

Minutes of the Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) Meeting
Colorado Community College System
October 2, 2014

Vice Chair Patty Pacey called the meeting to order at 1:15pm.

Vice Chair Pacey, Commissioners John Anderson, Luis Colon, Jeanette Garcia, Monte Moses, Hereford Percy and BJ Scott attended. Also in attendance were CCHE Advisory Committee members Wayne Artis, Dr. Toni Larson, Dr. Barbara Morris, Dr. Keith Owen, Mark Superka and Melissa Wagner.

Vice Chair Pacey introduced and welcomed Dr. Barbara Morris, Provost of Ft. Lewis College, as the new Academic Council Representative on the CCHE Advisory Committee.

Commissioner Percy moved to approve the minutes of the September 4, 2014 CCHE meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Colon and passed unanimously.

Andy Dorsey, President of Front Range Community College, welcomed the Commissioners to the campus. President Dorsey informed the Commission that Front Range Community College has three campuses in Westminster, Longmont and Ft. Collins, and centers in Brighton and Loveland.

Commissioner Percy complimented President Dorsey on the strong ties and partnerships the campuses have with the communities of Longmont and Westminster.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. George Walker of Denver talked about the lack of funding for higher education in Colorado and noted that he had not heard anything yet about higher education funding during the gubernatorial campaign.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR REPORT

Lt. Governor Joe Garcia told the Commission that the Department had been awarded a \$600,000 grant through the Kresge Foundation to support a national effort towards FAFSA Completion.

He also introduced Emma Beck, the department's newest finance analyst.

The Commission was informed that the Colorado Completes! Campaign is underway with visits to five different campuses to highlight their success with completion.

The Lt. Governor updated the CCHE on Otero Junior College which had a default rate over 30 percent for 2 consecutive years. President Jim Rizzuto has confirmed that Otero Junior College's rate this year is down 25.5%, thus avoiding sanctions and loss of eligibility for federal financial aid.

College America's status was also updated. The Division of Occupational School Board directed College America to provide all advertising from the last six months for a review to determine compliance. The Board also decided, with regard to the bond, College America had some mitigating circumstances that warranted consideration.

Lt. Governor Garcia also updated the Commission on the Colorado Opportunity Scholarship Initiative (COSI). The Initiative has in excess of \$30 million. Approximately 10 percent (\$3.4 million) of that money will be used for grants to support student success initiatives around the state in the coming year. The RFP will be released next week and proposals are due on November 14th.

COMMISSIONERS AND ADVISORS REPORTS

Parent Advisor, Melissa Wagner, announced that she is now sitting on the Colorado State Board of the Parent Teacher Association as a member at large and her title, at the El Paso Council level, is College Outreach Chair. There is a graduation guidelines task force she has joined and she is also an administrator for this year's 6th grade. Those 6th grade students will be the first group to graduate under the new guidelines. Ms. Wagner also informed the Commission that the month of October is the Family and School Partnership in Education month for the third year.

Faculty Advisor, Wayne Artis, announced that the Department of Higher Education is hosting a meeting of the Colorado Faculty Advisory Council on October 10th.

Dr. Keith Owen, K-12 Advisor, told the Commission that the State Advisory Council for Parent Involvement in Education (SACPIE) has been progressively getting stronger in advocating the important role parents and families play in students' education. The Department of Education hired a director of family and parent engagement and has been hosting trainings all over Colorado, including more remote areas of the state.

