

May 11, 2016

MEMORANDUM

TO: State Board of Regents

FROM: David L. Buhler

SUBJECT: USHE – Capital Development Prioritization (CDP) Cycle – Adoption of Priority Guidelines

Issue

As part of the annual Capital Development Prioritization (CDP) process, regent policy R741, *Capital Development Prioritization* requires the Regents to establish and adopt priority guidelines which help to outline the most pressing and critical needs related to facility requests.

Background

The Regents Capital Facilities Subcommittee met in early April to review the outcomes and lessons learned from last year's CDP process and to review and establish recommended priority guidelines for this year. The Subcommittee recommends adopting the same priority guidelines as last year, due to the tremendous support that USHE institutions received from the Legislature which funded four of the seven prioritized capital development projects advanced last session. The recommended priority guidelines for 2017-18 follow in the attachment.

The Regents' CDP process consists of two parts: a quantitative analysis and a qualitative review by Regents regarding how well a project addresses the priority guidelines and the Regents' priorities beyond what is captured in the quantitative analysis.

The CDP quantitative analysis evaluates how well an institution's proposed project addresses the following categories:

- Space needs analysis
- Non-appropriated funding
- Institutional priorities
- Facility condition
- Major infrastructure needs

Priority guidelines highlight the Regents' most pressing and critical needs related to capital development and provide guidance to institutions prior to the beginning of the annual CDP process. As part of the qualitative review, Regents award points to proposed projects on how well the projects meet the predetermined Regents' priority guidelines.

Commissioner's Recommendation

The Commissioner recommends approval of the proposed guidelines for use by the Regents and institutions during the upcoming CDP cycle.

David L. Buhler
Commissioner of Higher Education

DLB/KLH/RPA
Attachment

Capital Development Priority Guidelines for FY 2018

Step 4 – Prioritization of Projects for Funding Consideration - the Regents have a category of Regents Priority Points that they may use on a discretionary basis to address what are determined to be the most pressing and critical USHE needs. The proposed guidelines for prioritization of projects for FY 2018 funding consideration are as follows:

Guideline Based Points **0-10 Points**

Critical Programmatic and Infrastructure Needs		10 Points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Imminent threats to daily operations and program delivery • Extraordinary economic development/competitive opportunities • Enhancement of critical programs (science, engineering, technology, etc.) • Facilities needs to achieve strategic plan 2025 goals 		
High Priority Issues		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic planning & emerging time-sensitive opportunities Branch and satellite campus development Significant changes in role and mission Mergers and partnerships • Operational and programmatic efficiency Sustainability (energy conservation and efficiency) Operational efficiency (optimization of O&M costs) Innovative and cost effective delivery of academic programs Improved space utilization Eliminate functional obsolescence of equipment and space 	}	5-8 Points
Fulfills a Non-Critical Need		3 Points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Core programmatic enhancement Strengthen program deficiencies 		
Project Does Not Qualify for Regents' Priority Points		0 Points

Discretionary Points **0-15 Points**

These points are designed to position institutions to further develop and enhance their assigned missions and roles (see R741.3.4.1). It also is the intent of the Regents to give appropriate consideration to projects that respond straightforwardly in helping to achieve the goals and recommendations of the *HigherEdUtah 2020 Plan*. Consideration will also be given, where deemed to be appropriate, to projects with prior approved Legislative planning funding.

Total Regents Priority Points **25 Points**