



# Guidelines for Review of Proposed University Campuses, Community Colleges, and Educational Centers

## Introduction

### *Commission responsibilities and authority regarding new campuses and centers*

Section 66904 of the California Education Code expresses the intent of the Legislature that the sites for new institutions or branches of public postsecondary education will not be authorized or acquired unless recommended by the Commission:

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

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

### *Evolution and purpose of the guidelines*

In order to carry out its given responsibilities in this area, the Commission adopted policies relating to the review of new campuses and centers in April 1975 and revised those policies in September 1978 and September 1982. Both the 1975 document and the two revisions outlined the Commission's basic assumptions under which the guidelines and procedures were developed and then specified the proposals subject to Commission review, the criteria for reviewing proposals, the schedule to be followed by the segments when submitting proposals, and the contents of the required "needs studies."

In 1990, the Commission approved a substantive revision of what by then was called *Guidelines for Review of Proposed Campuses and Off-Campus Centers*. Through that revision, the Commission sought to incorporate a statewide planning agenda into the quasi-regulatory function the guidelines have always represented, and the result was a greater systemwide attention to statewide perspectives than had previously been in evidence. These new guidelines called for a statewide plan from each of the systems, then a "Letter of Intent" that identified a system's plans to create one or more new institutions, and finally, a formal needs study for the proposed new institution that would provide certain prescribed data elements and satisfy specific criteria. At each stage of this process, the Commission would be able to comment either positively or negatively, thereby ensuring that planning for a new campus or center would not proceed to a point where it could not be reversed should the evidence indicate the necessity for a reversal.

This three-stage review concept statewide plan, preliminary review, then final review appears to be fundamentally sound, but some clarifications of the 1990 document have nevertheless become essential, for several reasons:

- ◆ In those *Guidelines*, the Commission stated only briefly its requirements for a statewide plan and for letters of intent. These requirements warrant greater clarification, particularly regarding the need for intersystem cooperation, to assist the systems and community college districts in the development of proposals.
- ◆ The 1990 *Guidelines* assumed that a single set of procedures could be applied to all three public systems. In practice, this assumption was overly optimistic, and this 1992 revision more specifically recognizes the major functional differences among the three systems.
- ◆ The procedures for developing enrollment projections need to be altered to account for the

curtailment of activities created by the severe staffing reductions at the Demographic Research Unit of the Department of Finance, which have eliminated its ability to make special projections for community college districts and reduced its capacity to project graduate enrollments.

- ◆ The unprecedented number of proposals emanating from the community colleges, as well as the staff reductions experienced by the Commission, require a streamlining of the approval process. Consequently, certain timelines have been shortened, and all have been clarified as to the duration of review at each stage of the process.
- ◆ Over the years, the distinctions among several terms, such as college, "center," and "institution," have become unclear.

By 1992, experience with the 1990 procedures suggested that they needed revision in order to overcome these problems and accommodate the changed planning environment in California, particularly related to California's diminished financial resources and growing college-age population.

---

### **Policy assumptions used in developing these guidelines**

The following six policy assumptions are central to the development of the procedures and criteria that the Commission uses in reviewing proposals for new campuses and off-campus centers:

1. It is State policy that each resident of California who has the capacity and motivation to benefit from higher education will have the opportunity to enroll in an institution of higher education. The California Community Colleges shall continue to be accessible to all persons at least 18 years of age who can benefit from the instruction offered, regardless of district boundaries. The California State University and the University of California shall continue to be accessible to first-time freshmen among the pool of students eligible according to Master Plan eligibility guidelines. Master Plan guidelines on undergraduate admission priorities will continue to be (1) con-

tinuing undergraduates in good standing; (2) California residents who are successful transfers from California public community colleges; (3) California residents entering at the freshman or sophomore level; and (4) residents of other states or foreign countries.

2. The differentiation of function among the systems with regard to institutional mission shall continue to be as defined by the State's Master Plan for Higher Education.
3. The University of California plans and develops its campuses and off-campus centers on the basis of statewide need.
4. The California State University plans and develops its campuses and off-campus centers on the basis of statewide needs and special regional considerations.
5. The California Community Colleges plan and develop their campuses and off-campus centers on the basis of local needs.
6. Planned enrollment capacities are established for and observed by all campuses of public postsecondary education. These capacities are determined on the basis of statewide and institutional economies, community and campus environment, physical limitations on campus size, program requirements and student enrollment levels, and internal organization. Planned enrollment capacities are established by the governing boards of community college districts (and reviewed by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges), the Trustees of the California State University, and the Regents of the University of California.

