commitment to sustainable agriculture by including a wide range of electives allowing them to focus on what would best meet their needs and interests, from developing or enhancing their local food or agribusiness systems to finding solutions to urban food deserts to international development efforts. The program will also be offered online to provide access to students that may be...

| • Concepts: Food systems, sustainability, food systems policy, quantitative reasoning, communication.  
• Competencies: Students will demonstrate their skills in the sustainability education competencies of strategic thinking, futures thinking, and collaboration.  
• Assessment Methods: In SOS 232 Professional Skills in Sustainability, the case study challenge assignments will be assessed by a faculty-designed rubric that focuses on sustainability education competencies. In SOS 498 Capstone Workshop, the learning outcome will be assessed through a holistic analysis of the projects for the stakeholders/clients.  
• Measures: The curriculum will be refined based on measures indicating student ability to develop and implement strategies in sustainable food systems, think critically and make societal recommendations using sustainability education competencies, apply quantitative reasoning to food-related questions, and solve real-world problems through teamwork and collaboration.  

| Learning Outcome 2: Graduates of the program will demonstrate proficiency in critical, analytic and creative thinking by developing, communicating, and applying practical solutions to food sustainability challenges. |
unable to participate in a campus experience.

**Market Need:**
Graduates with a BS in Sustainable Food Systems will be prepared to assess, analyze, and create policies and processes related to food security, sustainable agriculture, climate change, food equity and economic development. Market analytics provided by Emsi indicate job growth within this sector will increase at an annual rate of 7.3 percent, and the U. S. Department of Labor projects an 11 percent increase in openings in the environmental specialist sector, with Arizona seeing an increase of 15 percent. Every year, there are an estimated 10,000 job openings due to growth and net replacement. Interviews conducted by the Swette Center for Sustainable Food Systems director with leaders from local, state, and federal government, as well as private sector businesses, and philanthropic and private equity investors have cited a critical need for graduates who understand food systems from a multidisciplinary lens. Sustainable food systems graduates will offer employers and graduate programs an integrated approach to developing solutions to sustainability challenges. Graduates of the program will understand the complexity of systems.

- **Concepts:** Communicating and persuasion of complex material, critical thinking, analytic thinking, creativity, pragmatism, problem resolution and food sustainability
- **Competencies:** Students will demonstrate their skills in the sustainability education competencies of systems thinking, normative thinking, and strategic thinking in their application of practical solutions to food sustainability challenges.
- **Assessment Methods:** In SOS 310 Equity, Justice and Sustainability, students will be assessed against a faculty developed rubric that addresses the intersection of justice and sustainability that includes effective use of evidence, analysis and explanation, processes and strategies. A holistic assessment will be based on digital portfolios consisting of selected course assignments, reflections on sustainability education competencies, and creative communication.
- **Measures:** The curriculum will be refined based on measures indicating student ability to recognize the ethical issues involved in food systems, develop and apply practical solutions to food sustainability challenges, and consider the implications of actions in relation to the application of these solutions.

**Learning Outcome 3:** Graduates of the program will be able to synthesize, think critically, and communicate about the complexities of food...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>have engaged in a range of knowledge and experience from different disciplinary perspectives, and understand the importance of planning for the future and how to engage stakeholders in that process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>systems from policy to business, health care to sustainability, locally, regionally, nationally, and globally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concepts:</strong> Critical thinking, analytic thinking, synthesis, complexity, sustainability, effective communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competencies:</strong> When the students analyze, synthesize and communicate the complexities of food systems, they will demonstrate their skills in the sustainability education competencies of systems thinking, normative thinking and strategic thinking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Methods:</strong> In School of Sustainability 200 and 300 level courses introducing aspects of food systems, students will be assessed against faculty developed rubrics that address their understanding of the complexities and intersections of agribusiness, science, policy and governance, health, social justice and sustainability that includes effective use of evidence, analysis and synthesis. A holistic assessment will be based on a presentation assignment in the students’ capstone internship course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measures:</strong> The curriculum will be refined based on measures indicating student ability to evaluate and integrate the complexities in food systems as well as effectively create communication and presentations appropriate to different audiences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New Graduate Degrees**
# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master of Arts in Classical Liberal Education and Leadership</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Liberal Arts and Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Civic and Economic Thought and Leadership (Tempe)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Description and Justification:
The ASU Charter states that the university assumes "fundamental responsibility" for the communities it serves. This MA program is the result of a direct and felt community need: the need for teachers in classical-spaced charter schools, for continuing education and a graduate degree program suited to their particular educational niche. It will be a unique academic program serving a growing need in the community as well as an increasingly important national trend in the direction of liberal education.

This MA program also fulfills a number of the design aspirations of a New American University. This program clearly "Leverages Our Place," contributes to "Transforming Society," "Fuses Intellectual Disciplines," and is "Socially Embedded."

### Market Need:
Emsi data shows demand for secondary school teachers especially, with 41,000 annual openings nationally. In total, there are approximately 70,000 annual openings for careers in education in related positions such as teachers, administrators, and education counselors. Analysis suggests that charter schools make up approximately 2,755 of these job openings. The high volume of

## Learning Outcome 1:
Graduates from the MA in Classical Liberal Education and Leadership program will be able to create and effectively communicate persuasive interpretations of classic texts in literature, philosophy, politics, history, and related fields.
- **Concepts:** Graduates will demonstrate knowledge through persuasive interpretations of classic texts and how they relate to political, social, and leadership challenges of current times.
- **Competencies:** Students will demonstrate skills necessary for success in the areas of comparative analysis, leadership, and education.
- **Assessment Methods:** Term papers assigned for particular courses taken in the program will be reviewed using faculty-developed rubrics to assess students’ ability to form and effectively communicate persuasive interpretations of classic texts in literature, philosophy, politics, history, and related fields.
- **Measures:** The curriculum will be monitored and refined based on measures of student ability to form and effectively communicate persuasive interpretations of classic texts in literature, philosophy, politics, history, and related fields and how the texts relate to contemporary political, social, and leadership challenges.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Charter schools with a classical liberal education curriculum in the region supplies a large core market for this particular degree program. This strong core market will be augmented by a substantial national market among teachers at similar schools and also by the large and growing homeschooling community. Comparative programs include the University of Dallas and Eastern University, both developed in the last 5 years in response to this market need. According to a recent survey by Hart Research Associates, 74 percent of employers would recommend a classical liberal educational approach to college-bound students.

Learning Outcome 2: Graduates from the MA in Classical Liberal Education and Leadership program will be able to communicate ideas and arguments related to the history of social, political, and philosophical thought.

- **Concepts:** Graduates will demonstrate knowledge of the classic questions related to the human experience and methods of preparing persuasive arguments necessary to be a successful educator, administrator, or leader in any field.
- **Competencies:** Students will demonstrate skills necessary for successfully communicating persuasive arguments, classic perspectives, and lessons related to the timeless questions of human existence.
- **Assessment Methods:** Students’ ability to communicate ideas and arguments on the comprehensive exam will be assessed using faculty-developed rubrics. Students’ participation in discussions from all core courses will be assessed according to faculty-developed rubric in accordance with established best practices. This method will draw from the rubric sections on argument construction, clarity, and depth of the understanding. Results will be examined by course as well as aggregated.
- **Measures:** The curriculum will be monitored and refined based on measures of student ability to verbally communicate persuasive arguments and classic perspectives.
Learning Outcome 3: Graduates from the MA in Classical Liberal Education and Leadership program will be able to synthesize themes from classic texts across disciplines from literature, philosophy, politics, history, and related fields.

- **Concepts**: Students will demonstrate knowledge of the classic texts in literature, philosophy, politics, history, and related fields to successfully lead in educational, civic and business organizations and institutions.

- **Competencies**: Students will demonstrate skills necessary to be successful in the areas of teaching, communication, public service, and business.

- **Assessment Methods**: Students will participate in ongoing course discussions about classic texts in literature, philosophy, politics, history, and related fields, and their depth of understanding of these classic texts will be assessed using faculty-developed rubrics. This method will draw from the rubric section on integration of readings, and synthesis of multiple sources and across disciplines. Results will be examined by course as well as aggregated.

- **Measures**: The curriculum will be monitored and refined based on measures of student ability to synthesize themes from classic texts across disciplines from literature, philosophy, politics, history, and related fields.
| Executive Master in Community Development | Yes | Description and Justification: The Executive Master in Community Development is an advanced master's degree designed specifically for mid-career working professionals who wish to expand their leadership potential and capacity in strategic community development. ASU offers Executive Master’s degrees through schools such as Public Affairs, Sustainability, Thunderbird, and W. P. Carey. Community Development is a long established, global, professionally-based academic discipline currently not incorporated into Arizona State University’s degree-granting portfolio. It focuses on strategic planning, development, implementation, and evaluation of community projects. It also provides a foundation in policy analysis, program and project management and community/social research. Community Development requires a distinct, differentiated degree program that can add value to the students and mission of the School, and thus serve the use-inspired, community-embeddedness design principles of Arizona State University. This Executive Master degree is specifically designed for mid-career professionals, which distinguishes it from a) the research-oriented MS in |
| Watts College of Public Service and Community Solutions |  | Learning Outcome 1: Demonstrate a systematic and critical understanding of a substantial and complex body of knowledge at the frontier of community development |
| School of Community Resources and Development (Downtown Phoenix) | $500 per credit hour | ● Concepts: Roles and representations of community development, including international best practices. |
| 2020-2021 |  | ● Competencies: Ability to demonstrate autonomy, authoritative judgement and responsibility as an expert and leading practitioner; demonstrate and apply ethical and professional standards to all work. |
|  |  | ● Assessment Methods: Final Project in CRD XXX: Theory and Practice of Community Development. Students will be rated on their ability to critically assess a community development program. Final project in CRD XXX, Advanced Concepts and Methods in Community Development. Students will be rated on their ability to critically assess a contemporary issue in community development studies. |
|  |  | ● Measure: The curriculum will be refined based on measures indicating student ability to identify and understand the complex body of knowledge surrounding community development. |
|  |  | Learning Outcome 2: Demonstrate a range of analytical, creative, critical specialized research |
### Community Resources and Development

that is currently offered and from b) the MPS in Community Development Practice (included on this plan.)

### Market Need:

According to Salary.com, the average Community Development Manager salary in the United States is $109,856; the range typically falls between $94,795 and $126,822. Current Community Development and Community Economic Development salaries listed on Indeed.com range from $45,000 to $162,000. Many universities worldwide offer related degree programs or concentrations in such diverse academic hubs as human development, rural sociology, social work, economics, regional planning and anthropology. In the US, 32 universities offer graduate degree programs in Community Development; the University of Arizona offers a Master’s of Development Practice. Graduates of this Executive Master degree can expect to advance in their current jobs or move into more senior positions upon completion. The program is designed for mid-career professionals from across the country and around the world.

### Skills and be able to apply them to finding practical pathways in community development.

- **Concepts:** Understanding and role of culture and community development, including indigenous culture and multiculturalism; ability to apply research methods and skills in professional practice
- **Competencies:** Ability to disseminate and promote new insights to professional and academic peers
- **Assessment Methods:** Final project in CRD XXX, Community Development Policy. Students will be rated on policy critiques and research on constructing alternatives.
- **Measure:** The curriculum will be refined based on measures indicating student ability to effectively research community development issues and solutions. 80% of graduating students will have authored (or co-authored) and submitted two public research outputs (e.g., journal articles, book chapter, research briefs, research reports) for dissemination in professional or academic journals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description and Justification:</th>
<th>Learning Outcome 1: Demonstrate a systematic and critical understanding of a substantial and complex body of knowledge at the frontier of community development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Master of Professional Studies (MPS) is a master's degree that combines the focused study of traditional graduate degrees (such as the Master of Arts or Master of Science) with specialized, industry-specific skills that can immediately be put to use in the workplace. The MPS in Community Development Practice is designed for aspiring professionals and includes direct experience gained through internships, fieldwork and a graduate project to complement classroom learning. It is distinguished from a) the more research-focused MS in Community Resources and Development currently offered, which is designed for those pursuing an academic career path, and also from b) the Executive Master in Community Development (on this plan), which is specifically designed for mid-career working professionals. The program focus is on how to plan, develop, implement, monitor and evaluate community projects, in the context of policy analysis, program and project management and community/social research.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Need:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250 per credit hour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watts College of Public Service and Community Solutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Community Resources and Development (Downtown Phoenix)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Outcome 1: Demonstrate a systematic and critical understanding of a substantial and complex body of knowledge at the frontier of community development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concepts: Participative democracy, sustainable development, human rights, economic opportunity, equality and social justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competencies: Understand the values, processes and outcomes of community development; understand how to engage with communities; be able to develop and support collaborative working and community participation; ability to enable communities to take collective action, increase their influence and their ability to access, manage and control resources and services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Methods: Final Project in CRD XXX: Theory and Practice of Community Development; students will be rated on their ability to critically assess a community development program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: The curriculum will be refined based on measures indicating student ability to identify and understand the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graduates of the MPS in Community Development Practice will be prepared to work in the public, business, and non-profit sectors. They will also be qualified for various managerial positions such as program associates, development managers and grant coordinators. According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, employment for social and community service managers is projected to grow at a rate of 10 percent between 2014 and 2024. Current Community Development and Community Economic Development salaries listed on Indeed.com range from $45,000 to $162,000. In the US, 32 universities offer graduate degree programs in Community Development; the University of Arizona offers a Master’s of Development Practice. Students completing this degree could be expected to work in a variety of occupations from social and community service to real estate and property development.

Learning Outcome 2: Demonstrate a range of analytical, creative, critical specialized research skills and be able to apply them to finding practical pathways in community development

- **Concepts:** Promoting diversity and inclusion (equity), building leadership and infrastructure, incorporating values into practice (ethics), ensuring participatory planning, learning for change, organizing for change, improving policy and practice, and building leadership and infrastructure

- **Competencies:** Ability to support people and organizations to learn together and to raise understanding, confidence and the skills needed for social change; ability to design and deliver practices, policies, structures and programs that recognize and respect diversity and promote inclusion; ability to facilitate and support organizational development and infrastructure for community development; ability to develop, evaluate and inform practice and policy for community development

- **Assessment Methods:** Final project in CRD XXX, Community Development Policy (elective course); students will be rated on policy critiques and research on constructing alternatives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doctor of Philosophy in Data Science, Analytics and Engineering</th>
<th>No</th>
<th><strong>Description and Justification:</strong> With its programs in Computer Science, Computer Systems Engineering, Industrial Engineering and Software Engineering that cover data management, statistical modeling, optimization, and artificial intelligence and machine learning, the ASU School of Computing, Informatics and Decision Systems Engineering is in a unique position to offer graduate degrees in data science that span the spectrum from data acquisition to decision-making with a focus on data science, analytics and engineering. Our faculty base can propel this effort into a top 10 national program for this emerging area within a short time. We propose a program targeted towards data scientists and engineers that will have analytical and computational depth and go beyond the business data analytics often offered through business schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Outcome 1: Graduates will be able to identify open challenges, adapt, develop, and apply methods and tools from industrial statistics, operations research, machine learning, computer science, and computer engineering for problem description, system development, and prescriptive decision analysis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concepts:</strong> Program goals focus on enabling graduates to recognize opportunities, diagnose distinguishing characteristics of those challenges and then build, implement, maintain, and apply models and tools that can leverage existing data, create new knowledge, and make decisions for solving problems of societal interest.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competencies:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Ability to develop, implement and apply algorithms for various data science tasks such as: prediction, classification, recommendations, pattern detection and grouping, anomaly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

to address issues related to managing and using data for discovery and prescriptive decision-making.

**Market Need:**
The U.S. Department of Labor Occupational Outlook Handbook (as of April 2018) lists statisticians, mathematicians, software developer (applications) and operations research analysts all among their top 20 fastest growing occupations for 2016-2026. The article, "The Quant Crunch: How the Demand for Data Science Skills is Disrupting the Job Market" (Burning Glass Technologies, 2017) mentions the significant growth of data-center skills in 2016 (Data Science: +40 percent, Data Engineering: +28 percent) and goes on to say that "advertised data scientist jobs pay an average of $105K and advertised data engineering jobs pay an average of $117K." Although there exists several graduate programs in Data Science, only a limited number are offered by ASU peers or ASU aspirational universities. This program will be backed by a strong and large faculty of computer scientists, computer engineers and industrial engineers and will produce graduates with job prospects much beyond "data analysis" that involves computing, detection, recognition, scoring and ranking, segmentation, and forecasting.