CONSENT ITEMS

Recommend Approval of Bachelor of Arts in Media Production at University of Colorado Boulder

Recommend Approval of Bachelor of Arts in Media Studies at University of Colorado Boulder

Recommend Approval of Bachelor of Science in Information Science at University of Colorado Boulder

Recommend Approval of Bachelor of Science in Strategic Communication at University Of Colorado Boulder

Recommend Approval to Offer Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Education Endorsement at Colorado Mesa University

Recommend Approval of Doctor of Philosophy Degree in Media Research and Practice at University of Colorado Boulder

Recommend Approval of Doctor of Philosophy in Emergent Technologies and Media Art Practices at University of Colorado Boulder

Recommend Approval of Doctor of Philosophy in Intermedia Art | Writing | Performance at University of Colorado Boulder

Recommend Approval of Master of Arts in Media and Public Engagement at University of Colorado Boulder

Recommend Approval of Master of Fine Arts in Interdisciplinary Documentary Media Production at University of Colorado Boulder

Recommend Approval of Master of Science and Doctor of Philosophy in Information Science at University of Colorado Boulder

Recommend Approval of Master of Science in Biomedical Science and Biotechnology at University of Colorado Denver

Recommend Approval of Master of Science in Exercise and Sport Science – High Altitude Exercise Physiology at Western State Colorado University

Recommend Approval of Associate of Arts in Geography and Associate of Arts in Philosophy Degrees with Designation at Colorado Community College System

Recommend Approval of Admissions Index Score for Colorado State University Global Campus

Commissioner Moses moved to approve the consent items. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Percy and unanimously passed.

ACTION ITEM

HB14-1319 Project Update and EAG Recommendations – Kachina Weaver, Project Manager for HB14-1319 updated the Commissioners on the progress of the projects teams.

The Public Education & Outreach team scheduled regional meetings around the state for the purpose of getting input from stakeholders. Lorez Meinhold, of the Keystone Group, reported that to date, there have been eight meetings held with 174 attendees. The make-up of these meetings have been comprised of students, parents, members of the business community, state and local elected officials, members of higher education, representatives of K-12 system and community leaders and members. Some of the preliminary findings are that education's role is;

training and educating the workforce and, of slightly lesser importance, economic development and creating good stewards and lifelong learners. The factors and metrics leading the way for both the rural and urban areas are the number of low-income, first-generation attendees, as well as degree or certificate completion. The issue of affordability was heavily emphasized. Regarding current state general fund budget allocations for higher education, 90% of the 174 participants said they either disagree or strongly disagree that it sufficiently meets Colorado’s goals and needs.

The Cost Driver Analysis Team, led by CFO Diane Duffy, reported that they have held two meetings and had a very informative discussion with the Governor’s Office of State Planning and Budget Director, Henry Sobanet, about his perspective and perception on the type of cost information that would be helpful to the process. The cost driver team decided not to meet in October, partly because the Funding Allocation Model Expert Team (FAMET) is working on the funding allocation model.

The Funding Allocation Model Expert Team or FAMET, led by Chief Research Officer Dr. Beth Bean, reported that they have met twice and the meetings were very collaborative and productive, and the team has sent several recommendations to the EAG.

Both Commissioner Moses and Vice Chair Pacey complimented the teams on their efficiency.

The Executive Advisory Group (EAG) update was presented by Ms. Weaver. She reported that the recommendation by the CCHE to include all four goals in the master plan was quickly adopted by the EAG at their last meeting. The EAG recommendation was to amend the project principles to include the fourth goal in order to ensure Colorado higher education affordable, accessible, of high quality, and seen as a public good.

Commissioner Scott moved to approve the recommendation. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Anderson and unanimously passed.

The Commissioners then voted on the definitions and data sources for the factors and the metrics for the funding allocation model adopted by the EAG.

They are as follows:

Selectivity of institution.	<p>Admissions Factors: Use the median of the following admissions factors to create a weighted proxy index:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Entering ACT/SAT scores • High School GPA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The high school GPA factors will be weighted at 10 times the ACT/SAT composite score. 	Student Unit Record Data System (SURDS)
-----------------------------	---	---

The EAG was unanimous on this definition. Ms. Weaver reported that the FAMET had one member who thought the Student Unit Record Data System (SURDS) data would have been a

better data source. SURDS is a Colorado calculation. The issue with using SURDS is that every institution is counted as having one campus.