---

### **Definitions**

For the purposes of these guidelines, the following definitions shall apply:

*Outreach Operation* (all systems): An outreach operation is an enterprise, operated away from a community college or university campus, in leased or donated facilities, which offers credit courses sup-

ported by State funds, and which serves a student population of less than 500 full-time-equivalent students (FTES) at a single location.

*Educational Center* (California Community Colleges): An educational center is an off-campus enterprise owned or leased by the parent district and administered by a parent college. The center must enroll a minimum of 500 full-time-equivalent students, maintain an on-site administration (typically headed by a dean or director, but not by a president, chancellor, or superintendent), and offer programs leading to certificates or degrees to be conferred by the parent institution.

*Educational Center* (The California State University): An educational center is an off-campus enterprise owned or leased by the Trustees and administered by a parent State University campus. The center must offer courses and programs only at the upper division and graduate levels, enroll a minimum of 500 full-time-equivalent students, maintain an on-site administration (typically headed by a dean or director, but not by a president), and offer certificates or degrees to be conferred by the parent institution. Educational facilities operated in other states and the District of Columbia shall not be regarded as educational centers for the purposes of these guidelines, unless State capital outlay funding is used for construction, renovation, or equipment.

*Educational Center* (University of California): An educational center is an off-campus enterprise owned or leased by the Regents and administered by a parent University campus. The center must offer courses and programs only at the upper division and graduate levels, enroll a minimum of 500 full-time-equivalent students, maintain an on-site administration typically headed by a dean or director, but not by a chancellor), and offer certificates or degrees to be conferred by the parent institution. Organized Research Units (ORUs) and the Northern and Southern Regional Library Facilities shall not be regarded as educational centers. Educational facilities operated in other states and the District of Columbia shall not be regarded as educational centers unless State capital outlay funding is used for construction, renovation, or equipment.

*College* (California Community Colleges): A full-service, separately accredited, degree and certificate granting institution offering a full complement of lower-division programs and services, usually at a single campus location owned by the district; colleges enroll a minimum of 1,000 full-time-equivalent students. A college will have its own administration and be headed by a president or a chancellor.

*University Campus* (University of California and The California State University): A separately accredited, degree-granting institution offering programs at the lower division, upper division, and graduate levels, usually at a single campus location owned by the Regents or the Trustees; university campuses enroll a minimum of 1,000 full-time-equivalent students. A university campus will have its own administration and be headed by a president or chancellor.

*Institution* (all three systems): As used in these guidelines, "institution" refers to an educational center, a college, or a university campus, but not to an outreach operation.

---

### **Projects subject to Commission review**

New institutions (educational centers, campuses, and colleges) are subject to review, while outreach operations are not. The Commission may, however, review and comment on other projects consistent with its overall State planning and coordination role.

---

### **Stages in the review process**

Three stages of systemwide responsibility are involved in the process by which the Commission reviews proposals for new institutions: (1) the formulation of a long-range plan by each of the three public systems; (2) the submission of a "Letter of Intent to Expand" by the systemwide governing board; and (3) the submission of a "Needs Study" by the systemwide governing board. Each of these stages is discussed below.

#### *1. The systemwide long-range plan*

Plans for new institutions should be made by the Regents, the Trustees, and the Board of Governors only after the adoption of a systemwide plan that addresses total statewide long-range growth needs, including the capacity of existing institutions to accommodate those needs. Each governing board should submit its statewide plan to the Commission for review and comment (with copies to the Department of Finance, the Demographic Research Unit, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst) before proceeding with plans for the acquisition or construction of new institutions. Each system must update its systemwide long-range plan every five years and submit it to the Commission for review and comment.

Each systemwide long-range plan should include the following elements:

- ◆ For all three public systems, a 15-year undergraduate enrollment projection for the system, presented in terms of both headcount and full-time-equivalent students (FTES). Such projections shall include a full explanation of all assumptions underlying them, consider the annual projections developed by the Demographic Research Unit of the Department of Finance, and explain any significant departures from those projections.
- ◆ For the University of California and the California State University, a systemwide 15-year graduate enrollment projection, presented with a full explanation of all assumptions underlying the projection.
- ◆ Each of the three public systems should provide evidence within the long-range plan of cooperative planning with California's other public systems, such as documentation of official contacts, meetings, correspondence, or other efforts to integrate its own planning with the planning efforts of the other public systems and with any independent colleges and universities in the area. The physical capacities of existing independent colleges and universities should be considered. If disagreements exist among the systems regarding such matters as enrollment projections or the scope, location, construction, or conversion of

new facilities, the long-range plan should clearly state the nature of those disagreements.