- Ability to apply optimization and stochastic modeling techniques for abstraction of decision problems into quantitative models, validation of those models, solution of those models and sensitivity analysis for interpreting accuracy and implications of results;
- Understanding of the value of data and design of data systems;
- Ability to develop original models and algorithms for data-driven decision making that address problem specific objectives and constraints.

**Assessment Methods:**
- **Student performance on the data analysis questions of their PhD comprehensive exam.**
- **Student performance on the decision modeling and algorithmic section of the comprehensive exam.**

**Measures:**
The curriculum will be monitored and refined based on student ability to apply the appropriate analytics for the available data and insights required for decision making.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engineering, optimization and decision-making skills pre- and post-data analysis.</th>
<th>Learning Outcome 2: Graduates will be able to utilize and manage large, heterogeneous data sets for discovery.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● <strong>Concepts:</strong> The student is expected to be proficient at the acquisition, management and use of data for descriptive, predictive and prescriptive analytical studies. This includes understanding the issues of economics, privacy, security and computational feasibility.</td>
<td>● <strong>Concepts:</strong> The student is expected to be proficient at the acquisition, management and use of data for descriptive, predictive and prescriptive analytical studies. This includes understanding the issues of economics, privacy, security and computational feasibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● <strong>Competencies:</strong> ○ Ability to create and evaluate models using large, heterogeneous data sets; ○ Understanding the value of data and information and the risks/ethics involved in acquiring, managing and using that data; ○ Understanding of big data systems, such as Hadoop, for data management and processing and ability to apply existing software tools for data management and analysis.</td>
<td>● <strong>Competencies:</strong> ○ Ability to create and evaluate models using large, heterogeneous data sets; ○ Understanding the value of data and information and the risks/ethics involved in acquiring, managing and using that data; ○ Understanding of big data systems, such as Hadoop, for data management and processing and ability to apply existing software tools for data management and analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● <strong>Assessment Methods:</strong> Student performance in developing a data management plan for executing research as part of the dissertation.</td>
<td>● <strong>Assessment Methods:</strong> Student performance in developing a data management plan for executing research as part of the dissertation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● <strong>Measures:</strong> The curriculum will be monitored and refined based on student ability to manage big data sets and</td>
<td>● <strong>Measures:</strong> The curriculum will be monitored and refined based on student ability to manage big data sets and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
models in terms of security and computational feasibility.

**Learning Outcome 3:** Graduates will be able to develop original research ideas and effectively convey research results to a technical audience.

- **Concepts:** The graduate will be prepared for a successful career as a data researcher. They should be able to generate a research agenda, execute the technical portion of the research and then disseminate the results. In addition the graduate should be able to educate others on the specific methods and nuances of analytics and data science.

- **Competencies:**
  - Ability to identify feasible, original research ideas of measurable value to the body of knowledge;
  - Ability to present study results to both technical and managerial audiences at different levels;
  - Ability to develop educational materials that effectively convey opportunity and appropriate use of data science technologies to students and practitioners at different levels.

- **Assessment Methods:** Student performance on the written and oral Dissertation Proposal Defense.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master of Education in Early Childhood Education</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>$190 per course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Teacher Preparation (Tempe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description and Justification:**
The Master of Education in Early Childhood Education will prepare individuals to meet the educational, social and emotional needs of children from birth through age eight. The program will offer two tracks: the master’s degree for students who already have a teaching certificate or the master’s degree and Arizona certification in early childhood education for students wanting to become licensed to teach children in public schools from birth through grade three. The MEd program in early childhood education has been offered as a concentration under the curriculum and instruction degree since fall 2008 with continually increasing enrollment, currently exceeding 200 active students. The proposed degree would replace the master of education.

**Learning Outcome 1:** National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) Standard 1: Students will demonstrate understanding of child development and learning and application to designing learning environments.

- **Concepts:** Students will learn the history of educational theories, constructs and frameworks as related to early childhood development. This knowledge will guide their ability to construct and evaluate quality learning environments.
- **Competencies:** Students will demonstrate their understanding of child development, learning processes, and best practices in designing quality learning settings by synthesizing research findings and other sources of evidence in order to create an early childhood instructional unit. Students will display their ability to integrate pedagogical skills with content knowledge in the design of...
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>in curriculum and instruction (early childhood education) degree and provide parity with the college's teacher preparation and certification programs that are degrees rather than concentrations (e.g., elementary education, secondary education, special education). Additionally, offering the program as a degree will align with labor market recognition of similarly named degrees as indicated through contact with professionals in the field and survey of competitive programs offered by other peer institutions of higher education.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Market Need:**  
With more than 28,000 unique postings nationwide (Emsi Analyst job posting data) in positions that include lead teachers, preschool teachers, certified teachers, Head Start teachers, and kindergarten teachers, the demand for early childhood educators demonstrates the nationwide need for educators qualified to work with young children in elementary and other early childhood settings. Top recent job postings provided by Emsi Analytics demonstrate the focus of the labor market on degrees titled “early childhood education” that address hard skills in lesson planning (identified in an instructional setting that promotes whole-child learning opportunities.  
| **Assessment Methods:** The ECD 505: Foundations of Early Childhood Education Signature Assignment is aligned with standards from the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) (1b, 1f, 1k) and NAEYC. The Signature Assignment is an Issues Debate paper which requires the students to engage in discussions, selecting a current topic, researching the topic, formulating a professional viewpoint, taking a stance on the topic and debating it using a research stance.  
The ECD 565: Instructional Methods in Early Childhood Signature Assignment is aligned to standards from InTASC (1a) and NAEYC (1a, 1b, 1c, 6a, and 4e). The signature assignment for ECD 565 is to develop an Integrated Thematic Unit. The purpose of the assignment is to design lessons around major themes, sub themes and smaller units while meeting cross-curricular learning standards.  
| **Measures:** The curriculum will be refined based on students’ measured ability to design learning environments based on best practices, and principles of child development and learning processes.  
| Learning Outcome 2: NAEYC Standard 4: Students will demonstrate that they understand the
### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| 31% of related job postings), child development (23% of related job postings), preschool education (17% of postings), and early childhood education (31% of postings). The Emisi inclusion of the position “early childhood special education teachers” as the fifth most frequently posted job title highlights the need for early childhood educators prepared to work with young children with or without disabilities or developmental delays. The program addresses typical and atypical growth and development and exceptional learners as an embedded part of the curriculum, threading information about children with disabilities across all courses in the program. | Theories and research that support the importance of relationships and high-quality interactions in early education.  
- **Concepts:** Students will learn about research-based findings that should be used to guide the instructional cycle. Many theories and theorists will be explored as the students evaluate the sources and identify ways the information can be used to design, implement, and assess quality interactions in the early childhood setting.  
- **Competencies:** Students will conduct observations, analyze data obtained through the observations and learner work samples, and evaluate the results in relation to the research literature on high-quality interactions in early education. Students will determine the young learner’s current performance level, integrate relevant references and resources into the evaluation, and provide evidence- and standards-based suggestions for future learning needs that address academic, social, and emotional domains.  
- **Assessment Methods:** ECD 541--Signature Assignment Section 1 Descriptor: Analysis of the Child's Development (Aligned to InTASC; 6k, 6l and NAEYC 3b, 4a). ECD 541--Signature Assignment Section 2 Descriptor: Analysis... |
| Master of Science in Environmental Engineering  
Ira A. Fulton Schools of Engineering  
School of Sustainable Engineering and the Built Environment  
(Tempe)  
2019-2020 | No | **Description and Justification:** The growth in the MS in Civil, Environmental and Sustainable Engineering supports the establishment of an independent MS in Environmental Engineering degree with separate classwork and research tracks. This degree will be useful to recruit a broad range of ASU students including those in the 4+1 degree program, and allow us to narrow recruiting efforts for future students. The current MS degree in Civil, Environmental and Sustainable Engineering will remain for students interested in a broad interdisciplinary MS program, while the new MS in Environmental Engineering will focus on environmental processes; air, land and water systems engineering; and environmental chemistry and microbiology. The MS in Environmental Engineering program provides a natural pathway into graduate school for students enrolled in the BS program in of the Assessment Data/Impact of the Lesson (Aligned to InTASC; 6i. 6o. 6v, NAEYC: 4b).  
**Measures:** The curriculum will be monitored and refined based on students' expertise in understanding the theories and research that support the importance of relationships and high-quality interactions in early education.  
**Concepts:** Environmental engineers utilize key terminology and concepts in environmental chemistry, environmental microbiology, and risk management to recommend solutions.  
**Competencies:** Students will demonstrate understanding of fundamental concepts related to physical, chemical, and biological processes.  
**Assessment Methods:** Written comprehensive examination, Applied Project, or Thesis assessed via analytic rubric  
**Measure:** The curriculum will be refined based on measures indicating student ability to demonstrate advanced understanding of scholarly learning in their specialty area in environmental engineering.  
**Learning Outcome 1:** Graduates of the MS Environmental Engineering program will be able to evaluate complex environmental problems from conflicting perspectives and assumptions. |
Environmental Engineering. Many students in a variety of disciplines are concerned about the environment and would like to obtain advanced education in environmental engineering. Students with undergraduate degrees in Chemistry, Biology, Molecular Sciences, Chemical Engineering, and Biological and Health Systems Engineering would likely be interested in a degree that provides advanced training in environmental engineering. Rather than pursue a degree in Civil Engineering, these students are more likely to be drawn towards a degree in Environmental Engineering. This promotes and advances trans-disciplinary dialogue in the School and enriches the student’s educational experience. Students will be advised by faculty mentors with respect to appropriate prerequisites that they need to take to pursue the MS in Environmental Engineering.

**Market Need:**
Environmental engineers incorporate the principles of chemistry and microbiology with engineering processes in order to produce potable water and treat wastewater, remediate contaminated soil and sediment, manage solid and hazardous waste,

**Learning Outcome 2:** Graduates of the MS Environmental Engineering program will be able to propose and defend engineering solutions to environmental problems consistent with current theoretical foundations to relevant audience.

- **Concepts:** Environmental engineers employ technical writing, oral communication, and appropriate principles for visualizing information and data.
- **Competencies:** Students will demonstrate the ability to communicate environmental engineering concepts that are correct and appropriate for the audience.
- **Assessment Methods:** Presentation in ENG XXX will demonstrate mastery of environmental engineering concepts and effective communication skills scored using an analytic rubric. Graduates will be employed in an area of environmental engineering by way of private industry, research or government lab, or university setting utilizing the knowledge and skills acquired in the program or are accepted for further graduate study in environmental engineering using the knowledge and skills acquired in the program.
- **Measure:** The curriculum will be refined based on measures indicating student ability to emphasize the engineering of
monitor air quality, and implement air quality control devices. Graduates with a master’s degree in Environmental Engineering pursue careers in engineering consulting, project management and execution, and design of facilities and environmental treatment processes. They serve as environmental engineers within industry, water project managers, and environmental health and safety professionals. The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics projects an 8% increase in employment of environmental engineers over the next decade. The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that median salary for environmental engineers was $86,800 in 2017. However, environmental engineers coming out of the proposed degree program will have much broader employment prospects than traditional environmental engineers. Given ASU’s emphasis on addressing grand challenges, bringing about quantum leaps in sustainability, and advancing solutions to global climate change, environmental engineers trained in this program will have a broad array of opportunities that go well beyond the classic definition of an environmental engineer. Environmental challenges being faced today are increasingly natural and built environments to enhance the human condition.
| Doctor of Philosophy in Geographic Information Science | No | **Description and Justification:** The PhD in Geographic Information Science (GIS) will foster training of next generation scientists and engineers who will excel at theoretical, computational, analytical and technical knowledge in transdisciplinary geospatial sciences. Recent advances in location-based big data acquisition using remote sensing, Internet of Things, drones, and citizen sensors have created tremendous demand for a workforce to solve unique challenges across spaces and places, and to develop new ways of analyzing geospatial big data to support decision-making in smart city designs, disaster resilience, precision agriculture, public health, homeland- and cyber- security, refugee operations and environmental management. This exciting field sits in the heart of Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) | **Learning Outcome 1:** Graduates of the Geographic Information Science PhD program will be able to analyze and isolate the spatial properties that can produce insight for decision making.  
- **Concepts:** Recognize that spatial processes are distinct from a-spatial processes and that the nature of geographical space adds complexity and challenges to our understanding of the world. Consequently, recipients of the degree will demonstrate their knowledge of geography and geographical processes and their ability to understand the complexity of spatial vs a-spatial problems.  
- **Competencies:** Spatial data collection procedures, use of Geographic Information Science tools (e.g. ARCGIS, QGIS, map data), and crafting spatially-explicit research questions.  
- **Assessment Methods:** The first question of the written comprehensive |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| education, the enhancement of which will undoubtedly retain the international competitiveness and impact of ASU and its students. This new degree program will also play a key role in achieving ASU’s mission of becoming "a global center for interdisciplinary research, discovery and development." | examination and the oral defense of this question will evaluate the student's ability to think spatially.  
**Measure:** The curriculum will be refined based on measures indicating student ability to demonstrate their knowledge of geography and geographical processes and their ability to understand the complexity of spatial vs a-spatial problems. |
| **Market Need:**  
Only four PhD programs focused exclusively on geographic information science exist in the US. Forty-three geographic information science faculty positions became available recently ([http://www.indeed.com](http://www.indeed.com)). According to private research, the geographic information science industry grew in the double digits in 2010 and another 8 percent in 2011. The Bureau of Labor Statistics' 2010-2011 Handbook reported skilled geographic information science workers have "favorable job prospects." The US Department of Labor's High Growth Industry Profile -- Geospatial Technology report, described the geospatial market as "growing at an annual rate of almost 35 percent, with the commercial subsection of the market expanding at | **Learning Outcome 2:** Graduates of the Geographic Information Science PhD program will be able to demonstrate analytical, statistical, and computational skills for analyzing geospatial data.  
**Concepts:** Solve complex spatial problems through computational, statistical and mathematical skills applied to spatial problems. Apply data science approaches to spatial data.  
**Competencies:** Spatial statistics, Geographic Information Science programming, geo-statistics, remote sensing, handling big data.  
**Assessment Methods:** Students will answer a technical question as part of their comprehensive exam. Students will take a technical course on GIS and the culminating project will be assessed on a faculty developed rubric. |
the rate of 100 percent each year."
According to the American Association of Geographers, median annual salary for geospatial information scientists and technologists has increased from $79,000 in 2010 to $83,000 in 2014. Geographic information science theory, tools, computational procedures, models, and techniques engage several critical elements in STEM curriculum and instruction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Objective 1:</th>
<th>Learning Objective 2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure: The curriculum will be refined based on measures indicating student ability to demonstrate analytical, statistical, and computational skills for analyzing geospatial data.</td>
<td>that assesses the application of statistical methods to a geospatial problem.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Learning Outcome 3:** Graduates of the Geographic Information Science PhD program will be able to demonstrate an understanding of where the research frontiers are in geographic information science.

- **Concepts:** Demonstrate that, although the student's research is based on previous research, it extends our current knowledge and therefore contributes significantly to geographic knowledge. Able to identify geographic information and knowledge needs that are cutting edge.

- **Competencies:** Conduct review and synthesis of geographic literature. Be able to communicate (via writing and oral presentation) clearly about geographic research frontiers.

- **Assessment Methods:** For the culminating assignment, students will situate their research within frontiers of GIS during GCU 585 Research Design and Proposal Writing assessed using a graded rubric.
### Master of Global Leadership and Strategy

**Thunderbird School of Global Management**  
(Downtown Phoenix)  
2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>$2,500 to $3,400 per credit hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Description and Justification:**  
Globalization, economic change, more stringent regulations and tougher governance make realizing stakeholder value increasingly difficult. Private and public businesses, nongovernment organizations and government institutions must have a visible pipeline of high-potential individuals "in waiting" for senior leadership and executive positions. These leaders must be developed to engage globally, value entrepreneurship and transform society (ASU's design aspirations). The senior leaders of the future may have ambition and talent, but these alone do not ensure success in senior leadership positions. To succeed as senior leaders, **Learning Outcome 1:** Graduates will demonstrate the ability to build sustainable trusting relationships based on respect and openness for other cultures with others from diverse parts of the world.

