

## RECOMMENDED CRITERION FOR MISSION-RELATED GROWTH

At its meeting on Thursday, October 11, the Commission on Higher Education adopted a recommendation that a criterion addressing growth and utilization be included in the approved criteria for evaluating and scoring capital requests. The Commission also adopted a recommendation that all projects included in the complete list of Exceptional Capital Project Requests (ECP) requests be scored according to the new criteria. CHE staff agreed to meet with members of the Funding Advisory Committee and the Facilities Advisory Committee to provide input to the development of the new criterion and its application.

The Facilities Advisory Committee and the Funding Advisory Committee held a joint meeting on Wednesday, October 17, 2001, to assist CHE staff in the development and application of the new criterion.

Because there are still some problems with the data used for data reporting and because SC has not yet adopted standards for utilization, the Committees and the staff believe, for the current year's requests, only mission-related growth for academic capital improvement projects should be addressed in the new criterion. The staff and the Facilities Advisory Committee will continue to refine the facilities utilization data, and review space-planning guidelines over the next year for consideration in the 2002 ECP process.

Criterion #3 on the current list of approved criteria, states, "Documentation that the project corresponds to the institution's mission and enhances institutional effectiveness and efficiencies with respect for programs." A score of up to 25 points is assignable to this criterion. In the past, no institution has submitted a project that did not correspond to its mission, and all projects received an automatic score of 25 points on this criterion. The Committees suggested that since the criterion being proposed is directly related to mission, e.g. mission-related growth, it should replace Criterion #3. This would also keep the maximum number of possible points at 110 (including the 10 additional points for health and safety), rather than increasing the maximum to 135.

The five-year plans for enrollment projections for Performance Funding and the MRR were adopted in 1996. There were no caps placed on graduate enrollment or enrollment at the two-year institutions. It was suggested that for the research institutions, weight be given to research and enrollment growth. However, research is not a significant part of the mission of the teaching universities and is not included in the mission of two-year institutions, so all of the weight for the score would be given to enrollment growth for these sectors.

**Staff recommends, therefore, for one year only, the following mission-related growth criterion replace criterion #3 for evaluating Exceptional Capital Projects:**

### **Criterion 3:**

**Documentation that the project is an academic capital improvement project<sup>1</sup> that addresses mission-related growth – Up to 25 points. Points will be assigned according to growth in two areas – FTE enrollment growth (10) points) and research expenditures (15 points), and will**

---

<sup>1</sup> Academic Capital Improvement Projects are those relating to the functions of Instruction, Research, and Academic Support.

differ by institution type. For the teaching universities and the two-year colleges, the 25 points will be based on enrollment growth; For the research universities, the 25 points will be allocated between FTE growth (10 points) and research expenditures (15 points). The 25 points will be allocated based on the five-year percentage increase in FTE enrollment and/or research expenditures from fall 1996 to fall 2001.

**Application of Criterion:**

For appropriate projects at research institutions, points would be assigned based on the growth in restricted research dollars (as reported for the MRR). Institutions at or above the average percentage increase for the sector would receive a prorated number of points based on their percentage as compared with the average. A decrease would receive a score of zero.

For appropriate projects at the teaching institutions and the two-year institutions, points would be assigned based on FTE enrollment growth, Fall 2001 over Fall 1996. Institutions at or above the percentage increase for the sector would receive a prorated number of points based on their percentage as compared with the average. A decrease would receive a score of zero.

Staff further recommends that the Advisory Committee on Facilities continue to work on space planning guidelines and utilization standards over the next year for consideration in the 2002 ECP process.

A copy of the list of criteria and their application is included on Attachment 1. Recommended deletions are shown with a ~~strike-through~~ and recommended additions are in *italics*.

**APPLICATION OF RATING CRITERIA**

1) Project represents the following type of space:

	<u>Points</u>
• <u>Instruction, Library, Research, Infrastructure</u>	<u>30</u>
• <u>Academic Support</u>	<u>20</u>
• <u>Student Services</u>	<u>15</u>
• <u>Institutional Support</u>	<u>10</u>
• <u>Non-Educational &amp; General (E&amp;G)</u>	<u>0</u>

A) Points were assigned based on percentage of proposed use

B) If the project involves several buildings, or a multi-use E&G facility (including instruction), and the percentage of use by category is unknown, 20 points were assigned.