Commissioner Moses moved to approve the definition. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Percy and unanimously passed.

<p>Number of campuses of the institution.</p>	<p>The number of campuses using the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) definition¹</p> <p>The HLC identifies a location of an institution to be independent of the main campus if the location has all of the following four attributes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is permanent in nature; • Offers courses in education programs leading to a degree, certificate, or other recognized educational credential; • Has its own faculty and administrative or supervisory organization; and, • Has its own budgetary and hiring authority. <p>The term branch campus is “a location of an institution that is geographically apart and independent of the main campus of the institution”.</p>	<p>Higher Learning Commission (HLC)</p>
---	--	---

The Commissioners asked for clarification about Colorado Mesa University and Pikes Peak Community College number of campuses. It was clarified that Pikes Peak Community College has one president and one administrative structure, although it is over several different campuses, whereas Colorado Mesa University has three campuses with separate administrative structures, thus being acknowledged as three separate campuses.

Commissioner Percy moved to approve the definition. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Scott and unanimously passed.

<p>Rural or urban location of the institution.</p>	<p>Population of Home County Counts: Level of gradation by using the population of home county counts.</p>	<p>U.S. Census Bureau</p>
--	--	---------------------------

Ms. Weaver explained that the goal is to have a gradation in the actual model, in order to have institutions separated from each other. It was proposed that the population of home county counts be used to create a level of gradation by using the population of these counts. The data source would be the U.S. Census Bureau. Both the EAG and the FAMET were unanimous in their decision on this recommendation.

¹ (HLC relies on the definition of campus per the Federal Higher Education Authorization Act)

Commissioner Garcia asked how, if looking at total populations with gradation, is it decided which institution is rural and which is urban. Dr. Bean replied that the final metric will not be defined by rural or urban, but instead will be the count of the population. Lt. Governor further explained that it will be a population factor, rather than an either/or definition between rural and urban. Commissioner Percy added that the vote was for the metrics, not the weights, which will come later. Commissioner Moses confirmed that the gradient will be a mathematical equation in which there will not be any variation, except from the census statistics.

Commissioner Colon asked why the metric was to be part of the funding model and how the number of campuses impacts funding allocation. Dr. Bean replied that the role and mission side of the funding allocation model is meant to support the institution. Each institution within the public institutions has a very unique and important role. The role and mission side is meant to ensure the institutions continue to serve that role. Each of these factors on the role and mission side regard keeping institutions doors open. Selectivity has to do with the type of students that they bring in. Selective institutions sometimes can demonstrate a higher level of graduation rates.

A rural institution might have a greater difficulty of attracting the faculty that they need. The number of campuses goes to the cost that the institution has to actually support their overall structure. An institution with a lower student enrollment makes it difficult for the campus to meet the costs that are needed and that needs to be taken into consideration. The other side of the model is on performance: how the institution is achieving; how many students are graduating and certifying; how they are retaining students to meet their goals and meet the goals of the state. These factors are dictated by the legislature.

Commissioner Percy moved to approve the definition. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Anderson and unanimously passed.

<p>Low student enrollment, affecting ability of the institution or campus to meet operational costs.</p>	<p>Actual enrollment of institutions and campuses.</p>	<p>Student Unit Record Data System (SURDS)/ Finance Data</p>
--	--	--

Ms. Weaver explained that low student enrollment affects the ability of the institution or campus to meet operational costs. There is a concern about certain institutions' ability to stay open. FAMET had asked for leeway moving forward with inputting the data and starting the weighting conversations. They would like to reexamine this metric, once the model is further developed, to explore how this particular variable could be used to balance any sort of disproportionate outcomes that came from the putting together of the model. Commissioner Moses explained that

this important caveat was added because this may be the single most important mechanism used to ensure everything turns out fairly. Commissioner Percy agreed to the importance of the caveat.

Dr. Bean told the Commissioners that they 2013-2014 enrollment numbers were being used but there is discussion of using a three year average moving forward.