- **Concepts:** Graduates will employ knowledge of global organizations, private and public sector organizations, global industries, global value networks and cultural complexities.
- **Competencies:** Students will develop a Global Mindset which comprises knowledge of global organizations, global industries, global value networks and cultural complexities. Students will be able to build sustainable trusting relationships with others from diverse parts of the world and exhibit passion,
these individuals with high-potential must be given the right set of conditions and support to develop. These include international exposure to develop a global mindset, geopolitical savvy and cross-cultural agility; broad strategic thinking experiences and stretch to develop emotional intelligence; judgement and learning agility to lead in senior and executive positions. The Master of Global Leadership and Strategy develops leaders who can design and create solutions to contemporary global challenges.

Market Need:
The largest readiness gap for organizations around the world is a shortage of senior leadership talent. Emsi labor market analysis (2016, 2017) identified a 10 percent growth in managerial and executive jobs that require leadership, critical thinking and project management skills. Deloitte found that only 14 percent of global firms were doing an excellent job of senior leadership development; 85 percent were doing an inadequate job. Grant Thornton and the Conference Board identified similar gaps. Successful senior leaders need much more than business skill mastery; they excitement, respect, flexibility and openness towards other cultures.

- **Assessment Methods:** A Global Mindset Inventory pre- and post-test will be administered to each student in the program upon entry in an introductory class and prior to graduation in a capstone class to assess development in the graduate's ability to think with a Global Mindset as measured using the validated Global Mindset Inventory instrument. Development will be measured along three factors: Intellectual Capital, Cultural Capital, and Social Capital. Graduating students will evaluate the quality of the program's ability to enhance Global Mindset.

- **Measures:** The curriculum will be refined based on students' growth on the Global Mindset Inventory and weaknesses identified by students.

**Learning Outcome 2:** Students will demonstrate the ability to engage globally, manage the tradeoffs and tensions encountered by leaders in the global context, and deal with the paradoxes and fast-paced change in the global context through their enhanced leadership versatility.

- **Concepts:** Students will navigate trends of globalization, economic change, regulation and governance and their impacts on global stakeholder
### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>need to be globally sophisticated, innovative, curious and able to make rapid decisions. Most organizations are &quot;redesigning their entire strategy for leadership development, driving deeper skills faster, developing leaders globally, and building leadership on a continuous basis.&quot; The Master of Global Leadership and Strategy is designed to accelerate the career trajectory of high potential individuals to fill the global senior leadership pipeline talent gap.</th>
<th>relationships and entrepreneurship.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competencies:</strong> Students will demonstrate leadership versatility—the ability to deal with fast-paced changes encountered in the global environment. Students will demonstrate the ability to adjust their behavior and apply the right leadership approach for the circumstances at hand in a variety of global contexts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Methods:</strong> Students will be assessed in their ability to meet the leadership versatility criteria utilizing the Leadership Versatility Index, a validated scale that identifies strengths and weaknesses, ability to manage global leadership tensions and tradeoffs, and mastery of opposing leadership forces need to deal with paradox and fast-paced change encountered in the global environment. This assessment will be administered in their first Leadership class at the beginning of the program and as a post-test in their final course before graduation. Graduating students will evaluate the program's ability to enhance Global Leadership.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measures:</strong> The curriculum will be refined based on students' growth in Leadership Versatility and weaknesses identified by students in this area of the training.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Master of Science in Health Care Simulation | Yes | Description and Justification: The expanding use of simulation education in health care settings demonstrates the need and opportunities to educate innovative leaders in experiential teaching strategies. Simulation in health care education improves competencies in communication, teamwork, critical thinking, professional identity and safety. The simulated learning environment provides a psychologically safe space where students can make mistakes without risk to real patients. Evidence-based standards are used in scenario design, replicating real patient experiences with life-like high-fidelity computer manikins or standardized patients (trained actors). Students complete core courses then choose electives to maximize their individual learning needs. The courses which comprise this program will provide students the opportunity to learn and work with their peers, faculty and leaders from multiple disciplines, including academia, health care, sociology, technology, the arts and public policy. Students will work collaboratively to identify and develop strategies and solutions to health care and community-based health care. | Learning Outcome 1: Demonstrate the ability to influence the design, operations, and evaluation of educational health care simulation in academic and/or practice settings.  
- **Concepts:** Graduates of the MS in Health Care Simulation program will demonstrate expertise in process improvement and strategic planning applied to healthcare simulation in the academic and/or practice setting(s).  
- **Competencies:** Students will demonstrate competence in the use of strategic planning systems and infrastructures to support and maintain operations (International Association for Clinical Simulation and Learning (INACSL) 1 Operations Standard; SSH2 Core Standards).  
- **Assessment Method:** In NUR XXX: Simulation Practicum Advanced, Simulation Program Process Improvement Oral Presentations will be assessed against a faculty developed rubric that measures process improvement and application of strategic planning to health care settings. In NUR XXX: Capstone, Strategic Plan Written Projects will be assessed against a faculty developed rubric that measures process improvement and application of strategic planning to health care settings.  
- **Measures:** The curriculum will be monitored and refined based on student feedback. |
| College of Nursing and Health Innovation | $107 per credit hour; cap at $750. | |
| (Downtown Phoenix) | 2019-2020 | |
### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

challenges through simulation and experiential education. The Arizona Board of Nursing Advisory Opinion authorized the use of up to 50 percent of clinical experiences can be simulated using evidence-based practices and qualified faculty. The foundation of this opinion is based on the National State Board of Nursing Simulation Study in 2012. [https://www.ncsbn.org/JNR_Simulation_Supplement.pdf](https://www.ncsbn.org/JNR_Simulation_Supplement.pdf)

**Market Need:**
The MS in Health Care Simulation will target interprofessional educators and practitioners seeking operational and leadership expertise to be innovative change agents in academic or health care simulation settings. The 2016 National League for Nursing Biennial Survey suggests 43 percent of surveyed individuals identified lack of clinical placements and 33 percent of qualified applicants are turned away due to faculty shortage. The College of Nursing and Health Innovation Simulation Learning Resources program at ASU currently operates over 80,000 student hours per year. The nationwide nursing shortage decreases the number of qualified nurse educators with additional stress ability to articulate principles of design, operations and evaluation for educational healthcare simulations.

**Learning Outcome 2:** Demonstrate the ability to provide health care simulation program leadership and oversight associated with fiscal management, physical space, equipment, and personnel resource operations.

- **Concepts:** Graduates of the MS in Health Care Simulation program will demonstrate expertise in health care simulation leadership skills and operational perspectives.
- **Competencies:** Students will demonstrate competencies in Leadership, Financial, Human Resource, Capital Equipment, Disposables Management, and Space Allocation essential to Healthcare Simulation Program (INACSL Operations Standard).
- **Assessment Methods:** In NUR XXX: Simulation Practicum 1, Preceptor Observation Written Journals will be assessed against a faculty developed rubric that measures application of leadership and management principles. In NUR XXX: Educational Simulation Methods, Written Scenario Development Assignments will be assessed against a faculty developed rubric that measures application of leadership and management principles.
## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Description and Justification:</th>
<th>Measures:</th>
<th>Learning Outcome 1:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master of Science in Innovation and Venture Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>Over the past decade, there has been a growing recognition of the value of design thinking in innovation and business circles. This program capitalizes on this fact and ensures that graduates will gain enhanced terminal competencies that organizational leaders will need to be successful in their careers. The new multi-disciplinary Master of Innovation and Venture Development will prepare students to become the next generation of strategic thinkers and leaders equipped with a unique set of skills in design thinking, innovation process, business strategy, technology management and sustainability issues. Graduates from this program will be armed with the knowledge and skills to recognize, analyze, visualize and implement solutions for the complex global challenges we will face in the future. This degree utilizes a venture-based learning environment.</td>
<td>The curriculum will be monitored and refined based on student ability to critique and defend the management of physical space, equipment, personnel, and other operational perspectives.</td>
<td>Students graduating from the program will demonstrate the practical application of lean startup methodologies including customer discovery/development, data collection and analysis, prototyping, experimentation, business modeling, value proposition development along with supply chain awareness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herberger Institute for Design and the Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students will obtain the knowledge and skills (design thinking, innovation process, business strategy, and technology management) to recognize, implement, and analyze solutions for managing the business lifecycle across agile project developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Design School (Tempe)</td>
<td>$270 per credit hour; max $2425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students will be able to define product/service requirements and identify needs through customer discovery whilst developing innovation and entrepreneurship literacy through venture-based learning within a startup studio environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

75
### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>based learning model, in which students will have the opportunity to learn by participating in cross-functional teams on meaningful and challenging projects, sourced from the business community.</th>
<th>• <strong>Assessment Methods:</strong> Students will successfully complete a detailed new business proposal of a startup product or service project and present to the faculty committee and/or external panel in the studio courses (DSE 520 and DSE 580). Students in DSE XXX will demonstrate the ability to create a new product or service via the establishment or advancement of an internal or marketplace-focused team-based venture.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Market Need:</strong> Emsi reports confirmed our program matches the skills sought by local and national employers, showing positive growth trend for jobs utilizing this skill set between 2017 and 2022 both regionally (+13.4%) and nationally (+10%). In Arizona, job postings with these competencies include: Anthem, Oracle, Honeywell, Accenture, Raytheon, Godaddy, and Aetna. Job titles include: Business Development Manager, Corporate Vice President, Product Manager, Engineering Manager and Design Director. WPC benchmarked competitive offerings from other U.S. Universities. The results show this collaborative degree would be unique and in the vanguard of interdisciplinary programs. Companies hiring graduates from collaborative degree programs include: Amazon, Apple, Boston Consulting, Cisco, Deloitte, EBay, Glaxosmithkline, Google, GoPro, IBM, IDEO, Intel, John Deere and others.</td>
<td>• <strong>Measure:</strong> The curriculum will be refined based on areas of weakness and strength as indicated by measures of practical application of lean startup methodologies (e.g. customer discovery/development, data collection and analysis, prototyping, experimentation, business modeling, value proposition development).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Learning Outcome 2:** Students will demonstrate active project management skills to evaluate current issues, problems or opportunities for the organization and the successful project launch.

- **Concepts:** Using Design Strategies, students will successfully implement a Lean Startup incorporating cross discipline approaches and multiple systemic viewpoints.
- **Competencies:** Students will exercise critical thinking skills while utilizing Risk and Failure Mode Analysis along with
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>We conducted qualitative research through a series of 14 interviews with executives and managers at companies with significant operations in Arizona. Feedback was overwhelmingly positive to the concept of a venture-based interdisciplinary degree.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>project Gantt Charting to map out critical milestone requirements and increase start-up implementation success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Assessment Methods:</strong> Success will be measured through the practice and process of innovation and critical thinking in the context of Creative Design Thinking (Innovision). Using a program-long portfolio, various milestone activities in relation to strict adherence to an established Gantt chart will be periodically monitored and assessed at the end of DSE XXX using a faculty-developed rubric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Measure:</strong> The curriculum will be refined based on measures indicating student ability to demonstrate critical thinking and innovation skills to evaluate current issues, problems and opportunities in a venture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Learning Outcome 3:</strong> Students will work effectively within a multidisciplinary development team and external stakeholders to identify issues and opportunities, solve problems, and create high value products or services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Concepts:</strong> By applying metrics that represent multidisciplinary milestones and ROI thresholds that are paramount to ‘managing’ the process and working with a seasoned ‘network’ of advisors,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
investors, business consultants, students will increase likelihood of lean start-up success.

- **Competencies:** Participating students will progress in their cross discipline awareness of each other's business, engineering, manufacturing and design awareness competencies.
- **Assessment Methods:** Students will demonstrate the ability to successfully form and manage multi-disciplinary operating teams or start-up entities, and learn the importance of human capital, as demonstrated by establishing a successful start-up company or be judged by faculty as qualified to establish a start-up.
- **Measure:** The curriculum will be refined based on measures indicating student ability to work effectively within a multidisciplinary development team and external stakeholders to identify issues and opportunities in venture development.

| Master of Arts in International Affairs and Leadership | Yes | **Description and Justification:** The MA in International Affairs and Leadership will leverage the McCain | **Learning Outcome 1:** Graduates of the program will be able to clearly analyze challenges in international affairs, articulate the development | 50 |
| College of Liberal Arts and Sciences | $287 per credit hour | Institute's deep international affairs experience and ASU's unmatched academic scope. This program would be an investment in a long-term, education-focused enterprise that would combine the university's academic capacity and visibility of the new Washington Center with the McCain Institute's connectivity in Washington and emphasis on leadership. Based in Washington, students will be exposed to and interact with senior government, private-sector officials, and international top decision-makers. Experiencing academic theory in action will provide students a distinctive edge as they approach graduation and seek job opportunities. As an innovative institution entering this market, ASU could establish a program that surpasses D.C.-based international affairs programs with particular emphasis on the practical applications of international affairs education and hands-on experience as part of the curriculum while coming in at a substantially lower cost. |
| School of Politics and Global Studies (Tempe) | | of relevant U.S. foreign policy, and demonstrate its practical application and implementation in the field. |
| 2019-2020 | | - **Concepts:** Critical thinking and analysis in reality-based international affairs scenarios; Effective verbal and written communication in the relevant professional setting; Foreign language proficiency; Sophisticated understanding of the multiple layers of government and private sector resources available to foreign policy decision-makers. |
| | | - **Competencies:** The ability to collect and synthesize relevant information to make a knowledgeable decision with an actionable result. Effective, sharply focused public speaking and written communications skills to convey a clear and purposeful message in an international context. Advanced ability to operate professionally and achieve results in unfamiliar cultural settings. |
| | | - **Assessment Methods:** In a final presentation (Applied Leadership Project), we will examine the level and sophistication of reality-based research and proposed policy recommendations that demonstrate a clear understanding of the multiple available levers of national power and their appropriate deployment for achieving national security goals. |
| Market Need: | According to a 2014 Forbes article, master’s degrees in International Relations rank as the fifth best degree |
### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| | for jobs with a projected employment increase for jobs associated with this degree. Emsi data further supports this claim, showing that careers related to international affairs such as business operations specialists, security managers, and intelligence analysts are on an upward trend and projected to increase by 120,000 by 2023. The Washington DC market has four well-established and well-known international affairs programs: The Elliott School at George Washington University (GW); Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies; American University’s School of International Service; and Georgetown University’s School of Foreign Service. George Mason University recently decided to increase its offerings in this area as well. All programs are private institutions with high tuition with traditional academic programs resting on their strong reputations, rather than the kind of dynamic innovation characteristic of ASU. Of the four, only GW has displayed a strong sense of innovation and willingness to emphasize practical applications beyond the general academic curriculum. There is a need for a new program in the international affairs space that breaks away from the | Students will present detailed, reality-based policy recommendations as a result of their research, synthesized in their final presentation (Applied Leadership Project), before a panel of foreign policy experts to defend their recommendations.  
- **Measures:** The curriculum will be monitored and refined based on measures of student ability to collect and analyze relevant information, critically analyze challenges in international affairs, articulate the development of relevant U.S. foreign policy in verbal and in written form, and demonstrate its practical application and implementation in the field.  

| Learning Outcome 2: Graduates of the program will be able to clearly evaluate foreign policy challenges and apply effective diplomatic negotiating strategies and tactics to achieve positive outcomes.  
- **Concepts:** Negotiation; Conflict resolution; Adaptability in diverse negotiating environments; basic concepts of international law and the variety of culturally influenced negotiating styles.  
- **Competencies:** The ability to navigate the complex foreign policy landscape. Convening authority to explore a diversity |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>traditional academic structure. The McCain Institute aims to provide an innovative international affairs program providing a practical, hands-on curriculum led by Professors of Practice at a substantially lower cost than competitors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of opinions and to resolve differences. Understanding and deploying diplomatic protocol to achieve negotiation outcomes. Identifying and effectively interacting with the diverse players and their agendas operating in the international environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Assessment Methods:</strong> In action teams, students will participate in active simulation exercises and produce a collective policy document reflecting lessons learned that demonstrate their understanding and ability to achieve positive outcomes in a challenging international setting. Students will be required to articulate their policy choices and negotiating strategy and to justify verbally and in writing the expected impact and consequences of their policy recommendations. Students will participate in weekly group discussion panels where they will discuss the current policy environment, analyze and assess negotiation strategies based on previous class lectures and readings, and propose next steps in advancing a complex set of interwoven policy objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Measures:</strong> The curriculum will be monitored and refined based on measures of student understanding of basic concepts of international law and the variety of culturally influenced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
negotiating styles; ability to articulate their policy choices and negotiating strategy and to justify verbally and in writing the expected impact and consequences of their policy recommendations; and their ability to evaluate foreign policy challenges and apply effective diplomatic negotiating strategies and tactics to achieve positive outcomes.