- ◆ For all three public systems, the physical and planned enrollment capacity of each institution within the system. Physical capacity shall be determined by analyzing existing capacity space plus funded capacity projects. Planned enrollment capacity shall be the ultimate enrollment capacity of the institution as determined by the respective governing board of the system -- Regents, Trustees, or Board of Governors.
- ◆ For all three public systems, a development plan that includes the approximate opening dates (within a range of plus or minus two years) of all new institutions -- educational centers, community colleges, and university campuses; the approximate capacity of those institutions at opening and after five and ten years of operation; the geographic area in which each institution is to be located (region of the State for the University of California, county or city for the California State University, and district for community colleges); and whether a center is proposed to be converted into a community college or university campus within the 15-year period specified.
- ◆ A projection of the capital outlay cost (excluding bond interest) of any new institutions proposed to be built within the 15-year period specified, arrayed by capacity at various stages over the fifteen-year period (e.g. opening enrollment of 2,000 FTES; 5,000 FTES five years later, etc.), together with a statement of the assumptions used to develop the cost projection.
- ◆ A projection of the ongoing capital outlay cost (excluding bond interest) of existing institutions, arrayed by the cost of new space to accommodate enrollment growth, and the cost to renovate existing buildings and infrastructure, together with a statement of the assumptions used to develop the cost projection, and with maintenance costs included only if the type of maintenance involved is normally part of a system's capital outlay budget.

## 2. *The "Letter of Intent to Expand"*

*New university campuses:* No less than five years prior to the time it expects its first capital outlay appropriation, the Regents or the Trustees should submit to the Commission (with copies to the Department of Finance, the Demographic Research Unit, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst) a "Letter of Intent to Expand." This letter should contain the following information:

- ◆ A preliminary ten-year enrollment projection for the new university campus (from the campus's opening date), developed by the systemwide central office, which should be consistent with the statewide projections developed annually by the Demographic Research Unit of the Department of Finance. The systemwide central office may seek the advice of the Unit in developing the projection, but Unit approval is not required at this stage.
- ◆ The geographic location of the new university campus (region of the State for the University of California and county or city for the California State University).
- ◆ If the statewide plan envisions the construction or acquisition of more than one new institution, the reason for prioritizing the proposed university campus ahead of other new institutions should be specified.
- ◆ A time schedule for development of the new university campus, including preliminary dates and enrollment levels at the opening, final buildout, and intermediate stages.
- ◆ A tentative ten-year capital outlay budget starting on the date of the first capital outlay appropriation.
- ◆ A copy of the resolution by the governing board authorizing the new university campus.
- ◆ Maps of the area in which the proposed university campus is to be located, indicating population densities, topography, and road and highway configurations.

*Conversion by the University of California or the California State University of an existing educational center to a university campus:* No less than

three years prior to the time it expects to enroll lower division students for the first time, the Regents or the Trustees should submit to the Commission (with copies to the Department of Finance, the Demographic Research Unit, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst) a "Letter of Intent to Expand." This letter should contain the following information:

- ◆ The complete enrollment history (headcount and full-time-equivalent students) or the previous ten years history (whichever is less) of the educational center. A preliminary ten-year enrollment projection for the new university campus (from the campus's opening date), developed by the systemwide central office, which should be consistent with the statewide projections developed annually by the Demographic Research Unit of the Department of Finance. The systemwide central office may seek the advice of the Unit in developing the projection, but Unit approval is not required at this stage.
- ◆ If the statewide plan envisions the construction or acquisition of other new institution(s), the reason for prioritizing the proposed university campus ahead of other new institutions should be specified.
- ◆ A time schedule for converting the educational center and for developing the new university campus, including preliminary dates and enrollment levels at the opening, final buildout, and intermediate stages.
- ◆ A tentative ten-year capital outlay budget starting on the date of the first capital outlay appropriation for the new university campus.
- ◆ A copy of the resolution by the governing board authorizing conversion of the educational center to a university campus.
- ◆ Maps of the area in which the proposed university campus is to be located, indicating population densities, topography, and road and highway configurations.

