

EAG RECOMMENDED MODEL MODIFICATIONS, FOR CCHE ACTION

Presented 11/06/14

BACKGROUND

The Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) met on October 2nd and took action on the Funding Allocation Model Definitions and Data Sources, as recommended by the Executive Advisory Group (EAG) and Funding Allocation Model Expert Team (FAMET) respectively.

The initial creation of the model has been dependent upon the decision points that were only just finalized during this last CCHE meeting. Since that time, FAMET has been very productive working with the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) on the design features of the model with the expertise of the members of this team, and the input and priorities of the public as learned through the outreach process. At the same time NCHEMS and the CDHE data/finance teams have also been working to collect, prepare, and transfer the data needed to populate the model to NCHEMS.

Preliminary feedback from the public engagement team has been shared with FAMET and EAG, as well as, suggestions from NCHEMS as they worked through the model design phase.

Since the October 2nd CCHE meeting and several subsequent FAMET and EAG meetings, prompted by concerns expressed about the complexity of the approach to the role and mission factors and the grouping and indexing methodology, NCHEMS went back to the drawing board to create a simpler, more direct approach to the role and mission component of the model.

The FAMET submitted to the EAG recommendations for modifications to the model. The recommendations below represent the actions of the EAG and recommendations to CCHE.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION

1. **Add Metrics for “Underserved Students”** (within both the Performance and Role & Mission components) – “Underserved” as defined by the *Colorado Commission on Higher Education’s Master Plan*.
 - For Role & Mission, this will be based on underserved credit hours as a percent of COF Stipend.
 - For the Performance, this will be an additional bonus for each completion and transfer by a student identified as “Underserved.”
- The EAG **supported** this recommendation:
- 4  I agree with the recommendation as written
 - 3  I can live with the recommendation, but have some reservation
 - 4  I oppose the recommendation as written



2. **Modify the Structure of the Role and Mission Component of the Funding Allocation Model**

Utilize one calculation to account for the bulk of the role and mission factors spelled out in the legislation, under Section 23-18-303(3), by taking an institutions total completed student credit hours for a year and multiplying that by a weighted discipline cluster according to a recognized cost-informed matrix.

➤ The EAG **supported** this recommendation:

- 7  I agree with the recommendation as written
- 4  I can live with the recommendation, but have some reservation
- 1  I oppose the recommendation as written

INFORMATIONAL ONLY

“Credit for Successful Remediation” (within the Performance component)

FAMET had recommended eliminating the additional metric related to successful remediation, because this additional metric would not apply to all institutions. HB 14-1319 specifically requires that “each Performance funding metric be applied uniformly to all Governing Boards” **Section 23-18-306(2)(b)(IV)**. It is for this reason that FAMET recommends eliminating additional metric.

The EAG rejected this recommendation in favor of including the metric in the design structure of the model. However, the EAG left to the FAMET to continue to discuss how and if this metric is included in the final recommended funding allocation model.

➤ The EAG **rejected** this recommendation:

- 7  I agree with rejecting the recommendation
- 2  I agree with rejecting the recommendation, but have some reservation
- 3  I oppose rejecting the recommendation