Learning Outcome 3: Graduates of the program will have a sophisticated understanding of character-driven leadership and its role in a highly complex international environment, incorporating critical thinking, complex problem solving, and building of professional relationships with international partners as well as adversaries.

- **Concepts:** Ethical reasoning. Values based decision making. Formation of the foundation of trust. Networking in an international environment. Understanding of the power and influence of traditional and modern media.

- **Competencies:** Employing diplomacy skills inside and outside of traditional diplomatic discourse. Leading teams to find creative solutions to challenges in violent, uncertain, complex and ambiguous international settings. Comprehension and successful application of leadership principles based
## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master of Arts in Investigative Journalism</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Description and Justification: Investigative journalism, focused on holding the powerful accountable through highly specialized reporting, has played an increasingly vital role in American life since the Vietnam War.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walter Cronkite School of Journalism and Mass Communication</td>
<td>$1,000 per semester</td>
<td>Learning Outcome 1: Graduates will demonstrate the ability to conduct and critically evaluate research required for investigative journalism. Concepts: Graduates in the MA in Investigative Journalism program will learn cutting-edge reporting and research skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Assessment Methods:** Students will produce a Final Presentation (Applied Leadership Project) on a leadership challenge in which they will be required to propose a comprehensive leadership solution, including an impact assessment and benchmarks to measure success. Students will defend their Applied Leadership Project, ready for implementation, before a panel of experts.

- **Measures:** The curriculum will be monitored and refined based on measures of student ability to understand character-driven leadership and its role in a highly complex international environment, incorporate critical thinking, complex problem solving, and the building of professional relationships to propose a comprehensive solution to a leadership challenge, including an impact assessment and benchmarks to measure success.
### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Downtown Phoenix)</th>
<th>2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

and Watergate. It exposes corruption and points toward solutions in government, business, law enforcement, health, education, the environment and other areas.

In existing Cronkite School programs, students and faculty have produced award-winning investigative reporting that prompted policy changes and regulatory action in Arizona and beyond.

Now the Scripps Howard Foundation has awarded the Cronkite School $3 million to create the first-in-the-nation MA in Investigative Journalism -- leveraging expertise from across the university in interdisciplinary collaboration and bringing unprecedented focus and funding to this field.

The work of Investigative Journalism students, during and after the program, will unearth information vital to our democracy, aligning with several ASU Design Aspirations: transforming society, conducting use-inspired research, fusing intellectual disciplines, being socially embedded and enabling student success.

**Market Need:**
Investigative journalism is a highly competitive and specialized field. Techniques drawn from a wide array of academic disciplines. Graduates of the program must be nimble in applying a range of techniques in reporting specific stories and evaluating relevant research produced by other sources.

- **Competencies:** Graduates will apply a variety of strategies and tactics in interviewing sources, gathering and analyzing quantitative and qualitative data, accessing government data and understanding historical context.

- **Assessment Method:** In their capstone experience (MCO 570), students will produce a professional-level investigative reporting project and will present their work to a panel of experts from inside and outside the Cronkite School. Members of each panel will evaluate their work using a rubric of professional standards on a variety of measures. Throughout the program, students are required to conduct primary and secondary research to inform reporting using a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods. This research is included in individual online portfolios of work completed over the course of the program. The school will work with external industry leaders to evaluate a sample of these portfolios and ask evaluators whether the portfolios demonstrate the ability to conduct and

...
According to Emsi Analyst, the number of active postings listing "investigative journalism" as a hard skill tripled from approximately 150 in September 2016 to approximately 450 in June 2018. During this period, top newsrooms posted more than 2,000 unique jobs in investigative journalism. Meanwhile, employers report challenges in hiring journalists with the training required to excel in this area. No journalism school in the country offers a graduate degree in investigative journalism, and newsroom leaders world-wide who were surveyed by the Google News Lab in 2017 reported that they did not have the resources to teach the requisite skills in house. Carolyn Ryan, The New York Times editor in charge of recruiting, called the market a "ferocious battle for investigative talent." She told the Poynter Institute, "It's the most intense I've ever seen, and I've been hiring reporters for a long time." This new degree program will bring together students from a range of disciplines and provide complementary skills required for cutting-edge investigative reporting, preparing graduates to excel in this competitive industry while serving newsrooms and communities around the globe. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome 1: Graduates will critically evaluate research required for investigative journalism.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measures: The curriculum will be monitored and refined based on student ability to effectively employ reporting techniques and substantively evaluate research from primary and secondary sources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome 2: Graduates will demonstrate the ability to find and develop original story ideas into full investigative reporting projects worthy of professional publication and distribution.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concepts: Investigative reporters distinguish themselves by unearthing stories that were previously unreported and then developing them to be thorough, well-documented and complete investigations. Graduates of this program must be able to demonstrate that they can do that at a professional level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competencies: Students will demonstrate skill in applying a variety of strategies and tactics to find and develop investigative reporting projects, including interviewing, source development, data collection and analysis, and qualitative research, while applying the values of journalistic news judgement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Methods: Throughout the program students will be challenged to find and develop story ideas into...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
investigative projects. They will compile the final projects into an portfolio, and the Cronkite School will work with outside industry leaders to evaluate those portfolios against a rubric of professional standards. Throughout the program students will be encouraged to publish or broadcast their investigative reporting projects with professional news outlets.

- **Measures:** The curriculum will be monitored and refined based on student ability to recognize reporting avenues that can be further investigated for development into full reporting projects.

**Learning Outcome 3:** Graduates will demonstrate the ability to gather, analyze and communicate diverse viewpoints to journalistic audiences in ethical and responsible ways

- **Concepts:** Students of the MA in Investigative Journalism program must demonstrate competency in and commitment to inclusion and the highest standards for journalistic ethics.

- **Competencies:** Students will demonstrate that they can identify key stakeholders to share viewpoints on a particular topic, use responsible and ethical techniques of gathering these viewpoints and effective strategies for communicating these viewpoints according to the principles of the Society
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- **Assessment Methods:** Students will create a portfolio of their work over the course of the degree program. The Cronkite School will work with external industry leaders to evaluate a sample of these portfolios using a rubric of professional standards in determining the extent to which their work demonstrates critical evaluation of and integration of diverse viewpoints. Students are required to understand and apply the Society of Professional Journalists Code of Ethics in every class and assignment at the Cronkite School. The school will work with external industry leaders to evaluate a sample of student portfolios using a rubric of professional standards in determining the extent to which their work demonstrates reporting consistent with the ethics of the profession.

- **Measures:** The curriculum will be monitored and refined based on student ability to ethically represent and articulate differing viewpoints to audiences.

**Learning Outcome 4:** Graduates will demonstrate skills in using multimedia storytelling techniques to distribute the results of their investigations through media appropriate to each story.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **Concepts:** Students in the MA in Investigative Journalism program will produce investigative journalism stories on digital, social and broadcast platforms. Graduates of the program must demonstrate that they can use the tools and techniques that are most appropriate and effective for communicating the findings of their investigations.

- **Competencies:** Students will use journalistic writing, data visualization, audio production, photography and/or videography in communicating their findings.

- **Assessment Methods:** In their capstone experience (MCO 570), students will produce a professional-level investigative reporting project and will present their work to a panel of experts from inside and outside the Cronkite School who will evaluate their work using a rubric of professional standards on a variety of measures. Throughout the program, students will compile a portfolio of their investigative work and multimedia storytelling. The Cronkite School will work with external industry leaders to evaluate a sample of these portfolios using a rubric of professional standards on a variety of measures.

- **Measures:** The curriculum will be monitored and refined based on student
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master of Arts in Language Teaching</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Description and Justification: In an increasingly global world and an increasingly linguistically diverse nation, knowledge of a second language is increasingly important. In Arizona, the need for language teachers has reached a crisis point, and many classrooms are without teachers. In an effort to address the crisis, the Arizona Department of Education has changed its requirements to allow those with a Bachelor of Arts in a field, &quot;subject experts,&quot; to teach. With the MA in Language Teaching, we hope to assume a fundamental responsibility for the economic, social, and cultural health of Arizona by providing graduate training specifically in language teaching to those who already possess the linguistic skills. Currently, ASU does not provide a MA degree in language teaching.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Liberal Arts and Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of International Letters and Cultures (Tempe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Learning Outcome 1: Graduates of the MA in Language Teaching will be able to recognize and apply current second language acquisition theoretical concepts and pedagogical practices in the area of language teaching and learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Concepts: Students will learn research based principles of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) and the appropriate linguistic terminology to describe language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Competencies: Students will be able to evaluate the results of research in second-language acquisition in order to determine the best ways to apply SLA research to language pedagogy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | | ● Assessment Method: Sample lesson plans in SLC 596: Second Language Acquisition Methodologies will demonstrate the application of at least two second language acquisition theories and their resulting pedagogical
The proposed program is designed to build on existing graduate coursework on the following languages: Spanish, French, Chinese, Japanese, and German. These are also, with the possible exception of Japanese, languages that are currently taught in the majority of schools.

**Market Need:**
According to the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Language, the main national professional organization for language teachers, "For the third year in a row, more than 40 states plus the District of Columbia have reported a teacher shortage in world languages, an all-time high for the subject area since the Department of Education began collecting data over 25 years ago. In the report, language teaching vacancies are at the top of the list next to other key subject areas like math, science, and special education". Emsi data suggest there are currently no competitor programs in Arizona for an MA in Language Teaching. These data show that in 2017, there were 16,346 jobs in the region (8,176 in secondary schools and 8,170 in postsecondary institutions). Out of the 16,346 individuals holding these positions, only 1,518 have earned a

**Learning Outcome 2:** Graduates of the MA in Language Teaching will be able to critically evaluate published evidence from research and practice studies.

- **Concepts:** Students will study and learn various Principles of Language pedagogy, including the most important methods that have been developed over the years. They will also learn the appropriate linguistic terminology to describe language and language development.
- **Competencies:** Students will be able to read and evaluate results of research in second-language acquisition in order to develop appropriate curricula for second language classes.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

master’s degree, leaving a large number of potential students for the MA in Language Teaching. In terms of new vacancies, there were 58 unique job postings from October, 2017, to September 2018, at the university, community college, and secondary school levels.

The MA in Language Teaching degree would be the only one in Arizona to be offered in languages other than Spanish. Currently, the University of Arizona does not offer a MA in Teaching Languages and Northern Arizona University offers one online program in Spanish only. The target audience is undergraduate language graduates who want to go into teaching, as well as currently practicing language teachers who seek professional development in a program that is specifically designed for them.

Furthermore, community college teaching opportunities require a master’s degree in the target language; the MA in Language Teaching will provide community college teachers with the tools and skills necessary for successful teaching at that level. Additionally, based on a report by the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, educators with advanced training in language teaching will

- **Assessment Methods:** Research paper in SLC 596: Second Language Acquisition Methodologies, whereby students show evidence of a solid understanding of the published research as detailed by the faculty designed rubric. Discussion board assignments on readings reflecting on the relevance of published research in SLC 596: Second Language Acquisition Methodologies. All required discussion posts will be evaluated using a grading rubric for the students' evaluation of evidence.

- **Measures:** The curriculum will be monitored and refined based on student ability to defend and critique research methods and evidence from published works in the Principles of Language pedagogy.

**Learning Outcome 3:** Graduates of the MA in Language Teaching will be able to create different types of language related activities following current pedagogical recommendations.

- **Concepts:** Students will learn the principles of computer-assisted language learning, including how to develop and use technology for language teaching.

- **Competencies:** Students will be able to develop curricula for second language classes by applying existing technological tools to language learning, as well as developing their own tools. Teachers who
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master of Science in Natural Resource Management</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Watts College of Public Service and Community Solutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Community Resources and Development (Downtown Phoenix)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description and Justification:**
The MS Natural Resource Management degree provides a transdisciplinary education that prepares graduate students for careers in natural resources management (NRM) in the private and public sector. NRM has historically emerged from a science-based curriculum. However, with an increased understanding of the role of humans in shaping natural

**Learning Outcome 1:** Graduates will master an understanding of the role of human agency and social science in shaping natural resource management.

- **Concepts:** Graduates will master resource stewardship; project and program management; scientific method in natural resource management.
- **Competencies:**
  1. Effectively apply laws, policies, regulations, and guidelines to...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2019-2020</th>
<th>environments, the profession recognizes the importance of social science in NRM. Our NRM degree has a strong focus on the social sciences aspect of NRM while still incorporating the natural sciences. Students learn to integrate the managerial, social, and natural sciences to make informed decisions regarding natural resources. This enables students to continue on to doctoral level work or enter the workforce with applied knowledge. The degree speaks to ASU’s design aspirations of fusing intellectual disciplines, community-embeddedness and use-inspired research.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market Need:</td>
<td>Natural resources related employment is often obtained in federal and state management offices including USDA, agencies such as Forestry and Fish &amp; Wildlife, and the National Parks Services. Government jobs offer good benefits packages and excellent retirement plans. Other employers may include public and private institutions or non-governmental and international organizations. The job growth rate for a career in this field is about 7% – 11% between now and 2024. A Masters NRM graduate working as a Forest Conservationist today earns $59,060 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>protect resources and ecological systems;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Apply knowledge of scientific concepts to plan, implement, and administer natural resources projects;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Knowledge and ability to apply sound scientific approaches and appropriate methods to resolve natural resource management issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Assessment Methods: Program assessment exercise in CRD XXX: Natural Resource Management Assessment. Students will be rated on their major assignment that requires them to assess an existing major natural resource management program. Final project in CRD XXX: Natural Resource Management Practice: Students will evaluate and offer new features for state-level natural resource management programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Measure: The curriculum will be refined based on measures indicating student ability to utilize resource stewardship; manage projects and programs; and apply scientific methods in natural resource management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Outcome 2:</td>
<td>Graduates will master risk assessment and communication of threats and vulnerabilities on a contemporary natural resource topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concepts: Students will be able to utilize risk and assessment of risks methodologies; technical and public communication; professional credibility in the management of natural resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competencies:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Application of contemporary practices in assessment of threats and vulnerabilities to natural resources;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ability to effectively communicate complex, technical, or controversial information of threats and vulnerabilities to diverse audiences;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Demonstrated expertise in and contributions of risk methodologies in scientific endeavors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Methods: Risk assessment in CRD XXX: Risk Assessment and Communication. Students will be rated on their ability to apply risk assessment practices to a natural resource topic of their choice. Formal pre-test and post-test polling of audience at public risk assessment presentations event, CRD XXX: Risk Assessment and Communication.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: The curriculum will be refined based on measures indicating student ability to utilize risk assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$80,000/year, depending upon position and experience, while a Masters NRM graduate working as a Geographic Information System (GIS) Analyst earns $56,000 - $71,000/year. Research on business management degrees indicates that salaries can range upwards of $120,160/year with an NRM Master’s degree in a management position and adequate experience.
| Master of Science in Organizational Leadership | Yes | Description and Justification: | Methodologies to counter threats to natural resources. | Learning Outcome 1: Graduates will be able to apply a comprehensive body of organizational leadership scholarship and theory to identify and propose solutions to complex problems of leadership practice. |
| College of Integrative Sciences and Arts (Polytechnic) | $160 per credit hour |  |
| 2019-2020 | **Concepts:** This program will produce graduates who are critical consumers, producers, and practitioners of leadership scholarship and theory. | |
|  | **Competencies:** Students will produce scholarship to apply social psychological and critical theories of leadership. | |
|  | **Assessment Methods:** In OGL 520 Organizational Leadership: Social Psychological Perspectives, students will demonstrate in a culminating research paper that they can apply social psychological scholarship and theories of leadership to identify and propose solutions to a problem of leadership practice. In OGL 530 Critical Perspectives in Leadership Theory, students will demonstrate in a culminating research paper that they can critique a proposed solution to a problem of leadership practice by applying critical perspectives in leadership theory and articulating the normative and epistemological underpinnings of organizational leadership theories within the broader | |
|  | Market Need: | |
|  | The Faculty of Leadership and Interdisciplinary Studies in the College of Integrative Sciences and Arts currently offers a Bachelor of Arts in Organizational Leadership to 1,340 undergraduates and an Organizational Leadership concentration to about 475 Interdisciplinary Studies students. We have assembled a strong core of faculty who are well positioned to establish a transdisciplinary MS in Organizational Leadership that builds upon our Bachelor of Arts in Organizational Leadership and complements other graduate degrees at ASU. | |
|  | The MS in Organizational Leadership will offer a theoretically and methodologically rigorous approach to theory and use-inspired research needed in organizational leadership including organizational dynamics, institutional evolution, strategic change, leading diverse teams, collaborative governance, conflict mediation, critical problem solving, leadership assessment, and advanced methodological and statistical skills. | |
|  | Market Need: | |
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