*New educational centers of the University of California and the California State University:* No less than two years prior to the time it expects its first

capital outlay appropriation, the Regents or the Trustees should submit to the Commission with copies to the Department of Finance, the Demographic Research Unit, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst) a “Letter of Intent to Expand.” This letter should contain the following information:

- ◆ A preliminary five-year enrollment projection for the new educational center (from the center's opening date), developed by the systemwide central office, which should be consistent with the statewide projections developed annually by the Demographic Research Unit of the Department of Finance. The systemwide central office may seek the advice of the Unit in developing the projection, but Unit approval is not required at this stage.
- ◆ The location of the new educational center in terms as specific as possible. An area not exceeding a few square miles in size should be identified.
- ◆ If the statewide plan envisions the construction or acquisition of more than one new institution, the reasons for prioritizing the proposed educational center ahead of other new institutions should be specified.
- ◆ A time schedule for development of the new educational center, including preliminary dates and enrollment levels at the opening, final buildout, and intermediate stages.
- ◆ A tentative ten-year capital outlay budget starting on the date of the first capital outlay appropriation.
- ◆ A copy of the resolution by the governing board authorizing the new educational center.
- ◆ Maps of the area in which the proposed educational center is to be located, indicating population densities, topography, and road and highway configurations.

*New California Community Colleges:* No less than 36 months prior to the time it expects its first capital outlay appropriation, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges should submit to the Commission (with copies to the Department of Fi-

nance, the Demographic Research Unit, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst) a “Letter of Intent to Expand.” This letter should contain the following information:

- ◆ A preliminary ten-year enrollment projection for the new college (from the college's opening date), developed by the district and/or the Chancellor's Office, which should be consistent with the statewide projections developed annually by the Demographic Research Unit of the Department of Finance. The Chancellor's Office may seek the advice of the Unit in developing the projection, but Unit approval is not required at this stage.
- ◆ The location of the new college in terms as specific as possible, usually not exceeding a few square miles.
- ◆ A copy of the district's most recent five-year capital construction plan.
- ◆ If the statewide plan envisions the construction or acquisition of more than one new institution within the 15-year term of the plan, the plan should prioritize the proposed new colleges in terms of three five-year intervals (near term, mid term, and long term). Priorities within each of the five-year periods of time shall be established through the Board of Governors five-year capital outlay planning process required by Supplemental Language to the 1989 Budget Act.
- ◆ A time schedule for development of the new college, including preliminary dates and enrollment levels at the opening, final buildout, and intermediate stages.
- ◆ A tentative ten-year capital outlay budget starting on the date of the first capital outlay appropriation.
- ◆ A copy of the resolution by the local governing board authorizing the new college.
- ◆ Maps of the area in which the proposed new college is to be located, indicating population densities, topography, and road and highway configurations.

*New California Community College educational centers:* No less than 18 months prior to the time it expects its first capital outlay appropriation, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges should submit to the Commission (with copies to the Department of Finance, the Demographic Research Unit, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst) a "Letter of Intent to Expand." This letter should contain the following information:

- ◆ A preliminary five-year enrollment projection for the new educational center (from the center's opening date), developed by the district and/or the Chancellor's Office, which should be consistent with the statewide projections developed annually by the Demographic Research Unit of the Department of Finance. The Chancellor's Office may seek the advice of the Unit in developing the projection, but Unit approval is not required at this stage.
- ◆ The location of the new educational center in terms as specific as possible, usually not exceeding a few square miles.
- ◆ A copy of the district's most recent five-year capital construction plan.
- ◆ If the statewide plan envisions the construction or acquisition of more than one new institution within the 15-year term of the plan, the plan should prioritize the proposed new centers in terms of three five-year intervals (near term, mid term, and long term). Priorities within each of the five-year periods of time shall be established through the Board of Governors five-year capital outlay planning process required by Supplemental Language to the 1989 Budget Act.
- ◆ A time schedule for development of the new educational center, including preliminary dates and enrollment levels at the opening, final buildout, and intermediate stages.
- ◆ A tentative ten-year capital outlay budget starting on the date of the first capital outlay appropriation.
- ◆ A copy of the resolution by the local governing board authorizing the new educational center.

