

**Capital Construction and Renewal Criteria Changes**

Criteria	Changes	Justification
Health, Life Safety, and Code Issues (renamed Health and Safety)	Removed references to controlled maintenance, but kept years since last major renovation.	The Office of the State Architect handles controlled maintenance requests. CDHE does not have the expertise to verify such information.
	Defined "major renovation"	Removes ambiguity.
	Removed reference to documentation from a qualified engineer/fire marshal/attorney/etc. of a very significant legal or health/life safety risk.	This could lead to liability issues if a qualified professional identifies a risk, and nothing is done about it. Institutions should work internally or with the Office of the State Architect to address such issues.
	Added bonus points for capital renewal projects that the State Architect classifies as level 2 (1 point) or level 1 (2 points) controlled maintenance.	This promotes capital renewal projects, which are a priority for the state (CCHE, OSPB, Legislature)
Reduction of Deferred Maintenance (new criterion)	Added a new criterion awarding points based on the percentage of a project's budget dedicated to reducing deferred maintenance.	The state (Office of the State Architect, CCHE, OSPB, Legislature) has concerns about the growing deferred maintenance backlogs at institutions. This criterion incentivizes submission of projects addressing those backlogs.
Other Fund Sources	Reduced the total point value of the criterion from 15 points to 8 points.	At 15 points, this criterion was the second most heavily weighted in the old criteria. The lower weighting puts cash contribution more on par with other factors such as safety and space needs.
	Made AHEC, CCCS-Lowry, and all rural CCCS campuses exempt.	AHEC and rural community colleges do not have much, if any, ability to raise funds for capital projects.
	Lowered cash match thresholds across the board.	The goal of this criterion has shifted. Instead of being a big differentiator, the purpose is now to incentivize cash matches at a level that is reasonable to a given institution. This should lead to more equitable prioritization.
	Regrouped institutions.	Previously, there were three different rubrics for cash contributions, research institutions, four year institutions, and the community college system plus AHEC. Ability to contribute cash varies within those groups. The new groupings are based off of the financial health of the institutions.
	Clarified policy for changing pledged cash contributions. An institution can only receive additional points for increased cash contribution during the appeals period if it was an unanticipated gift/donation.	Mostly a clarification, but also allows an institution to increase their cash contribution during the appeals period if a gift is received. Explicitly excluding other increases in cash contribution after initial scores are published reduces gamesmanship.
	Created a policy for awarding credit for a very narrow set of prior cash contributions at 75%. This includes recent land purchases and program planning.	Recognizes that in some circumstances, a specific type of cash contribution must occur prior to a state appropriation for a project.
Space Needs Analysis	Modified language to decrease subjectivity in scoring.	Promotes consistent and objective scoring. Also, easier for institutions to justify scores.
Clear Identification of Beneficiaries (eliminated)	This criterion was eliminated.	Institutions agreed that this criterion was highly subjective, and there was no way to make it objective. Scores came down to an institution's ability to craft arguments.
Achieves Goals (renamed Achieves Master Plan Goals)	Previously, this criterion required institutions to justify how the project aligned with master plan goals, institutional planning, and ambiguous "state goals." The new criteria is simplified to only alignment with master plan goals.	This is a low point value criterion that was never meant to be a differentiator, but rather to encourage institutions to think through their request's alignment with various goals. The new criterion is simpler and emphasizes the master plan.
Governing Board Priority	Previous criterion specified point values for first, second, third, etc. governing board priorities. There were different rubrics for different institution types (CU and CSU system, other four-years, and CCCS) in recognition of governing boards having varying numbers of campuses. The new criterion allocates a certain number of points (varies based on number of campuses) to a governing board, which they may distribute as they see fit.	Allows governing boards more discretion in prioritization.
	Clarifies circumstances under which governing board priority can be changed.	Prevents gamesmanship, while being somewhat flexible when extenuating circumstances arise. Prevents future confusion.