| According to 2016 Em­si data, there were roughly 223,000 orga­ni­za­tion­al leadership jobs in the United States based on pro­gram mar­ket demand, but only 4,100 mas­ter’s de­grees were con­ferred that year. This leaves a sub­stan­tial gap that ASU can help fill. Ad­di­tion­ally, ac­cord­ing to 2017 Em­si data, there was 1.1% growth in Lea­dership oc­cu­pa­tions be­tween 2016 and 2017. Last­ly, 25% of jobs posted be­tween July 2017 and July 2018 sought an em­ployee with skills in lead­ership and lead­ership de­vel­op­ment. All of the Em­si data indi­cates a thriv­ing, and even grow­ing, work­force in Or­gan­i­za­tion­al Leadership. | social, po­li­ti­cal, cul­tur­al, and eth­ic contexts of lead­ership the­ory.  
- **Mea­sure**: The cur­ri­culum will be mon­i­tored and re­fined based on mea­sures of stu­dent abil­ity to syn­thetize and apply a com­pre­hen­sive body of or­gan­i­za­tion­al lead­ership scholarship to iden­tify and propose solu­tions to com­plex prob­lems of lead­ership prac­tice, as well as to crit­i­que pro­posed solu­tions by ap­ply­ing crit­i­cal per­spec­tives and artic­u­lat­ing the norm­a­tive and epistem­o­lo­gical un­der­pin­nings of or­gan­i­za­tion­al lead­ership the­ories.  

**Learning Outcome 2**: Graduates will be able to de­mon­strate that they can iden­tify and apply ap­propri­ate ad­vanced quan­ta­tive and qual­i­ta­tive as­sess­ment meth­ods of data an­a­lysis to lead­ership effec­tiveness and lead­ership the­ory.  
- **Con­cepts**: This pro­gram will pro­duce grad­u­ates who are crit­i­cal con­sum­ers, pro­duc­ers, and prac­tion­ers of lead­ership scholar­ship and the­ory.  
- **Com­petencies**: This pro­gram will pro­duce grad­u­ates who can iden­tify and apply ad­vanced quan­ta­tive and qual­i­ta­tive as­sess­ment meth­ods to lead­ership effec­tiveness and lead­ership the­ory.  
- **Assess­ment Meth­ods**: In OGL 571 Ad­vanced Leader­ship As­sess­ment, stu­dents will de­mon­strate in a cul­mi­nating case study their abil­i­ties to |
gather, interpret and evaluate quantitative and qualitative evidence of leadership effectiveness, 2) apply advanced assessment methods to assess leadership effectiveness including the assessment of self and others, and 3) apply the data to create leadership development plans with interventions to improve leadership effectiveness. In OGL 574 Qualitative Data Analysis in Leadership Research, students will demonstrate in a culminating research paper that they can identify and apply an advanced qualitative method of data analysis to develop, assess or apply a theory of leadership they anticipate using in their culminating experience. In OGL 575 Quantitative Data Analysis in Leadership Research, students will demonstrate in a culminating research paper that they can identify and apply an advanced quantitative method of data analysis (and appropriate tools including SPSS) to develop, assess or apply a theory of leadership they anticipate using in their culminating experience.

- **Measures:** The curriculum will be monitored and refined based on measures of student ability to identify and apply appropriate advanced quantitative and qualitative assessment methods of data analysis to develop,
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master of Arts in Policy Advocacy</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Description and Justification: This program will provide training and skills needed for successful careers within policy advocacy. This program directly addresses elements of ASU Charter by creating opportunities to increase the professionalism of individuals that can represent economic, social, cultural, and health concerns of local, state, national and other communities. ASU’s DC location affords advantages to leverage the highly skilled and networked individuals who work in this region. Governmental and regulatory environments have become increasingly complex. Considerable expertise and knowledge is required to navigate the legal, communication, political and policy landscapes, and effectively create societal change. This complex environment has prompted interest groups to increasingly call upon professionals to champion their concerns, and influence opinion, legal precedent and local to international policies. Policy advocacy encompasses a wide range of activities that influence decision makers. This includes traditional activities such as litigation, lobbying, and public education. It can assess, or apply leadership effectiveness and leadership theory.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Watts College of Public Service and Community Solutions | $100 per credit hour | Learning Outcome 1: Graduates in the MA in Policy Advocacy will allow students and professionals from a variety of backgrounds to understand, solve issues and work within the public policy process.  
  - **Concepts:** Understand the role of public policy in policy advocacy and be able to communicate this to others.  
  - **Competencies:** At the completion of CPP XXX, students will be able to apply analytical techniques to understand how the public policy process relates to policy advocacy and effectively communicate these relationships.  
  - **Assessment Methods:** Graduates in CPP XXX will demonstrate their knowledge of the public policy process through a written exam. Graduates in CPP XXX will demonstrate their ability to communicate the relationships between public policy and policy advocacy through their communications posted on a discussion board.  
  - **Measure:** The curriculum will be refined based on measures indicating student ability to apply analytical techniques to communicate and advocate policy based solutions. |
| Dean’s Office, Watts College of Public Service and Community Solutions (Downtown Phoenix) | 2019-2020 | |

90
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

also include capacity building, relationship building, forming networks, and leadership development.

**Market Need:**
The target audience is students from policy, legal, communication and other backgrounds with an interest in policy advocacy and working professionals seeking a career change or to enhance their skill set. Graduates can be expected to work at all levels of the public sector (federal, state, and local governments), as well as with nonprofit and private organizations. This degree will allow graduates to either begin or advance their careers in a wide range of fields, including: lobbying, public-private partnerships, child advocacy, community issues and development, health advocacy, law, education, social justice education, government, human rights, disability rights, environmental justice, human services, criminal justice, health care, business, nonprofit organizations and more. Very few universities in the nation offer any specific degrees that develop the high-level skills and techniques that are crucial to create change at the individual, community, and public policy levels.

**Learning Outcome 2:** Graduates will be able to apply and use legal, communications, policy and other applicable knowledge to plan for and approach real world policy advocacy issues.

- **Concepts:** Understand that multiple skills and knowledge sets are needed to create an effective policy advocacy campaign.
- **Competencies:** At the completion of CPP 593 Applied Project, students should have a good foundation for planning and approaching policy advocacy issues.
- **Assessment Methods:** Students in CPP 593 Applied Project will demonstrate their knowledge of planning for an advocacy project through a planning assignment. Students in CPP 593 Applied Project will demonstrate their knowledge of creating an effective policy advocacy campaign through completion of a final project.
- **Measure:** The curriculum will be refined based on measures indicating student ability to use legal, communications, policy and other applicable knowledge to create applicable solutions to policy advocacy issues.
## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics’ Occupational Outlook Handbook, employment of community and social service occupations is projected to grow 14 percent from 2016 to 2026, faster than the average for all occupations, adding about 371,900 jobs. In addition, O*NET Online lists Social and Community Service Managers as a bright outlook occupation with a growth rate of 18% by 2026.

### Doctor of Philosophy in Spanish Linguistics

**College of Liberal Arts and Sciences**

**School of International Letters and Cultures (Tempe)**

**2019-2020**

| No | Description and Justification: The Doctor of Philosophy in Spanish Linguistics would put ASU on the map to become the first university in Arizona with a doctoral program in Spanish linguistics. Spanish linguistics is an internationally recognized field of study, and demand for experts with an advanced degree in this field has been increasing over the past decade. At present, we offer a Doctor of Philosophy in Spanish, with a track in Spanish Linguistics. This track has attracted an increasing number of applicants and our graduate courses are thriving. Spanish linguistics, however, does not share content commonalities with Spanish literature and culture, and finding common courses is a challenge. Additionally, our |
| Learning Outcome 1: Graduates demonstrate and articulate appropriate content knowledge in the field of Spanish linguistics. |
| **Concepts:** Students will learn key linguistic terminology to describe language, will identify common linguistic patterns of Spanish, and will discriminate among current linguistic theories. |
| **Competencies:** Students will evaluate results of research in Spanish linguistics, will analyze samples of Spanish language, and will apply linguistic concepts to language teaching. |
| **Assessment Methods:** Students can define key terms in the field using existing scholarship as demonstrated using faculty developed rubrics on course exams in SPA 543 and SPA 544. Students demonstrate and articulate familiarity with linguistic theories and |

12
graduate students stand a better chance on the job market if their titles reflect this specialization.

Market Need:
This degree addresses the increasing national and state-wide demand for more graduates with a Doctor of Philosophy in Spanish Linguistics, with specializations in second-language acquisition and teaching, heritage language research and pedagogy, historical linguistics, and sociolinguistics. The current Modern Language Association Spanish job list contains a substantial number of ads for Spanish linguists (44 percent of all positions in Spanish, 2016-2017, a notable increase from 35 percent in 2015-2016). This degree will help the School of International Letters and Cultures and ASU attain additional regional and national teaching and research excellence and prepare the next generation of experts in Spanish linguistic s. In addition, the degree program will serve local (and also national) communities by addressing the growing need for K-12 and high school Spanish language teachers and administrators who involve the use of innovative language teaching practices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome 2: Graduates demonstrate familiarity with research methods common to the field and conduct relevant independent research projects.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concepts:</strong> Students will learn key terminology in quantitative and qualitative research methods, will identify and evaluate common data collection methods, and will identify and use current data analysis tools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competencies:</strong> Students will evaluate research designs, will analyze linguistic data, and will formulate appropriate research questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Methods:</strong> Students are able to synthesize and evaluate research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| The Emsi data show that the most common job postings for individuals with a PhD in Spanish Linguistics advertised openings for the following types of positions: Postsecondary Teachers, Managers, Instructional Coordinators, Computer and Information Research Scientists, Medical Scientists (except Epidemiologists), Secondary School Teachers (except Special and Career/Technical Education), and Detectives and Criminal Investigators. The most common job titles for individuals with a PhD in Spanish linguistics were the following: college/university faculty (tenure-track and contract faculty), project managers, learning managers, IT subject matter experts and Spanish translators. For an individual with a degree in Spanish Linguistics, there were 353 unique job postings in 2017 at university, colleges, schools as well as in the private sector such as Duolingo, IXL Learning, Inc., Amazon, and Google. | reports as demonstrated using faculty developed rubrics on written projects about developing a research agenda in the following course -- SPA 598 (Research methods). Graduates are able to design an individual research project that addresses relevant research questions as demonstrated using faculty developed rubrics on a final research paper in SPA 598 (Research methods).  
- **Measures:** The curriculum will be monitored and refined based on student ability to defend and critique research methods and determine the best approach towards an original research question.  

**Learning Outcome 3:** Graduates demonstrate knowledge of the conventions of scholarly activity in the field of Spanish linguistics.  
- **Concepts:** Students will identify main linguistic theories and use academic conventions (written and oral).  
- **Competencies:** Students will compare theoretical approaches and discuss implications of theories for practical use.  
- **Assessment Methods:** Students can synthesize existing scholarship to create literature reviews offering new academic arguments and situating their own scholarship within ongoing conversations. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master of Science in Supply Chain Management</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>$800 per credit hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W. P. Carey School of Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Supply Chain Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Tempe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description and Justification:**
Expanding the MS degree offerings at the W. P. Carey School is an effort to respond to student and corporate demand for more specialized programs. The proposed curriculum delivers students a solid Supply Chain Management program covering the core elements of analysis, as well as sophisticated and holistic understanding of supply chain management that balances analytical and soft skills. As the global economy continues to expand to include more markets, the demand for this degree will continue to rise from both students and organizations. Within the discipline, our Supply Chain Management Department consistently

**Learning Outcome 1:** Graduates will evaluate a case study and create an actionable plan to a problem to demonstrate graduate-level proficiency in critical thinking within the supply chain management domain.

- **Concepts:** Students’ supply chain case evaluations will demonstrate issue identification, reflect context and assumptions, outline a thesis or approach, and employ evaluation of evidence to defend conclusions and inferences.

- **Competencies:** Students will be able to state and describe the issue or problem that is being addressed, state and question implicit assumptions, identify the reverent contexts for stakeholders, evaluate source material and select

and larger contexts as demonstrated using faculty developed rubrics on a final paper in the following courses: SPA 598 (SLA), SPA 542, or SPA 546. Graduates are able to give a professional presentation as demonstrated using faculty developed rubrics on the final oral presentation in the following courses: SPA 598 (SLA), SPA 542, or SPA 546.

- **Measures:** The curriculum will be monitored and refined based on student ability to articulate their scholarship and the interactions of current theories with the student's own academic arguments.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

is ranked in the top 5, giving the promotion of the program an immeasurably positive boost.

Market Need:
According to data from Emsi, offering the MS in Supply Chain Management degree will support a growing need for employers involved in the spectrum of activities across logistics, procurement, and operations. Their data shows very strong job growth (6.8%) over the next five years with an average starting salary across the industry of almost $90,000 per year.

Data from the most recent Emsi report shows few (16) competitor programs existed in 2017, leaving significant space in the marketplace for an offering from our top-ranked Department of Supply Chain Management, ranked #3 by the U.S. News and World Report this year. Furthermore, latest Emsi data suggests that a broad range of companies (current and target employers) plan on hiring to meet the increased need over the next 5 years. These data confirm our ability to deliver a competitive and attractive MS in Supply Chain Management, and demonstrates long-term demand from employers and students for the degree.

appropriate evidence to support the student’s claims.

- Assessment Methods: Students will analyze and complete a case study that forces them to choose between conflicting aspects of supply chain management in their capstone course. Graduates surveyed upon graduation (Graduate and Law Student Report Card) will evaluate the strength of their university preparation in "Critical Thinking Skills." Graduates surveyed 3 years after graduation (Graduate Alumni Survey) will evaluate the quality of "Acquiring job or work-related knowledge and skills."

- Measures: The curriculum will be monitored and refined based on student ability to evaluate a problem with conflicting aspects and assumptions, and articulate a plan to resolve the issue.

Learning Outcome 2: Graduates will evaluate a case study, evaluate options, and select and defend recommendations through writing to demonstrate graduate-level communication skills within the supply chain management domain.