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

### 3. *Commission response to the "Letter of Intent to Expand"*

Once the "Letter of Intent to Expand" is received, Commission staff will review the enrollment projections and other data and information that serve as the basis for the proposed new institution. If the plans appear to be reasonable, the Commission's executive director will advise the systemwide chief executive officer to move forward with site acquisition or further development plans. The Executive Director may in this process raise concerns about defects in the Letter of Intent to Expand that need to be addressed in the planning process. If the Executive Director is unable to advise the chief executive officer to move forward with the expansion plan, he or she shall so state to the chief executive officer prior to notifying the Department of Finance and the Legislature of the basis for the negative recommendation. The Executive Director shall respond to the chief executive officer, in writing, no later than 60 days following submission of the Letter of Intent to Expand to the Commission.

### 4. *Development of the "needs study"*

Following the Executive Director's preliminary recommendation to move forward, the systemwide central offices shall proceed with the final process of identifying potential sites for the new institution. If property for the new institution is already owned by the system, alternative sites must be identified and considered in the manner required by the California Environmental Quality Act. So as to avoid redundancy in the preparation of information, all materials germane to the environmental impact report process shall be made available to the Commission at the same time that they are made available to the designated responsible agencies. Upon approval of the environmental impact report by the lead agency, the systemwide central office shall forward the final environmental impact report for the site as well as the final needs study for the new institution to the Commission. The needs study must respond fully to

each of the criteria outlined below, which collectively will constitute the basis on which the proposal for the new institution will be evaluated. The needs study shall be complete only upon receipt of the environmental impact report, the academic master plan, the special enrollment projection approved by the Demographic Research Unit, and complete responses to each of the criteria listed below.

#### 5. *Commission action*

Once the Commission has received the completed needs study, the Excessive Director shall certify the completeness of that Needs Study to the systemwide chief executive officer. The Commission shall take final action on any proposal for a new institution according to the following schedule:

##### *New university campus:*

University of California: One Year  
The California State University: One Year

##### *New college:*

California Community Colleges: Six Months

##### *New Educational Center:*

University of California: Six Months  
The California State University: Six Months  
California Community Colleges: Four Months

Once the Commission has taken action on the proposal, the Executive Director will notify the appropriate legislative committee chairs, the Department of Finance, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst.

---

### **Criteria for evaluating proposals**

As stated in Sections 66903[2a] and 66903[5] of the Education Code, the Commission's responsibility is to determine "the need for and location of new institutions and campuses of public higher education." The criteria below follow that categorization:

#### *Criteria related to need*

##### *1. Enrollment projections*

1.1 Enrollment projections must be sufficient to justify the establishment of the "new institution," as that term is defined above. For a proposed new educational center, enrollment projections for each of the first five years of operation (from the center's opening date), must be provided. For a proposed new college or university campus, enrollment projections for each of the first ten years of operation (from the college's or campus's opening date) must be provided. When an existing educational center is proposed to be converted to a new college or university campus, the center's previous enrollment history, or the previous ten year's history (whichever is less) must also be provided.

As the designated demographic agency for the State, the Demographic Research Unit has the statutory responsibility for preparing systemwide and district enrollment projections. For a proposed new institution, the Unit will approve all projections of undergraduate enrollment developed by a systemwide central office of one of the public systems or by the community college district proposing the new institution. The Unit shall provide the systems with advice and instructions on the preparation of enrollment projections. Community College projections shall be developed pursuant to the Unit's instructions.

Undergraduate enrollment projections for new institutions of the University of California and the California State University shall be presented in terms of headcount and full-time-equivalent students (FTES). Lower-division enrollment projections for new institutions of the California Community Colleges shall be presented in terms of headcount students, Weekly Student Contact Hours (WSCH), and WSCH per headcount student.

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

1.2 For a new University of California campus, statewide enrollment projected for the University should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing University campuses and educational centers as defined in the systemwide long-range plan developed by the Regents pursuant to Item 1 of these guidelines. If the statewide enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity for the University system, compelling statewide needs for the establishment of the new university campus must be demonstrated. In order for compelling statewide needs to be established, the University must demonstrate why these needs deserve priority attention over competing systemwide needs for both support and capital outlay funding.

1.3 For a new University of California educational center, statewide enrollment projected for the University should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing University campuses and educational centers as defined in the systemwide long-range plan developed by the Regents pursuant to Item 1 of these guidelines. If the statewide enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity for the University system, compelling statewide needs for the establishment of the new educational center must be demonstrated. In order for compelling statewide needs to be established, the University must demonstrate why these needs deserve priority attention over competing needs in other sectors of the University for both support and capital outlay funding.