The majority of the FAMET agreed on the definition. One member was undecided as they were concerned with how low enrollment would affect the overall model. The EAG was unanimous in support of the recommendations of the FAMET for this metric. The recommendation will capture the actual enrollment of the institutions and campuses using the SURDS data and the finance data.

Commissioner Percy moved to approve the definition. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Moses and unanimously passed.

Undergraduate (UG) programs with a high cost per student.	Using a common chart of high cost programs by discipline developed from a periodically updated multi-state analysis. NCHEMS High Cost Index Model: An index score created by weighted undergraduate FTE divided by the un-weighted undergraduate FTE.	NCHEMS, Student Unit Record Data System (SURDS), other state studies
---	--	--

Commissioner Colon confirmed that this definition is intended to show the proportion of high cost undergraduate students in a particular campus or system.

Commissioner Scott moved to approve the definition. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Garcia and unanimously passed.

Whether the institution conducts research.	“Research-ness” Score: Research expenditures divided by full-time faculty (tenured and tenured track).	IPEDS
--	--	-------

Ms. Weaver explained that each institution will have a score. That score would be added into the model and the weighting of that score is still yet to be determined. Both the EAG and the FAMET were unanimous in their decision on this recommendation.

Commissioner Anderson moved to approve the definition. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Moses and unanimously passed.

Pell-Eligible Undergraduate Students	Number of undergraduate students eligible for Pell at any time during the year. Use Pell-eligible credit hours as a percent of the College Opportunity Fund (COF) stipend (must never be less than 10 percent of COF).	Student Unit Record Data System (SURDS)
--------------------------------------	--	---

Ms. Weaver explained that this portion of the bill addresses additional role and mission funding factors, and the amount to be provided to each governing board to offset the costs incurred in providing additional support services to the groups that are outlined; Pell Eligible, first generation, underserved and undergraduate students. It also directs that the funding model shall ensure that the funding going to this portion must be at least equal to 10% of the COF stipend. It was determined to count a student as Pell eligible, if they were Pell eligible at any point during the academic year.

Commissioner Percy moved to approve the definition. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Anderson and unanimously passed.

Graduate Programs – an amount based on number enrolled, based on subject and level. Shall consider programs that have a high-cost per student.	Using a common chart of high cost programs by discipline developed from a periodically updated multi-state analysis. NCHEMS High Cost Index Model: An index score created by weighted graduate FTE divided by the un-weighted graduate FTE.	NCHEMS, Student Unit Record Data System (SURDS), other state studies
--	--	--

Ms. Weaver noted this recommendation is identical to the recommendation for undergraduate programs. This recommendation only looks at the graduate level programs. Both the EAG and the FAMET were unanimous in their recommendation.

Ms. Weaver clarified for Advisor Wagner that doctorate programs will be part of the graduate programs.

Commissioner Percy moved to approve the definition. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Moses and unanimously passed.

Remediation – cost of providing these courses, and must determine how to measure successful remediation.	Proportion of first-time students identified as requiring remediation, which will be measured by the number of basic skills and supplemental academic instruction course hours divided by total course hours. This factor is only for institutions authorized to provide basic skills courses and/or supplemental academic instruction.	Student Unit Record Data System (SURDS)
--	---	---

Ms. Weaver said that in establishing the components of this factor, the Commission shall determine how to measure successful remediation; which measure may include a student’s successful completion of a first level college course in the area of remediation. She also explained that included in the recommendation is the proportion of first time students, identified as requiring remediation, through an industry accepted mechanism utilizing SURDS as the data source. Both the EAG and FAMET were unanimous in their recommendations.

Dr. Bean explained that due to the unfortunate result of the current data lag, the first iteration for the academic years 2013-2014, the supplemental academic instruction and the other pilot programs, will be reflected in the later iterations of this model. She also explained that this is written as industry accepted mechanism and current state cut scores that exist will be used to determine whether a student is placed remediation or not. Dr. Bean also confirmed for Commissioner Garcia that students who are receiving the supplemental academic instruction from our institutions are included in the SURDS data.