- Concepts: Writing will align with the purpose of the assignment and reflect facility with Audience Awareness, Support and Development, Organization and Structure Style, Diction and Conciseness and Mechanics.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● <strong>Competencies:</strong> Written communication states the purpose and meets the audience’s needs and expectations with regard to tone, design, and visual appeal; demonstrates developed main ideas with sufficient support; logical sequence with recognizable introduction, body, and conclusion; attempts to use paragraph structure and transitions to enable comprehension; demonstrates some variety of sentence structure, varied vocabulary and appropriate use of business terms; demonstrates proficient word usage; spelling, punctuation and capitalization errors do not interfere in a major way with the readability and writer’s credibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● <strong>Assessment Methods:</strong> Students will prepare an analysis of a case that succinctly describes the problems, methodologies, outcomes, and recommendations in their capstone course. Graduates surveyed upon graduation (Graduate and Law Student Report Card) will evaluate the strength of their university preparation in “Writing Skills.” Graduates surveyed 3 years after graduation (Graduate Alumni Survey) will evaluate the quality of &quot;Writing Skills.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● <strong>Measures:</strong> The curriculum will be monitored based on student ability to evaluate multiple solutions to an issue and write a defendable presentation of a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Learning Outcome 3: Students will complete a final exam that comprehensively measures their ability to evaluate scenarios within the end-to-end supply chain management domain, thus demonstrating graduate-level proficiency in supply chain management knowledge.

- **Concepts:** Supply chain management as a tool for competitiveness, Shifting between technical and business communications, Analysis of supply chain activities, Mapping of supply chain construct supply chain management domain thus demonstrating graduate-level global leadership.

- **Competencies:**

  1. Conduct advanced analyses used in standard operations of global supply chains including inventory, transportation, warehousing, procurement, and network design;
  2. Explain how technology is used in supply chain management from fundamental use to innovative applications;
  3. Demonstrate the ability to apply core methodologies in modeling the physical, informational, and financial flows in global supply chains;
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

4. Effectively present information and analyses in oral presentations and discussions; and
5. Communicate analyses and recommendations in written form.

- **Assessment Methods:** Students will complete a final examination designed to assess their mastery of the program material which will be assigned in their capstone course. Graduates surveyed upon graduation (Graduate and Law Student Report Card) will evaluate the strength of their university preparation in "Subject Matter in the Field." Graduates surveyed 3 years after graduation (Graduate Alumni Survey) will evaluate the quality of "Acquiring job or work-related knowledge and skills."

- **Measures:** The curriculum will be monitored and refined based on student ability to effectively analyze and model the global supply chain management practices across multiple scenarios.

**Learning Outcome 4:** Graduates will investigate a global case study to critique international factors within the supply chain management domain thus demonstrating graduate-level global leadership.
| Master of Science in Sustainable Food Systems | Yes | Description and Justification: | Learning Outcome 1: Graduates will be able to develop, evaluate, and communicate food policy |

- **Concepts:** Open economy and globalization, International company competitiveness, Differences between various geographical locations and design
- **Competencies:** Graduates will be able to understand and analyze globalization. Students will be able to identify and understand the factors of international supply chains. Student will have the proficiency to operate in various international assignments
- **Assessment Methods:** Graduates will identify global issues of supply chain management in analysis and recommendations in a case assigned in SCM 545. Graduates surveyed upon graduation (Graduate and Law Student Report Card) will evaluate the strength of their university preparation in "Addressing Global and Local Issues." Graduates surveyed 3 years after graduation (Graduate Alumni Survey) will evaluate the quality of "Addressing Global and Local Issues."
- **Measures:** The curriculum will be monitored and refined based on student ability to appraise and dissect the factors of globalization in international supply chain.
| School of Sustainability (Tempe) 2019-2020 | $350 per credit hour | As part of the educational mission of the Swette Center for Sustainable Food Systems, this will be the first graduate program to be launched. The program will fuse intellectual disciplines to equip the next generation of food policy leaders to understand the current landscape and then to shape it. Participants will include business, nonprofit and government professionals as well as graduate students from a range of disciplines. The diverse enrollment will encourage students to engage on a local, national, and global level to transform society toward more sustainable food systems that value economic, social and cultural wellbeing. The curriculum will promote entrepreneurship and innovation, and will be socially embedded in issues related to land use, social justice, and equity. It will target emerging leaders from both rural and urban areas with demonstrated interest in food policy and a commitment to sustainable agriculture. |

**Market Need:**
Each year there are 54,400 jobs within the food and agriculture sector and only 29,400 graduates with the necessary skills. Using an Emsi report, growth within the sector is expected at initiatives, including the impact on public health and health equity.

- **Concepts:** Students will develop an interdisciplinary and panoramic understanding of the complexities of food system issues. Students will be able to recognize the history and effectiveness of previous food policy initiatives and model the potential effectiveness of new policy initiatives.

- **Competencies:** Students will achieve skills in the sustainability education competencies of systems thinking, normative thinking, strategic thinking.

- **Assessment Methods:** A section of the written report in the capstone course Organizational Research Project (new course) addresses the analysis of the development, evaluation and communication of food policy initiatives. The report will be assessed using a faculty-developed rubric. Students will deliver an oral presentation in their capstone course Organizational Research Project (new course). Presentations will be assessed using a faculty-developed rubric.

- **Measures:** The curriculum will be monitored based on student ability to justify and recommend food policy initiatives to combat the complexities of food system issues.
| **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY** | +7.4% with an estimated 17,617 annual openings. Interviews conducted by the Swette Center for Sustainable Food Systems director with leaders from local, state, and Federal government, as well as private sector businesses, and philanthropic and private equity investors have cited a critical need for professionals who understand and can lead food systems change from a multidisciplinary lens. Graduates of this program will be prepared to conduct research and assess, analyze, and create policy related to food security, sustainable agriculture, climate change, equity, and economic development. | **Learning Outcome 2:** Graduates will be able to analyze and assess the complex policy making process as it relates to food systems at the local, state, federal and international levels.  
- **Concepts:** Graduates will be able to assess multiple dimensions of the policy making process, including the roles of ethics and evidence.  
- **Competencies:** Graduates will achieve skills in the sustainability education competencies of systems thinking, normative thinking, collaboration, strategic thinking, and future thinking.  
- **Assessment Methods:** Policy Exercises in a new core course, Tools and Tactics for Food Policy Change will be assessed using a faculty-developed rubric. A section of the written report in capstone course Organizational Research Project (new course) addresses the analysis of the policy making process. The report will be assessed using a faculty-developed rubric.  
- **Measures:** The curriculum will be monitored based on student ability to examine evidence and ethical approaches when developing policy at varying levels of government. |
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Item Name: 2018 Fall Enrollment Report

☑ Action Item

Requested Action: The board office asks the board to approve the 2018 Fall Enrollment Report of headcount and full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollment for universities in the Arizona University System.

Background and Discussion

- The fall enrollment report provides enrollment data for students attending Arizona’s Public Universities in the 2018-19 academic year and updates 5-year enrollment trends.
- The report includes twenty-first day headcount, FTE and forty-fifth day FTE enrollment data for each university and their various campuses. The report counts student enrollment across all education delivery modalities, including online and extended campuses.
- The report further disaggregates the data into undergraduate, graduate and total enrollment. The report further presents the data by full-time and part-time student enrollment semester credit hours, course level and residency status. Finally, the report includes the number of students at each university with excess credit hours.
- The report will be provided separately to the board and posted on the ABOR website.

Committee Review and Recommendation

The Academic Affairs and Educational Attainment Committee reviewed this item at its November 1, 2018 meeting, and recommended forwarding the item to the full board for approval.

Statutory/Policy Requirements

A.R.S. § 15-1466.01 Calculation of Full-Time Equivalent Student Enrollment
A.R.S. § 15-1626 General Administrative Powers and Duties of Board
A.R.S. § 15-1802 In-State Student Status
A.R.S. § 15-1803 Alien In-State Student Status

ABOR Policy 2-122 requires that each university shall report to the Board headcount and FTE enrollment data.

Contact Information:
Chad Sampson, ABOR (602) 229-2512 chad.sampson@azregents.edu
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Item Name: 2017-2018 High School Report Card

☑ Action Item

Requested Action: The board office asks the board to approve the 2017-2018 High School Report Card.

Background and Discussion

- Arizona Revised Statute §15-1822 requires the universities to develop annual reports on the performance of the previous year’s Arizona high school graduates during their first year in higher education. Arizona community colleges produce similar reports for their students.

- Aggregate data is provide in the summary report below to as an overall update concerning Arizona high school graduate preparedness for college level course work.

- An individual report card is produced for each Arizona public high school. These report cards are designed for and distributed to Arizona’s high schools through the Arizona Department of Education to help ensure that their graduates are ready for success in post-secondary education.

Data provided

- The universe of students data captured in the high school report card is limited to Arizona resident undergraduate students who graduated from an Arizona high school in the immediately previous year. High school report card information does not directly relate to any other ABOR reporting regarding university student preparedness and progress.

- If a student took remedial or other classes at a community college or other institution, that class work is not reported in this report.

Statutory/Policy Requirements


Contact Information:
Chad Sampson, ABOR  (602) 229-2512  chad.sampson@azregents.edu
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2018
HIGH SCHOOL REPORT CARD
ABOUT THIS REPORT

Arizona Revised Statute §15-1822 requires the universities to develop annual reports on the performance of the previous year’s Arizona high school graduates during their first year at an Arizona public university. Aggregate data is provided by the Arizona Board of Regents’ Academic Affairs and Educational Attainment Committee as part of the board’s review of Arizona high school graduate preparedness for college-level coursework.

An individual report card is produced for each Arizona public high school. These report cards are designed for and distributed to Arizona’s high schools through the Arizona Department of Education to help ensure that their graduates are ready for success in postsecondary education. Arizona community colleges produce similar reports for their students.

Student data captured in the High School Report Card is limited to Arizona resident undergraduate students who graduated from an Arizona high school the previous year. Each university aggregates the information in the report by using high school transcript data received when a student enrolls. Due to the manner in which the data is collected, the High School Report Card information is not directly correlated to any other ABOR reporting regarding university student preparedness and progress.

An academic deficiency is defined as a high school graduate admitted into the university without having previously taken one of the 16 core courses generally required for admission into an Arizona public university. For example, a high school graduate may be admitted without having completed two years of a foreign language or a fine arts course. If a student took remedial or other classes at a community college or other institution, this work is included in the report.

ABOUT THE ARIZONA BOARD OF REGENTS

The Arizona Board of Regents is committed to ensuring access for qualified residents of Arizona to undergraduate and graduate institutions; promoting the discovery, application, and dissemination of new knowledge; extending the benefits of university activities to Arizona’s citizens outside the university; and maximizing the benefits derived from the state’s investment in education.

MEMBERS

Ron Shoopman, Chair
Larry Penley, Chair Elect
Ram Krishna, Secretary
Bill Ridenour, Treasurer
Lyndel Manson
Karrin Taylor Robson
Jay Heiler
Rick Myers
Aundrea DeGravina, Student Regent
Lauren L’Ecuyer, Student Regent
Gov. Doug Ducey, Ex-Officio
Superintendent Diane Douglas, Ex-Officio
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 2017-18 incoming freshmen at Arizona’s public universities demonstrated stronger academic preparation and performance over the previous year’s class. Trends during the past decade suggest students are beginning their college years better prepared for university rigor. Approximately 12 percent of freshmen were admitted in fall 2017 with deficiencies compared to 28 percent in 2009. Students’ first-term grade-point averages also showed improvement at 3.1 in fall 2017, up from 3.0 GPA for the previous years’ class and 2.8 in fall 2007.

Arizona high school graduates during their first semester at Arizona’s public universities averaged a B- or 2.77 grade-point average for their first college math course and a B+ or 3.41 grade-point average in their first college English course. Comparatively, in fall 2007, students who took college algebra had a GPA of 2.6 and students who took freshman English had an average GPA of 3.2.

College preparedness is a key indicator of student success at Arizona’s public universities. An increasingly prepared freshman class is good news for Arizona where educational attainment rates lag the national average during a time when the state is transitioning to a skills-based economy with most jobs demanding some kind of education past high school. Without increased educational attainment in Arizona, the state’s economy will underperform.

Higher education remains one of the most important investments that an individual can make in their future while more residents with an education past high school leads to greater prosperity for the state. Research shows that earning a college education provides higher wages for individuals – a million dollars more over the course of a career for those with a bachelor’s degree compared to an individual who graduated from high school. States benefit from an increasingly robust tax base and a workforce that is highly qualified and sought after from employers throughout the state.

Key takeaways:

1. The number of Arizona high school graduates enrolled in an Arizona public university with one or more academic deficiencies continues to decline. Approximately 12 percent of Arizona high school graduates enrolled in Arizona’s public universities with one or more academic deficiencies – the lowest percentages of incoming Arizona high school graduates admitted with deficiencies in the past 10 years.

2. Average Arizona high school graduates’ first-term college grade-point averages continue to improve. The 2017 average fall GPA was 3.1 up from 3.0 in 2016 and 2.9 in 2009.

3. Arizona high school graduates’ performance in college English improved from last year to 3.4 GPA from 3.3. In addition, the participation rate in fall semester English classes is up by 0.2 percentage points from 2016. In first year English, the majority of students - 70.8 percent, up from 68.9 percent the previous year - enrolled in freshman English and had an average B grade or 3.4 GPA. Only 19.5 percent of students, however, enrolled in an advanced English course. This rate was down from the previous year’s enrollment rate of 21.6 percent. Those who took advanced English received an average B+ grade of 3.6, which was unchanged from last year.

4. Arizona high school graduate performance in college math improved slightly from last year from 2.7 to 2.8 GPA. More students are enrolling in calculus over college algebra, but the overall participation
rate in calculus is down by 1.8 percentage points. Participation rates in first-semester math courses by Arizona high school graduates decreased by 7.4 percentage points from 2016. In their first semester, more Arizona high school graduates enrolled in calculus than college algebra. Of those students who enrolled in math, 69.3 percent of freshmen enrolled in college algebra or calculus. The remaining 30.7 percent of students enrolled in a remedial math course.

5. The average grade in calculus was a B- or 2.8 GPA, representing a slight improvement from the average 2.7 GPA the previous year. Students earned an average B- or 2.8 GPA for college algebra, another slight improvement from last year’s average 2.7 GPA.