1.4 For a new California State University campus, statewide enrollment projected for the State University system should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing State University campuses and educational centers as defined in the systemwide long-range plan developed by the Board of Trustees pursuant to Item 1 of these guidelines. If the statewide enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity for the system, compelling regional needs must be demonstrated. In order for compelling regional needs to be demonstrated, the system must specify why these regional needs deserve priority attention over competing needs in other sectors of the State University system for both support and capital outlay funding.

1.5 For a new California State University educational center, statewide enrollment projected for the State University system should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing State University campuses and educational centers as defined in the systemwide long-range plan developed by the Board of Trustees pursuant to Item 1 of these guidelines. If the statewide enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity for the State University system, compelling statewide or regional needs for the establishment of the new educational center must be demonstrated. In order for compelling statewide or regional needs to be established, the State University must demonstrate why these needs deserve priority attention over competing needs in other sectors of the University for both support and capital outlay funding.

1.6 For a new community college or educational center, enrollment projected for the district proposing the college or educational center should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing district colleges and educational centers. If the district enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing district colleges or educational centers, compelling regional or local needs must be demonstrated. The district shall demonstrate local needs by satisfying the requirements of the criteria specified in these guidelines. Regional and statewide needs shall be demonstrated by the Board of Governors through the long-range planning process.

## 2. *Programmatic alternatives*

2.1 Proposals for new institutions should address at least the following alternatives: (1) the possibility of establishing an educational center instead of a university campus or community college; (2) the expansion of existing institutions; (3) the increased utilization of existing institutions, particularly in the afternoons and evenings, and during the summer months; (4) the shared use of existing or new facilities and programs with other postsecondary education institutions, in the same or other public systems or independent institutions; (5) the use of nontraditional modes of instructional delivery, such as “colleges without walls” and distance learning through interactive television and computerized in-

struction; and (6) private fund raising or donations of land or facilities for the proposed new institution.

### *3. Serving the disadvantaged*

3.1 The new institution must facilitate access for disadvantaged and historically underrepresented groups.

### *4. Academic planning and program justification*

4.1 The programs projected for the new institution must be described and justified. An academic master plan, including a general sequence of program and degree level plans, and an institutional plan to implement such State goals as access; quality; intersegmental cooperation; and diversification of students, faculty, administration, and staff for the new institution, must be provided.

### *5. Consideration of needed funding*

5.1 A cost analysis of both capital outlay estimates and projected support costs for the new institution, and possible options for alternative funding sources, must be provided.

### *Criteria related to location*

### *6. Consideration of alternative sites*

6.1 A cost-benefit analysis of alternatives, including a consideration of alternative sites for the new institution, must be articulated and documented. This criterion may be satisfied by the Environmental Impact Report, provided it contains a comprehensive analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of alternative sites.

### *7. Geographic and physical accessibility*

7.1 The physical, social, and demographic characteristics of the location and surrounding service areas for the new institution must be included.

7.2 There must be a plan for student, faculty, and staff transportation to the proposed location. Plans for student and faculty housing, including projections of needed on-campus residential facilities, should be included if appropriate. For locations that do not plan to maintain student on-campus residences, reasonable commuting time for students defined generally as not exceeding a 30-45 minute automobile

drive (including time to locate parking) for a majority of the residents of the service area must be demonstrated.

### *8. Environmental and social impact*

8.1 The proposal must include a copy of the final environmental impact report. To expedite the review process, the Commission should be provided all information related to the environmental impact report process as it becomes available to responsible agencies and the public.

## 9. *Effects on other institutions*

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

9.2 The establishment of a new University of California or California State University campus or educational center must take into consideration the impact of a new facility on existing and projected enrollments in the neighboring institutions of its own and of other systems.

9.3 The establishment of a new community college must not reduce existing and projected enrollments in adjacent community colleges either within the district proposing the new college or in adjacent districts to a level that will damage their economy of

operation, or create excess enrollment capacity at these institutions, or lead to an unnecessary duplication of programs.

## *Other considerations*

### 10. *Economic efficiency*

10.1 Since it is in the best interests of the State to encourage maximum economy of operation, priority shall be given to proposals for new institutions where the State of California is relieved of all or part of the financial burden. When such proposals include gifts of land, construction costs, or equipment, a higher priority shall be granted to such projects than to projects where all costs are born by the State, assuming all other criteria listed above are satisfied.

10.2 A higher priority shall be given to projects involving intersegmental cooperation, provided the systems or institutions involved can demonstrate a financial savings or programmatic advantage to the State as a result of the cooperative effort.