Commissioner Moses moved to approve the definition. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Percy and unanimously passed.

Ms. Weaver told the Commissioners that the bill dictates that each role and mission factor may be applied differently to institutions. To the extent possible, similar institutions must be treated similarly. This will be one of the things that FAMET will figure out. Moving into the performance side of the funding metrics, the bill further says that these metrics must be applied uniformly to all governing boards. The funding metric for retention must be measured and applied to a community college in the same manner that it is measured and applied to a four year institution.

<p>Completion</p>	<p>The number of certificates or degrees awarded an institution and the number of students who transfer from a community college to another institution after the completion of a minimum of 18 credit hours. The amount to be awarded for each certificate or degree is based on the subject and level of the credential. Certificates will be counted when issued for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programs spanning one year (24 credit hours) or more; or • If program is less than one year (24 credit hours): • Certificate meets the federal “gainful employment” definition, or • Certificate represents the highest award earned at stop-out. <p>Students earning multiple 1-2 year or 24 to 60 credit hour certificates in an academic year will have each earned certificate count as a separate outcome.</p> <p>A community college that receives an incentive for a transfer student cannot also receive a retention bonus for that student in the same year.</p> <p>The value shall be increased for each credential earned or transfer of a Pell-eligible undergraduate student and/or an undergraduate student designated as underserved. Underserved is defined as African American, Hispanic and Native American students; excludes Asian students</p>	<p>Student Unit Record Data System (SURDS)</p>
-------------------	---	--

Ms. Weaver explained that regarding completions, what will be looked for is an amount for each certificate or degree awarded. Certificates should be counted in terms of the actual completion. It was agreed, by both the EAG and the FAMET that certificates should be counted when issued for programs spanning one year or more or if the program is less than one year (24 credit hours) and the certificate meets the federal gainful employment definition or the certificate represents the highest award earned at stop out. Further identifying those students earning multiple one or two year, or 24 to 60 credit hour, certificates in an academic year will be counted as separate

outcomes. For transfers, the recommendation is a minimum of 18 credit hours at the time of transfer, including concurrent enrollment.

Mr. Frank Watrous, Senior Analyst for the Bell Policy Center, brought up another nuance of the discussion that the FAMET had on this particular measure that he believed was very important. Specifically, additional funding in the completion metric for not only Pell eligible students, but for underserved students and non-traditional adult students, as well.

Mr. Watrous noted the emphasis on the underserved component is not reflected and he believes it is a critical component of what the Commissioner is doing.

Commissioner Moses asked for the component to be added to the descriptor and Commissioner Percy assured Mr. Watrous that the underserved population will be revisited in the next FAMET meeting.

Commissioner Percy moved to approve the definition. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Anderson and unanimously passed.

Retention	<p>The number of students who make the following steps of academic progress:</p> <p>Four-year institutions –number of students who cross the threshold of completing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 30 credit hours • 60 credit hours • 90 credit hours <p>Two-year institutions - number of students who cross the threshold of completing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15 credit hours • 30 credit hours • 45 credit hours <p>Concurrent enrollment will be included and each student will be counted only once at each academic progress interval.</p>	Student Unit Record Data System (SURDS)
-----------	---	---

Commissioner Colon asked if there was a time limit for completion. Dr Bean replied that there was not but the FAMET was open to further discuss the subject. Commissioner Colon requested they do, and suggested that there be two different metrics that are tracked; one for part time students, and one for full time students. He believes putting a certain time frame around a completion of the number of hours puts some emphasis on completing faster, or incentive for institutions to graduate faster.

Vice Chair Pacey, who serves on the FAMET, replied that Commissioner Colon may be combining the completion performance award with the retention performance award. The thinking at the funding model meetings was that there are a lot of non-traditional students trying to take courses who don't necessarily need to be pushed along. It is meant to give them access and opportunity, whereas completion is encouraging a different measure. Her preference is to have the Cost Analysis Team and the FAMET not have a time factor at this point. It will be revisited.