---

1For information on converting letter grades to a 4.0 scale, go to https://pages.collegeboard.org/how-to-convert-gpa-4.0-scale

### Summary Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of High School Students Enrolled at the University</th>
<th>15,075</th>
<th>With Academic Deficiency</th>
<th>Without Academic Deficiency</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent Who Are</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**First Term Avg. GPA**

- **All Arizona H.S.**
  - With Academic Deficiency: 2.6
  - Without Academic Deficiency: 3.2
  - Total: 3.1

### Admitted Without Academic Deficiency

- **All Arizona H.S.**: 88%

**Fall Enrollment Continuing in Spring**

- **All Arizona H.S.**
  - 87%
  - Total: 93%

### First English Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First English Course</th>
<th>FE</th>
<th>AE</th>
<th>OE</th>
<th>First Math Course</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>OM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Enrolling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number Enrolling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Arizona H.S.</td>
<td>6,750</td>
<td>1,859</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>All Arizona H.S.</td>
<td>3,318</td>
<td>3,572</td>
<td>3,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Enrolling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent Enrolling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Arizona H.S.</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>All Arizona H.S.</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Arizona H.S.</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>All Arizona H.S.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent &quot;C&quot; or Higher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent &quot;C&quot; or Higher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Arizona H.S.</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>All Arizona H.S.</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FE = Freshman English   CA = College Algebra
AE = Advanced English   C = Calculus
OE = Other Lower Division English OM = Other Lower Division Math

**NOTE:** Blank boxes indicate that the data are not applicable.
## Summary Characteristics

| Number of High School Students Enrolled at the University | 6,706 | | |  
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Percent Who Are** | | With Academic Deficiency | Without Academic Deficiency | Total |  
| American Indian | 1% | | | |  
| Asian American | 9% | | | |  
| African American | 4% | | | |  
| Hispanic | 32% | | | |  
| Pacific Islander | 0% | | | |  
| Two or More Races | 4% | | | |  
| Female | 52% | | | |  
| **Admitted Without Academic Deficiency** | | | | |  
| All Arizona H.S. | 87% | | | |  
| **First Term Avg. GPA** | | | | |  
| All Arizona H.S. | 2.7 | 3.2 | 3.1 |  
| **Fall Enrollment Continuing in Spring** | | | | |  
| All Arizona H.S. | 90% | 96% | 95% |  
| **First English Course** | **Number Enrolling** | **Percent Enrolling** | **Average Grade** | **Percent “C” or Higher** |  
| FE | AE | OE | CA | C | OM |  
| All Arizona H.S. | 2,606 | 1,348 | 766 | 1,722 | 2,600 | 1,088 |  
| **Percent Enrolling** | | | | |  
| All Arizona H.S. | 39% | 20% | 11% | 26% | 39% | 16% |  
| **Average Grade** | | | | |  
| All Arizona H.S. | 3.3 | 3.6 | 3.1 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.9 |  
| **Percent “C” or Higher** | | | | |  
| All Arizona H.S. | 94% | 96% | 91% | 83% | 85% | 90% |  

**FE** = Freshman English  
**FE** = Freshman English  
**CA** = College Algebra  
**AE** = Advanced English  
**C** = Calculus  
**OM** = Other Lower Division Math

NOTE: Blank boxes indicate that the data are not applicable.
Summary Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of High School Students Enrolled at the University</th>
<th>3,280</th>
<th>With Academic Deficiency</th>
<th>Without Academic Deficiency</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent Who Are</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Admitted Without Academic Deficiency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Arizona H.S.</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**First Term Avg. GPA**

| All Arizona H.S. | 2.3 | 3.1 | 3.0 |

**Fall Enrollment Continuing in Spring**

| All Arizona H.S. | 84% | 95% | 93% |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First English Course</th>
<th>FE</th>
<th>AE</th>
<th>OE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Enrolling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Arizona H.S.</td>
<td>1,817</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Math Course</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>OM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Enrolling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Arizona H.S.</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>1,492</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Percent Enrolling    |    |   |    |
| All Arizona H.S.     | 55% | 7% | 3% |

| Average Grade        |    |   |    |
| All Arizona H.S.     | 3.6 | 3.7 | 2.5 |

| Percent "C" or Higher|    |   |    |
| All Arizona H.S.     | 96% | 97% | 89% |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CA = College Algebra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FE = Freshman English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE = Advanced English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE = Other Lower Division English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OM = Other Lower Division Math</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Blank boxes indicate that the data are not applicable.
### Summary Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of High School Students Enrolled at the University</th>
<th>4,189</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent Who Are</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### First Term Avg. GPA

| All Arizona H.S. | 2.3 | 3.0 | 2.9 |

#### Admitted Without Academic Deficiency

| All Arizona H.S. | 88% |       |

#### Fall Enrollment Continuing in Spring

| All Arizona H.S. | 89% | 95% | 94% |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First English Course</th>
<th>FE</th>
<th>AE</th>
<th>OE</th>
<th>First Math Course</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>OM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Enrolling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number Enrolling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Arizona H.S.</td>
<td>1,745</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>All Arizona H.S.</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>1,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Enrolling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent Enrolling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Arizona H.S.</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>All Arizona H.S.</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Arizona H.S.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>All Arizona H.S.</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent &quot;C&quot; or Higher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent &quot;C&quot; or Higher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Arizona H.S.</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>All Arizona H.S.</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FE = Freshman English  
AE = Advanced English  
OE = Other Lower Division English  
CA = College Algebra  
C = Calculus  
OM = Other Lower Division Math

NOTE: Blank boxes indicate that the data are not applicable.
This page intentionally left blank
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Item Name: Arizona Community College Transfer Students and Review of the 2018 Annual Report on Articulation and Transfer for Arizona Postsecondary Education

☐ Action Item

Requested Action: The board office asks the board to review and approve the annual report on articulation and transfer, to be submitted to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee (JLBC) by December 15, 2018.

Background

- Each year Arizona’s public universities and community colleges report on the progress made towards students transferring from Arizona’s public community colleges to Arizona’s public universities.

- Since 1996, the Arizona Board of Regents and the Arizona community colleges have reported to the Legislature on progress toward implementing a statewide model for transfer by students from community colleges to the universities, developed by the AZTransfer Steering Committee. The report is due to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee by December 15.

- The attached report describes the activities and accomplishments for the 2017-2018 academic year.

Discussion

- The report provides a snapshot of data related to student transfer among Arizona public community colleges and universities for the 2017-2018 academic year.

- The report also provides information on the work performed by the AZTransfer Steering Committee.

- AZTransfer develops and maintains web services and other resources directly related to operating the Arizona Transfer System and promoting transfer opportunities and programs. These tools and resources ensure faculty, staff, and students have access to transfer information from anywhere in the state.

- The AZTransfer Steering Committee comes together to help students plan a seamless transfer without loss of academic credit. It does this by focusing on the

Contact Information:
Chad Sampson, ABOR (602) 229-2512 chad.sampson@azregents.edu
Arizona General Education Curriculum (AGEC), majors and degrees, common courses, and electives, and supplement this foundation with credits earned through dual enrollment and exams.

- The AGEC consists of 35-37 credit hours of courses in English, math, social and behavioral sciences, physical and biological sciences, and arts and humanities. Through the AZTransfer Steering Committee, faculty determine which courses fulfill the AGEC requirements at their respective institutions and maintain transferability.

- Majors and degrees are those associate’s and bachelor’s degrees that are aligned within each ATF academic discipline. The transfer system maps these degrees for majors offered at two or more of Arizona’s public institutions.

- Common courses are lower division courses that apply toward a mapped bachelor’s degree program.

- Dual enrollment and exams refers to the course and exams high school students may take to earn college credit.

- All of this effort is intended to assist community college students to seamlessly transfer to ASU through a MAPP or TAG program, NAU through The Connect 2 NAU program, the UA through the UA Bridge program or other transfer options.

Summary

- The attached report represents a continued collaboration between Arizona’s public community colleges and universities to ensure a smooth transition for students who transfer from the community colleges to the universities. This collaboration is critical to Arizona efforts to increase the numbers of individuals with baccalaureate degrees.

Committee Review and Recommendation

The Academic Affairs and Educational Attainment Committee reviewed this item at its November 1, 2018 meeting, and recommended forwarding the item to the full board for approval.

Statutory/Policy Requirements

ARS 15-1824, Transfer Articulation, Common Numbering, Reports.
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ABOUT THIS REPORT

FOR MORE THAN 20 YEARS, academic leaders from each of Arizona’s public postsecondary institutions have collaborated to support transfer student success. Known as the AZTransfer Steering Committee, this coordinating body ensures Arizona students have access to efficient, seamless, and simple ways to transfer from a community college to a university in Arizona.

Born out of legislation passed in 1996, the AZTransfer Steering Committee works to fulfill a promise to provide high-quality educational pathways that lead to baccalaureate degree completion for all Arizonans. This report highlights results and services in the 2017-2018 academic year that deliver on that promise and help Arizonans build good academic credit.
YEAR IN REVIEW

AZTransfer’s major events, milestones, and annual activities in the 2017-2018 academic year.
2017

- Annual training retreat for AZTransfer Facilitators
- Executive Committee Meeting
- Published report on new transfers with 12 or more Arizona Community College Credits

JUL

- Admissions & Records ATF Meeting
- Executive Committee Meeting
- Published report on new freshmen entering with Arizona Community College Credits

AUG

- Steering Committee Meeting
- Hosted 16 ATF Meetings
- Honors Community of Interest Meeting
- Academic Advising ATF Meeting

SEP

- Hosted 24 ATF Meetings
- Executive Committee Meeting
- Received a National Council for Marketing & Public Relations Gold Medallion Award for the 2015-2016 Annual Report and a Silver Medallion Award for the 2016 Summit promotional materials
- Launched redesigned Majors & Degrees application on AZTransfer.com

OCT

- Hosted one ATF meeting
- General Education ATF meeting

NOV

- Annual report presented to the Arizona Board of Regents
- Annual report presented to the Arizona Community College Coordinating Council

DEC

- Steering Committee Meeting
- Annual reports distributed to stakeholders
- AZTransfer Facilitator Meeting
Published reports on baccalaureate degree recipients, new transfers’ graduation rate, and first-year performance of new transfers

Executive Committee Meeting

Hosted two ATF meetings

Received a Gold Paragon Award from the National Council for Marketing & Public Relations in the Novelty Advertising category

Executive Committee Meeting

Published report on transfer rate of first-time community college students

ASSIST Steering Committee and Users meetings
FAST FACTS

A snapshot of data related to student transfer among Arizona public community colleges and universities as reported in 2017-2018.
57.4% of university graduates had credit from an Arizona community college.

4,383 stakeholders on the AZTransfer email list.

1,349 faculty engaged in articulation task forces.

51.9% of new transfer students entered with 60 or more credits.

57.4% of new transfer students entered with 60 or more credits.

40.1% five-year increase in minority baccalaureate degree recipients who were new transfers.

HEALTH PROFESSIONS & RELATED PROGRAMS
major with the greatest five-year increase (112%) for baccalaureate degree recipients who entered as new transfers.
FAST FACTS

95.4% of Arizona community college courses evaluated are transferable to at least one Arizona public university

16,369 Arizona community college courses evaluated by ASU, NAU, and UA

BUSINESS

number one major of new transfer students

78.2% six-year graduation rate of new transfer students who entered with an associate’s degree

30.1% of new university freshmen who were Arizona residents entered with Arizona community college credits

10,257 new transfers to ASU, NAU, and UA from Arizona community colleges

292 AZTransfer Summit attendees in 2018
ARTICULATION TASK FORCES

Articulation Task Forces (ATFs) are the heart of AZTransfer’s faculty-driven transfer model. Each fall, 1,349 faculty in 43 academic disciplines convene to evaluate course transferability and discuss curricular alignment. The outcome of these meetings provides the content for the tools and resources on AZTransfer.com that students, advisors, and counselors use to plan a seamless transfer. In addition to the discipline specific ATFs, academic advising, admissions and records, and general education ATFs meet several times a year to address issues and trends in student support and general studies.
AZTRANSFER STATEWIDE MEMBERSHIP

by type of member

1,826
TOTAL MEMBERS

69
ACADEMIC ADVISING ATF

137
MEMBERS WITH 15+ YEARS OF SERVICE

1,343
FACULTY

61
ADMISSIONS & RECORDS ATF

154
COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST

39
GENERAL EDUCATION ATF

82
ASSIST USERS
ATF FACULTY MEMBERSHIP
by institution

ASU
Arizona State University 204

Arizona Western College 57

Central Arizona College 64

Chandler-Gilbert Community College 45

Cochise College 47

Coconino Community College 44

Eastern Arizona College 37

Estrella Mountain Community College 35

Gateway Community College 35

Glendale Community College 76

Mesa Community College 71

MCC
Maricopa Community College 37

Northern Arizona University 113

Northland Pioneer College 42

Paradise Valley Community College 44

Phoenix College 48

Pima Community College 78

Rio Salado College 24

Scottsdale Community College 44

South Mountain Community College 31

Pima Community College 19

Arizona 69

Yavapai College 44
TRANSFER SYSTEM COMPONENTS

Work performed through the Articulation Task Force network is the foundation of the Arizona Transfer System. The components of the system work together to help students plan a seamless transfer without loss of academic credit. Students build a transfer degree plan by completing the Arizona General Education Curriculum (AGEC), common courses, and electives, and supplement this with credits earned through dual enrollment and exams.
ARIZONA GENERAL EDUCATION CURRICULUM

The Arizona General Education Curriculum (AGEC) is a foundational block of coursework completed at an Arizona community college. The AGEC consists of 35-37 credit hours of courses in English, math, social and behavioral sciences, physical and biological sciences, and arts and humanities. Through Articulation Task Forces, faculty determine which courses fulfill the requirements at their respective institutions and maintain transferability.

COMMON COURSES

Common courses are lower division courses that apply toward a mapped bachelor’s degree program.

MAJORS & DEGREES

Associate’s and bachelor’s degrees are aligned within each ATF academic discipline. The transfer system maps these degrees for majors offered at two or more of Arizona’s public institutions. See page 17 for a list of all majors included in the system.

BUILDING A DEGREE WITH THE ARIZONA TRANSFER SYSTEM

BACHELOR’S DEGREE

120 CREDITS

ASSOCIATE’S DEGREE

64 CREDITS

CREDITS EARNED IN HIGH SCHOOL

56 UNIVERSITY CREDITS

27-29 ELECTIVE & COMMON COURSE CREDITS

35-37 AGEC CREDITS

DUAL ENROLLMENT CREDIT EXAM CREDITS (AP, CAMBRIDGE, CLEP, DSST, IB)
AZTRANSFER TOOLS & RESOURCES

AZTransfer develops and maintains web services and other resources directly related to operating the Arizona Transfer System and promoting transfer opportunities and programs. These tools and resources ensure faculty, staff, and students have access to transfer information from anywhere in the state. Many tools are refreshed daily while others are updated annually or as needed.
COURSE EQUIVALENCY GUIDE

The Course Equivalency Guide (CEG) is a statewide database that provides detailed information on how community college courses transfer to the three public universities (Figure 1). Users can search for course equivalency by subject, institution, and course number. Course data from each of Arizona’s public and tribal community colleges and universities is represented in the CEG.

DUAL ENROLLMENT GUIDE

Dual Enrollment courses are community college courses taken in high schools. The Dual Enrollment Guide shows how these courses transfer to Arizona’s three state universities.

EXAM EQUIVALENCY GUIDE

The Exam Equivalency Guide (EEG) shows users how exam scores may translate to college credit at Arizona community colleges and state universities. The EEG provides information on five testing programs—Advanced Placement (AP), Cambridge International Examination (CIE), College Level Proficiency Exam (CLEP), DANTES Subject Standardized Tests (DSST), and International Baccalaureate (IB).
MAJOR & DEGREE GUIDES

For students who have selected a major but not a university, Major & Degree Guides link associate’s degrees to their related bachelor’s degrees for majors that are offered by two or more of Arizona’s public universities. Major & Degree Guides provide a list of recommended lower division courses at the student’s community college that will meet the requirements for that major at any of the three universities.

***

MOBILE APP

The AZTransfer mobile app (Figure 3) offers on-the-go course planning and is available for both iOS and Android devices. The mobile app includes data from the Arizona General Education Curriculum, Course Equivalency Guide, Exam Equivalency Guide, and the Majors & Degrees Guide.

***

MARKETING COLLATERAL

AZTransfer provides marketing collateral (Figure 4) and promotional items to each member institution by request. The materials are used in orientation packets, during advising sessions, as a compliment to recruitment and outreach efforts, and more. A general transfer brochure, a handout specifically about the Arizona General Education Curriculum, and a card describing Dual Enrollment and Credit by Exam are currently available.
ARIZONA COURSE EQUIVALENCY TRACKING SYSTEM

The Arizona Course Equivalency Tracking System (ACETS) is a web-based application that tracks course equivalency decisions, as the courses move through the statewide evaluation and articulation process (Figure 5). ACETS supports all decision-making required to establish equivalencies in Arizona beginning with the initial request for an equivalency evaluation and ending with the creation of a report to be used by Arizona university encoders. ACETS tracks the time frame for course equivalency from source institution to target institution and triggers a report to target institutions when timelines are outside normal boundaries. A target school records its decision in ACETS within 45 days and encodes it within 15 days. Institutions can check recent information activity by querying the database.

ACADEMIC CURRICULUM REVIEW AND EVALUATION SYSTEM

The Academic Curriculum Review and Evaluation System (ACRES) is available for Arizona institutions to use for their formal internal curriculum review and evaluation process (Figure 6). Curriculum approved through ACRES can be submitted directly to ACETS with a single click. Other institutional processes can also be deployed in ACRES such as Program Approval forms, Institutional Degree/Certificate forms, Employee Development and more.
ARIZONA STATE SYSTEM FOR INFORMATION ON STUDENT TRANSFER
The Arizona State System for Information on Student Transfer (ASSIST) is a relational database containing enrollment and degree information on students attending Arizona’s public universities and community college districts.

ARTICULATION TASK FORCE PORTALS
A comprehensive resource which allows both institutional and statewide staff to maintain membership databases, curriculum (prefixes, degrees and pathways), meeting reports, and the master statewide calendar for AZTransfer’s Articulation Task Forces (Figure 7).