2) Degree to which proposed project up to 25  
addresses deferred maintenance needs  
as defined and included in the joint CHE  
and B& CB 1994 Study of Deferred  
Maintenance, or other objective  
documentation provided by the institution.

Staff used the 1994 study as a baseline for applying this criterion because it was the only consistent, objective, documentation available for all institutions. The Rating Committee will determine how the additional documentation provided by an institution will apply.

A) Points were assigned based on the scores in the 1994 Study:

<u>1994 Score</u>	<u>Points Assigned</u>
90-100	10
80-89	15
70-79	20
Less than 70	25
Multiple Buildings/Multiple Scores	20
Infrastructure (not separately addressed in 1994)	25
Project not addressed in 1994	0

3) Documentation that project corresponds Up to 25  
to the institution's mission and enhances  
institutional effectiveness and efficiencies  
with respect to programs.

All projects submitted were found to correspond to the institution's mission, and to enhance  
institutional effectiveness and efficiencies with respect to programs.

3) Documentation that project is an academic<sup>1</sup> Up to 25  
capital improvement project that addresses mission-related growth.  
Points will be assigned according to growth in two areas – FTE enrollment and  
Research Expenditures and will differ by type of institution -  
For teaching and two-year institutions – enrollment growth (up to 25); and,  
For research institutions – enrollment growth (up to 10) and research expenditures (up to 15).  
Points will be based on the five-year percentage increase in FTE enrollment and/or restricted  
research expenditures from fall 1996 to fall 2001.

For appropriate projects at research institutions, points would be assigned based on the growth in  
restricted research dollars (as reported for the MRR). Institutions at or above the average percentage  
increase for the sector would receive a prorated number of points based on their percentage as  
compared with the average. A decrease would receive a score of zero.

For appropriate projects at the teaching institutions and the two-year institutions, points would be  
assigned based on FTE enrollment growth, fall 2001 over fall 1996. Institutions at or above the  
percentage increase for the sector would receive a prorated number of points based on their  
percentage as compared with the average. A decrease would receive a score of zero.

4) Documentation that all reasonable up to 10  
alternatives to the project have been  
considered, that the project represents  
the best long-term resolution of the  
problem, and that the total estimated cost,  
including each component, can be  
documented as realistic.

A) Institutional/External documentation, 10  
and project has score of 80 or less in  
the 1994 study.

B) Project is infrastructure or mechanical 10  
repair/roof replacement (etc.)

C) Internal/External documentation, and 7  
project has score greater than 80,<sup>2</sup> or was  
not addressed in 1994 Study. (Assign  
66% of available points, rounded up)

<sup>1</sup> Academic facilities are defined as those projects with functions of Instruction, Research, and Academic Support.

<sup>2</sup> If a facility was considered to be suitable for renovations of 20% or less of its replacement cost in the 1994 Study, and the  
current proposal recommends demolition or a significant alteration of the facility, a score of 7 is assigned.

6) Documentation that space programmed for the proposed project is based on the application of objective space planning guidelines. up to 10

Institutional/External documentation provided  
Infrastructure/Repair/Replacement (mechanical, roofs, etc.) 10

Not addressed 0

---

**Sub-Total Points** **Up to 100**

---

7) EXTRA POINTS: up to 10

Documentation through external reports (CHE consultants, Institutional Consultants, specialized accrediting reports, CHE staff evaluation, etc.) that existing space is unsatisfactory and/or unsuitable in terms of quality or quantity because of health and/or safety concerns.

A) documented through external reports 10

B) documented by institution without external documentation (66% of available points, rounded up) 7

C) Not Applicable or Not Addressed 0

---

**Total Possible Points** **Up to 110**

---

Examples of Health and Safety Concerns:

Documented  
Health Concerns

Exposure to asbestos or;  
other harmful substances;  
documented problems assoc.  
with air quality; etc.

Documented  
Safety Concerns

Threat of physical  
danger assoc. with  
condition of facility;  
Life/Safety issues  
(egress, fire code compliance), etc.