Commissioner Anderson moved to approve the definition. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Garcia and unanimously passed.

Successful Remediation - Recommendation: Remedial students who successfully complete the gateway course within 30 credit hours of remediation completion.

Ms. Weaver explained this is not actually a metric in the bill but the bill does require that the Commission defines successful remediation. The conversation centered around the fact that the sooner the student completes the remedial course and takes the subsequent gateway course, the sooner they are in a position to get the most out of their education, and be successful in future classes. Both the EAG and FAMET were unanimous in their recommendation.

Advisor Artis asked about completing a gateway course within 30 credit hours. Dr. Bean replied that the FAMET thought one year was too long a time frame and maybe not applicable to part time students, thus the 30 credit hours was used.

Commissioner Percy moved to approve the definition. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Scott and unanimously passed.

Additional Performance Metric: Credit for increases in Completions	The net increase in awards and transfers year to year. Only positive changes are included in the calculation and negative values are treated as zero.	Student Unit Record Data System (SURDS)
--	---	---

Ms. Weaver explained that this is a recommendation that provides credit for the increase in completions. It encourages not only acknowledgement of the graduates and the actual completions at the institutions, but provides an incentive for increasing their overall completion percentages.

This recommendation would include additional credit under completions for the rate of increase of completions. The EAG did provide some feedback that will be going back to the FAMET team at their next meeting to consider basing this metric on an average, such as a multi-year rolling average, so that there aren't any major changes and show a progression over time.

Commissioner Moses, a member of the EAG, told the Commissioners that this recommendation did not require a vote, as the recommendation is a suggestion that goes back to the FAMET.

Commissioner Anderson suggested that the Commission stay with the absolute mandates of the bill the first year. This additional performance metric is not mandated. Vice Chair Pacey respectfully disagreed with not considering this metric, as it is tied to the performance and financial accountability plans, as well as the CCHE mission. Commissioner Percy agreed that recognizing improvement is important and it would be an easier calculation and more motivating for the institutions to count the increase from year to year, than to just count the number of degrees and certificates. Commissioner Scott suggested that whatever aligns best back to the master plan in terms of the four goals is what should be considered.

Resident and Non-Resident Students: Recommendation: Include a count of all students (resident and non-resident), within the funding allocation model, with the exception of counting only resident students for the Pell-Eligible metric under the role and mission section of the statute.

Ms. Weaver told the Commission that the resident, non-resident student count issue has been a lengthy discussion over many meetings in various different groups. The EAG vote was not unanimous: six members were for it; two could live with that recommendation but had some concerns, and one was opposed.

The support for this recommendation stemmed from the fact that the funding from the allocation model will go directly to the institutions. This will not be funding in-state or out-of-state students, but any funding the institutions receive do offset costs to the resident students. She explained that the current performance contracts include a count of *all* students. The goals of the CCHE master plan factors in overall numbers of completions. The directive included in this bill is that Colorado's limited state resources must be used in a way that provides incentives for state institutions of higher education to achieve the policy goals adopted by the general assembly and the Colorado Commission on Higher Education. It was clarified by both the EAG and FAMET that the COF dollars will continue to be applied only to resident students.

Ms. Weaver said that those who were opposed or maybe not fully in support of the recommendation outlined their concerns about the perception by the public and the legislature that state funds would be being used to support non-resident students.

Commissioner Moses added that there are some political comments in terms of the cautions of how the perceptions could be in the public about state dollars subsidizing out of state students, but the opposite is actually the case. He added that the state's non-resident students are bolstering the higher education system in Colorado. The largest funding mechanism that the University of Colorado has comes from non-resident students, not from in-state funds, allowing an education system far better than the state is funding. He believed it was fair to count the students who are paying a really large portion of the total cost of education in this state as a student on par with the resident. He stated there is the data that shows that 30 percent of these non-resident degree earners from out of state are staying in state and becoming Colorado wage earners and paying taxes.