USER MANUALS
AZTransfer publishes four web-based user manuals: the ATF Handbook & Policy Manual, Website Users Manual, Technology Users Manual, and the ASSIST Users Manual. These manuals can be accessed online via the Faculty/Staff portal page (Figure 8).
The Arizona State System for Information on Student Transfer (ASSIST) is a relational database containing enrollment and degree information on students attending Arizona’s public universities and community college districts. Using this data, AZTransfer provides a statewide snapshot of progress toward improving transfer and degree attainment in Arizona.
BACCALAUREATE DEGREE RECIPIENTS

who entered as new Arizona community college transfers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>6,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>7,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>7,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>7,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>7,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>7,833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BACCALAUREATE DEGREE RECIPIENTS
in 2016-17 with any credit from Arizona community colleges

Degree recipients with no Arizona community college credits

Degree recipients who entered the university as new transfers with 12 or more credit hours from Arizona community colleges

Degree recipients who entered the university as new freshman with any amount of Arizona community college credit

Degree recipients who were new transfers with fewer than 12 credit hours from Arizona community colleges, or who entered the university with zero credit hours from Arizona community colleges but earned some after entry
## CREDIT HOURS TRANSFERRED AT ENTRY

by new transfers from Arizona community colleges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12-23 HOURS</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-34 HOURS</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-59 HOURS</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+ HOURS</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASOCIATE’S DEGREE</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGEC ONLY</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTE: Graduation rates are cumulative. Students graduating within three years are also included in the six years column.

BACCALAUREATE DEGREE GRADUATION RATE

of new transfers from Arizona community colleges

NOTE: Graduation rates are cumulative. Students graduating within three years are also included in the six years column.
MINORITY STUDENTS

who were new transfers from Arizona community colleges
Arizona community college courses are constantly evaluated throughout the year to determine their transferability to ASU, NAU, and UA. Course equivalencies are categorized as direct equivalencies, electives, and non transferable.
Arizona community college courses with direct equivalency to ASU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AWC</th>
<th>CAC</th>
<th>COCHISE</th>
<th>CCC</th>
<th>DINE</th>
<th>EAC</th>
<th>MCCD</th>
<th>MOHAVE</th>
<th>NPC</th>
<th>PIMA</th>
<th>TOCC</th>
<th>YAVAPAI</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIRECT EQUIVALENCY</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>2,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTIVE CREDIT</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>3,098</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>7,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT TRANSFERABLE</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>2,764</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>5,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENDING EVALUATION*</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,173</td>
<td>1,063</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>1,196</td>
<td>7,069</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>1,844</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td>16,369</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Courses are continuously evaluated throughout the year. These courses were pending evaluation at the time of report publication.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AWC</th>
<th>CAC</th>
<th>COCHISE</th>
<th>CCC</th>
<th>DINÉ</th>
<th>EAC</th>
<th>MCCD</th>
<th>MOHAVE</th>
<th>NPC</th>
<th>PIMA</th>
<th>TOCC</th>
<th>YAVAPAI</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIRECT EQUIVALENCY</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>2,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTIVE CREDIT</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>6,041</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>1,394</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>12,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT TRANSFERABLE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENDING EVALUATION*</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,173</td>
<td>1,063</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>1,196</td>
<td>7,069</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>1,844</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td>16,369</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Courses are continuously evaluated throughout the year. These courses were pending evaluation at the time of report publication.
Arizona community college courses with direct equivalency to UA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AWC</th>
<th>CAC</th>
<th>COCHISE</th>
<th>CCC</th>
<th>DINE</th>
<th>EAC</th>
<th>MCCD</th>
<th>MOHAVE</th>
<th>NPC</th>
<th>PIMA</th>
<th>TOCC</th>
<th>YAVAPAIS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIRECT EQUIVALENCY</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTIVE CREDIT</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>3,341</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>7,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT TRANSFERABLE</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>3,007</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>5,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENDING EVALUATION*</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,173</td>
<td>1,063</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>1,196</td>
<td>7,069</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>1,844</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td>16,369</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Courses are continuously evaluated throughout the year. These courses were pending evaluation at the time of report publication.
VISION

College degree pathways are accessible to all Arizonans.

MISSION

The AZTransfer Steering Committee, an organization of academic leaders, supports successful application of transfer credits leading to degree completion for students in all public and tribal higher education institutions in Arizona.

VALUES

The decisions and actions of the AZTransfer Steering Committee demonstrate our

Purpose is to promote and support student academic success;

Leadership is transparent, collegial, collaborative, and proactive;

Decision making is data-informed and outcome-focused;

Fiscal stewardship is financially responsible and goal-oriented.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Item Name: Report on the Audit Committee Meeting

☐ Action Item

Requested Action: The board office asks the board to review the report of the November 1, 2018 Audit Committee meeting.

Agenda Highlights
Audit Committee
November 1, 2018

1. Auditor General

Outcomes and Assignments:

- The three university financial audits have concluded with the auditors issuing clean opinions.
- The financial audit Director is to obtain some information and will respond to a question by Regent Krishna regarding state medical benefits for Medicare eligible retirees.
- NAU and UA have made progress on remediating findings stemming from the IT security performance audit and anticipate full remediation being achieved within the next 12 months before the Auditor General performs follow-up procedures and issues another report.
- As recommended in the IT Security performance audit, Board staff will work with university staff to develop a plan for improved board governance over IT.

2. Chief Audit Executive Reports

Outcomes and Assignments:

- The NAU chief auditor discussed a possible new audit report format with the committee. The chief auditors will continue working on the new format and will make an official proposal to the committee at a future date.

Contact Information:
Richard Gfeller
richard.gfeller@azregents.edu
(602)-229-2592
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Item Name: Amendments to Contracts of Athletic Director and Head Coaches to Address Title IX Reporting Requirements and New NCAA Contractual Requirements (ASU)

☑ Action Item

Requested Action: Arizona State University asks the board to authorize amendments to the contracts of its Athletics Director and its head coaches to include language requiring compliance with all Title IX and other reporting requirements as well as language mandated by the NCAA requiring compliance with the NCAA Infractions Process, and described in this Executive Summary.

Background/History of Previous Board Action

- At its April 2018 meeting, the board approved a revision of ABOR Policy 6-1001 related to multiple-year contracts with intercollegiate athletics directors and head coaches. Under the revised policy, universities must require each athletics director, each university head coach, and all members of the athletics department staff to comply with all board and university policies, including all reporting and other requirements under Title IX and other laws related to sexual violence, sexual assault and related conduct.

- On August 8, 2018, the NCAA Division 1 Board of Directors adopted Proposal 2018-16. The proposal amends NCAA Bylaw 11.2.1 to require that any contractual agreement or appointment executed, extended or renewed after August 8 between an institution and its director of athletics, coach or other contracted or appointed athletics department staff include an express stipulation as to the employee’s affirmative obligation to cooperate fully in the NCAA infractions process.

- ASU seeks authorization to amend the contracts of its Athletics Director and head coaches to comply with the requirements set forth in ABOR Policy 6-1001 and NCAA Proposal 2016-16.

Discussion

Subject to board approval, ASU proposes to amend the multiple-year employment contract with its Athletics Director and the multiple-year employment contracts with each of its head coaches as follows:

- A new provision will be added to each contract requiring compliance with all

Contact Information:
José Cárdenas, Senior Vice President and General Counsel, ASU, (480) 965-4550, jcardenas@asu.edu
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board and university policies, including without limitation, all conflict of interest policies and all reporting and other requirements under Title IX. In addition, the provision will require compliance with all laws related to sexual violence, sexual assault and related conduct. As employees responsible for compliance with ASU Policy ACD 401: Prohibition Against Discrimination, Harassment and Retaliation and SDA 406: Consensual Relationships, the contractual provision stipulates that each employee is prohibited from having sexual relations with student athletes and SDA student assistants and is responsible for participating in and assisting with creating and maintaining an environment at the university free from all forms of prohibited discrimination, including harassment and retaliation. Each employee must also comply with all required reporting obligations and non-retaliation provisions described in ACD 401 and SDA 406 and must cooperate fully with any investigation of allegations and violations of ACD 401 or SDA 406.

- A new provision will be added to each contract pursuant to NCAA Bylaws 11.2.1 and 19.2.3 requiring the employee to acknowledge the employee’s affirmative obligation to cooperate fully in the NCAA infractions process, including the investigation and adjudication of a case. “Full cooperation” as defined in NCAA Bylaw 19.2.3 includes, but is not limited to: (a) affirmatively reporting instances of noncompliance to the NCAA (through the Sun Devil Athletics Compliance Office as set forth in SDA 602: Rules Violation Reporting) in a timely manner and assisting in developing full information to determine whether a possible violation has occurred and the details thereof; (b) timely participation in interviews and providing complete and truthful responses; (c) making a full and complete disclosure of relevant information, including timely production of materials or information requested, and in the format requested; (d) disclosing and providing access to all electronic devices used in any way for business purposes; (e) providing access to all social media, messaging and other applications that are or may be relevant to the investigation; and (f) preserving the integrity of an investigation and abiding by all applicable confidentiality rules and instructions.

- The provision that allows the university to terminate for “cause” will be modified to include failure to comply with the provision described in the first bullet above.

Statutory/Policy Requirements

ABOR Policy 6-1001 “Multiple-Year Appointments of Head Coaches and Intercollegiate Athletics Directors”
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Item Name: Proposed Revisions to ABOR Policy 6-1101 “Appointments of Presidents” (Second Reading)

☐ Action Item

Requested Action: The board office asks the board to approve the proposed revisions to ABOR Policy 6-1101 “Appointments of Presidents.”

Background/History of Previous Board Action/Discussion

ABOR Policy 6-1101 addresses the appointments of presidents. The proposed revisions add references in the policy to the board’s executive director and a letter of appointment.

The board reviewed this item on first reading at its September 2018 meeting.

Statutory/Policy Requirements

A.R.S. § 15-1626 “General Administrative Powers and Duties of the Board.”
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ARTICLE K. APPOINTMENTS OF PRESIDENTS AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

6-1101 Appointments of Presidents AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

A. Applicability

1. This Policy governs the appointment and employment of a university president OR THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE BOARD OFFICE or the Board president.

B. Conditions of Employment

1. All terms and conditions for the employment of a president OR EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR will be set forth in a written contract OR A LETTER OF APPOINTMENT.

2. As President, the University or Board President THE PRESIDENTS AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR shall not be subject to the Conditions of Service Policies for Administrators (6-101), Faculty (6-201), Professional (6-301), Classified Staff (6-401), or University Staff (6-510) IN THEIR ROLES AS PRESIDENT OR EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR UNLESS THE CONTRACT OR LETTER OF APPOINTMENT STATES OTHERWISE. A President OR EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR may however, WITH THE EXPRESS PERMISSION OF THE BOARD, concurrently hold an appointment to another Board employment position which is subject to one of these policies.

C. Board approval

Board approval is required for any appointment for a President OR EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE BOARD OFFICE. The Board may delegate its authority to execute the contract OR LETTER OF APPOINTMENT to the Board Chair, following a review of the contract OR LETTER OF APPOINTMENT by Board Counsel.

D. Contract Provisions

Each contract with a President OR LETTER OF APPOINTMENT will include the following terms, in addition to other terms negotiated by the parties.
1. Effective date, which may not be earlier than the date of approval by the Board and the execution of the contract OR LETTER OF APPOINTMENT;

2. Period of appointment, which MAY BE AT-WILL AND WHICH is not to exceed 3 years FOR THE INITIAL APPOINTMENT. Following the initial appointment term, the Board may authorize an exception to provide an appointment of no more than 5 years;

3. Duties and responsibilities of the President OR EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR;

4. Requirement to provide an annual disclosure statement to the Board describing all organizations with which the President OR EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR is affiliated;

5. Requirement to disclose all outside compensation including any consideration provided by a university foundation or university affiliated entity related to the role of university president OR EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR (this section does not require the president OR EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR to report personal and passive investment income to the board);

6. Statement that compensation beyond the current fiscal year is subject to legislative non-appropriation;

7. An explicit condition that the role of president OR EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR is primary, and although outside activities are permitted, they must not conflict with or interfere with the individual’s successful accomplishment of the responsibilities as president OR EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR.

8. Any employment benefits provided by the university and board.

9. IF THE PARTIES ENTER A CONTRACT FOR THE APPOINTMENT:
   9. A. A provision permitting the Board, at its sole discretion, to terminate the contract at any time without cause by paying, as liquidated damages in lieu of all other remedies available to the president OR EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, a specified sum not greater than that which the president OR EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR should have received as salary to the end of the then-existing contract
term, and the extent to which the sum to be paid will be reduced by the amount of compensation received by the president OR EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR if subsequently employed in a comparable position at another institution of higher education during the period covered by the multiple-year appointment with the Board, and

40. B. The basis on which the contract can be terminated for cause and the procedures to be followed.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Item Name: Proposed Repeal of ABOR Policies 3-701 “Authority and Responsibilities – Internal Audits” and 7-115 “Capital Projects Audits” (First Reading)

☐ Action Item

Requested Action: The board office asks the board to review on first reading the proposed repeal of ABOR Policies 3-701 “Authority and Responsibilities – Internal Audits” and 7-115 “Capital Projects Audits.”

Background/History of Previous Board Action

In November 2015, the board approved ABOR Policy 3-104 pertaining to the Audit Committee and the implementation of the system-wide audit redesign. The new policy established university internal audit review boards to perform governance over their respective internal audit functions.

With the board’s approval of ABOR Policy 3-104, ABOR Policies 3-701 and 7-115 pertaining to internal audit responsibilities are now obsolete.
3-701 Authority and Responsibility—Internal Audits

A. Nature

The Arizona Board of Regents audit staff performs an independent appraisal activity which reviews operations as a service to the Board of Regents and university administrators. Internal auditing is a managerial control which functions by measuring and evaluating the effectiveness of other controls.

B. Objective and Scope

The objective of internal auditing is to assist the Arizona Board of Regents and university administrators in the effective discharge of their responsibilities by furnishing them with analyses, appraisals, recommendations and pertinent comments concerning the activities reviewed. The attainment of this overall objective involves such activities as:

1. Reviewing and appraising the soundness, adequacy, and application of accounting, financial, and other operating controls, and promoting effective control at reasonable cost.

2. Ascertaining the extent of compliance with established policies, plans and procedures.

3. Ascertaining the extent to which assets are accounted for and safeguarded from losses of all kinds.

4. Ascertaining the reliability of management data developed within the organization.

5. Conducting special examinations and reviews at the request of the Arizona Board of Regents and university administrators.

6. Recommending operating improvements.

C. Authority

The internal audit staff is authorized to conduct a comprehensive program of internal auditing. Authorization is granted for internal auditors’
unrestricted access to the board office and university functions, records (irrespective of medium), property and personnel relevant to a review.

D. Responsibility

The internal audit staff has a responsibility to report to the Arizona Board of Regents and university administrators on the areas examined. The information furnished to the board and to university administrators may differ in format and detail, depending upon the requirements and requests of university administration and the Arizona Board of Regents. In meeting these responsibilities, the internal audit staff will develop and execute a comprehensive audit program and comply with applicable professional auditing standards.

The assistant vice president for audit services reports to the executive director of the board and sr. vice president regarding day-to-day activities. Additionally, he/she attend regularly scheduled audit committee meetings and presents the audit services annual audit plan for approval and audit reports for acceptance.

The assistant vice president for audit services shall confer with the Audit Committee of the Board of Regents at least annually, outside the presence of board office and university officials, on any subject germane to internal audit’s area of responsibility. In addition, if the circumstances ever warrant such action, the assistant vice president for audit services may communicate directly with the Chair of the Audit Committee.

In performing their functions, the internal audit staff has no direct responsibility for, or authority over, any of the activities reviewed.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

7.115 Capital Project Audits:

A. The System office shall audit capital projects, including substantially completed projects, on a periodic basis for compliance with Board policies.

B. The audits shall be performed by professionals with relevant skills and shall focus on those areas most important to assess system integrity.

C. The System office shall audit a sample of projects funded with state-appropriated building renewal monies. The audits shall take place no less than every two years, shall include each fiscal-year appropriation and shall be consistent with the corresponding capital outlay bill.