

IT Capital Scoring Criteria Revisions – Ms. Lauren Gilliland, CDHE, reviewed proposed changes to the CCHE capital IT scoring criteria. Ms. Gilliland noted that the criteria were not comprehensively reviewed, since they were only two years old. The only revisions made were to align shared criteria with the newly revised capital construction scoring criteria. Commissioners voted unanimously to approve the revised CCHE capital IT criteria, and forward to the CCHE for a full vote.

Financial Aid Allocations – Ms. Lauren Gilliland and Ms. Emma Fedorchuk, CDHE, provided a basic overview of how state financial aid allocations to institutions of higher education are determined for the Colorado Student Grant, the Colorado Graduate Grant, Work Study, and CTE grants. They discussed the timeline for future decisions, which includes bringing real scenarios to the next Fiscal Affairs and Audit Committee meeting. Ms. Fedorchuk discussed a letter sent by CCCS and CMU regarding the allocation amounts for the Colorado Student Grant by class rank, which favor student progression. The letter advocated for a less steep progression, arguing that it harms their two-year missions and focus on attracting first generation students. Mr. Jason Schrock, CDHE, noted that multiple institutions have voiced the desire for a robust stakeholder process if significant changes to any of the allocation formulas are considered. As such, Mr. Schrock recommended major changes not be implemented this year, but be considered for next year.

Process for CCHE use of step 1 and 3 of the funding formula – Mr. Jason Schrock, CDHE, provided an overview of the discussions for developing a process for the CCHE to use step 1 and 3 of the funding formula. A draft outlining the process was distributed to commissioners. He reminded commissioners of the three steps of the funding formula, indicating that step 1 and 3 are for providing additional funding to institutions to meet goals or priorities. However, step 1 is intended to be used for providing ongoing funding, while step 3 is for temporary, or one-time funding.

Mr. Schrock indicated that the process that has been established included the commission establishing a policy goal(s) or priority for the budget request in collaboration with the Department and governing boards; the Commission would then allocate funding to all governing boards to meet the goal. The amount of recommended funding, and the mechanism for distributing the funding to all institutions, would depend on the policy goal(s). He also indicated that there was discussion that the commission should have the option of recommending funding in steps 1 and/or 3 only to selected Governing Boards to meet certain goals or priorities. The methodology for determining which Governing Boards would be recommended for additional funding would depend on the circumstances and could involve an application process.

Commissioners discussed the process for using step 1 and 3 and noted the need for a more specific timeline for the development of the goal(s). They also indicated that the annual goal should provide for consistency over a period of time; the goal(s) should not vary widely on an annual basis. The Commissioners also discussed the importance of choosing a goal in which a distribution of funding could be established. Institutions provided feedback on the Commission's process for using step 1 and 3 of the funding formula. A majority of governing boards believe that any funding through steps 1 and 3 should be in addition to funding provided in step 2 to cover, at a minimum, the base cost increases of institutions. However, at least one governing board believed that addressing base funding disparities should take precedence.