Commissioner Percy reminded the Commission that non-resident students do not benefit from COF.

Mr. Steve Kreidler, Vice President for Admissions at Metropolitan State University of Denver, is a member of the FAMET team. He brought four other points for the Commission to consider:

- 1) The inclusion of resident and non-resident students in these counts is a change of policy.
- 2) The FAMET team would like to ensure that the measures and the factors continue to push forward the ability to have Colorado students achieve at the highest levels and continue to be residents of the state after they graduate, and contribute economically at the highest levels.
- 3) Resident versus non-resident inclusion in these factors impacts both role and mission, as well as completion factors.
- 4) There has been a recent opinion showing that in the legislation there is no prohibition so it doesn't prohibit the use of non-residents.

Ms. Weaver said that the plain language of the bill, required under completions, stipulate an amount for each certificate or degree awarded, an amount for each student who transfers, an amount to be awarded for each based on the subject and level of credentials, and an amount for the number of students who make academic progress.

Tonya Covarrubias, Lead Financial Analyst, told the Commission that in reviewing fee for service contracts, she found that HB14-1319 and the contracts don't prohibit looking at non-resident students and funding credit hours. Fee for service calculations take into account both resident and non-resident when looking at cost.

Commissioner Moses moved to approve the definition. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Scott and unanimously passed.

New and Continuing State-Funded Capital Projects and Priority List, Fiscal Year 2015-16 - Andrew Rauch, Lead Financial Analyst, presented this action item to the Commission. He reminded the Commission that during the summer of 2013, the Office of State Planning and Budget (OSPB), unveiled a list of criteria that they wanted to use for capital construction. The department took these criteria and used them to evaluate the 34 projects that were submitted last year. A comprehensive and transparent review process of the criteria was done by the capital asset subcommittee, DHE staff, the higher education institutions, OSPB and the capital development committee in the Spring of 2014. The result of the review was CCHE's list of priority criteria which was used to evaluate this year's submissions:

- Health, Life Safety, and Code Issues
- Other Fund Sources
- Space Needs
- A Clear Identification of Beneficiaries
- Achieves Goals and
- Governing Board Priority

Ultimately, this year's list was reduced to 28 projects after "spillover" funding was awarded from general fund surplus. The total amount of these 28 projects was approximately \$545

million comprised of \$350 from state capital construction funds and \$195 million in institutional support. Two of these projects are the Certificates of Participation (COP) projects for Anschutz medical campus and the federal mineral lease program. These are ranked at the top, due to their statutory requirement, and total \$26 million. Five projects on the list are continuation projects. The remaining 21 projects are previously unfunded projects that appear in rank order on the list. Their rank is based on the analysis conducted by DHE staff and vetted through the capital asset subcommittee in conversations with the institutions. On September 22nd, the capital asset subcommittee voted 3-0 in favor of moving the prioritization list to CCHE for its approval. The OSPB limits the number of projects submitted to 20, not including the COP projects.

Mr. Rauch requested the Commission vote on four different actions: approve the two projects that meet the waiver requirement; approve the four new projects and six older projects that require program plan approval from Colorado Mesa University, University of Northern Colorado, Western State Colorado University, Pueblo Community College, University of Colorado-Boulder and University of Colorado-Colorado Springs; approve the prioritized list for FY2015-2016; and, acknowledge and forward to the governor's office and general assembly a list of all capital construction projects and their total costs for the year.

Commissioner Scott moved to approve the four recommendations. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Anderson and unanimously passed.

Mr. Andy Carlson, Senior Policy Analyst with the State Higher Education Executive Officers Association (SHEEO) gave the Commission a PowerPoint presentation on "Higher Education Funding: Colorado Within the National Context".

Commissioner Moses moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Percy. The meeting was adjourned at 5:05pm.