

CAPITAL IT PRIORITY RANKING FY2022-23

Ranking	Institution Name	Project Name	Score	CCF	CF
1	Colorado State University Fort Collins	Network Hardware Upgrade for CSU	N/A	\$ 646,119	\$ 491,001
2	Adams State University, Fort Lewis College, Western Colorado University	Digital Transformation Initiative for Rural Higher Education: A Collaboration of Adams State University, Fort Lewis College, and Western Colorado University	N/A	\$ 15,563,988	\$ 157,212
3	Metropolitan State University	Reimagining the Campus Digital Experience	N/A	\$ 3,350,000	\$ 335,000
4	Metropolitan State University	Network Infrastructure Modernization	N/A	\$ 795,000	\$ 250,000
5	Community College of Denver	Classroom and Conference Room Technology	N/A	\$ 1,532,140	\$ 97,796
6	Colorado School of Mines	Re-envisioning Mines ERP and SIS	N/A	\$ 2,304,000	\$ 239,000
New Projects					
7	Colorado Mesa University	ERP Modernization	96.23%	\$ 4,133,602	\$ 464,398
8	University of Northern Colorado	ERP Modernization and Cloud Migration	88.68%	\$ 4,325,584	\$ 184,931
9	Colorado Northwestern Community College, Lamar Community College, Morgan State Community College, Northeastern Junior College, Otero College, Trinidad State College	Rural College Consortium	84.44%	\$ 8,627,000	\$ -
10	Community College of Aurora	Improving Student Access to Technology	69.81%	\$ 476,923	\$ 52,992
11	Colorado State University Pueblo	Communications System Upgrade	54.72%	\$ 2,754,622	\$ -
GRAND TOTAL				\$ 44,508,978	\$ 2,272,330

Appendix D: CCHE Capital IT Scoring Criteria

#1 IT Health, Security and Industry Standards

ALL INSTITUTIONS	
IT Health, Security and Industry Standards	Points
IT systems associated with proposed project are fully supported by developer ¹	/2
Cybersecurity of IT systems/devices associated with project is up to industry standards (e.g. two-factor authentication, does not compromise FERPA compliance, etc.)	/2
Articulates how project fits in with current disaster recovery system	/2
Project mitigates urgent/serious IT risk (e.g. imminent risk of system failure or serious security IT risk (e.g. imminent risk of system failure or serious security vulnerability)	/2
Project has life safety function ²	/2
TOTAL	/10

Clarifications:

¹ “Fully supported” means that the developer of the software actively provides updates, addresses security concerns, and provides full IT support for the version of the software utilized. For hardware, full support and replacement parts must be available from manufacturer.

² Examples of a life safety function would be security cameras, emergency alert systems, etc.

#2 Other Fund Sources^{1,3,4,5}

GROUP 1: ASU, CSU-P, FLC, UNC, WCU	
Cash Contribution of Total Funds Requested	Points
1-2%	2
2-3%	4
3-4%	6
Over 4%	8
GROUP 2: CCCS Urban/Suburban Campuses²	
1-3%	2
3-6%	4
6-8%	6
Over 8%	8
GROUP 3: CMU, MSU	
1-4%	2
4-7%	4
8-10%	6
Over 10%	8
GROUP 4: CSM, CSU-FC, CU	
1-8%	2
8-16%	4
17-25%	6
Over 25%	8
Other Fund Sources Total	/8

¹AHEC, CCCS-Lowry, and CCCS Rural Campuses (CNCC, LCC, MCC, NJC, OJC, PCC, and TSJC) are exempt.

²CCCS Urban/Suburban Campuses are ACC, CCA, CCD, FRCC, PPCC, and RRCC.

³Pledged cash contributions may not be changed after initial submission for scoring purposes, unless there is documented proof of a late gift or award that was not final at the time of initial submittal, but became available prior to the final CCHE Fiscal Affairs and Audit Committee (FAA) prioritization vote. Supporting materials must be submitted to the CDHE and FAA at least one day prior to the August FAA meeting. If non-gift additional funds become available, an increase in cash spending authority may be requested without scoring impact.

#3 Quality of Planning/Proposal

ALL INSTITUTIONS	
Quality of Planning/Proposal	Points
Cost-benefit analysis performed with positive outcome	/2
Proposal articulates how the project fits in the with institution's strategic IT plan	/2
Alternatives analyzed	/2
Proper measures in place to prevent time and cost overruns	/2
Proposed project is cohesive and is not a combination of smaller, unrelated projects	/2
TOTAL	/10

#4 Achieves Master Plan Goals

ALL INSTITUTIONS	
Achieves Goals	Points
Articulates request's alignment with one or more of the strategic goals in the Colorado Higher Education Master Plan, <i>Colorado Rises</i> . ¹	5
TOTAL	/5

¹<http://masterplan.highered.colorado.gov/read-colorado-rises/>

#5 Governing Board Priority¹

INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTIONS NOT IN A SYSTEM & AHEC	
Cash Contribution of Total Funds Requested	Points
37 points to distribute across all projects, with a maximum of 20 points per project.	0-20
COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM	
52 points to distribute across all projects, with a maximum of 20 points per project.	0-20
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO SYSTEM	
64 points to distribute across all projects, with a maximum of 20 points per project.	0-20
COLORADO COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM	
96 points to distribute across all projects, with a maximum of 20 points per project.	0-20
Other Fund Sources Total	/20

Bonus Points:

Project involves multiple institutions, all of which award the project a full 20 points. ²	+2
TOTAL	/0

¹Governing board priority order may not be changed after initial submission, except for when a project is withdrawn from consideration. If a governing board withdraws a project from consideration, any projects prioritized below the withdrawn project will move up one rank in priority level and be rescored accordingly. In order to have projects rescored, the CDHE and CCHE Fiscal Affairs and Audit Committee (FAA) must be informed of the withdrawal at least one day prior to the August FAA meeting.

²Multiple institution bonus points apply only to collaboration across separate, distinct institutions. This includes multiple community colleges within CCCS and AHEC.