

Minutes of Meeting
Facilities Advisory Committee
March 22, 2005
10:30 a.m.

Present

Tony Ateca, USC-Aiken
Walter Hardin, Winthrop
Charlie Jeffcoat, USC-Columbia
Rich Puncke, USC-Upstate
Dennis Rogers, Aiken TC
Tom Suttles, Lander
John Sutusky, MUSC
Andre Tanner, SCSU
Don Tomasik, The Citadel
Bob Wells, Clemson
Richard Williams, SBTCE
Dale Wilson, Piedmont TC

Guests

Donna Collins, USC-Columbia
Craig Hess, Midlands TC
Jennifer Pearce, MUSC
Charles Shawver, B&CB

Staff

Alyson Goff
Lynn Metcalf
Janet Stewart

For the record, notification of the meeting was made to the public as required by the Freedom of Information Act.

The meeting of the Advisory Committee on Facilities was called to order by Ms. Metcalf on April 26, 2005 at 10:30 a.m. in the CHE conference room. She welcomed everyone to the meeting.

1. Minutes of Meeting, March 22, 2005

The minutes of the Facilities Advisory Committee meeting on March 22, 2005 were approved as read.

2. Discussion of Capital Funding Goals for Public Higher Education Institutions

Dr. Sutusky reported on the recommendation of the subcommittee on developing priority criteria for capital projects. Members of the subcommittee were John Sutusky, chair; Walter Hardin, Dennis Rogers, Sally Horner [via e-mail and telephone], and Lynn Metcalf).

For the purpose of discussion, it was moved (Sutusky) and seconded (Rogers) to approve the capital funding goals, related standards and rating criteria developed by the sub-Committee. Members of the subcommittee stated that the goal of the subcommittee in developing its recommendation was to make the process fair and relevant to all institutions. Efforts were made to correct some problems in the criteria that had been used in the past. Projects would be rated on the total combined number of points generated, up to a maximum of 200 points overall. Mr. Hardin stated that he did not think many would receive 200 points.

After extensive discussion and some changes in the wording, it was voted to approve the process and criteria presented by the subcommittee. Mr. Ateca is recorded as voting in the negative. The approved goals and criteria are attached.

The next full Committee meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, **June 14**, at 10:30 a.m. in the Commission's main conference room.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:10 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Janet K. Stewart
Recorder

Attachment (1)

**SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION
CAPITAL FUNDING GOALS
FOR
PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS**

The following goals have been formulated to guide the Commission on Higher Education in making capital funding recommendations to the Governor and the General Assembly.

STATEWIDE GOALS

- To ensure campus health and safety by supporting projects designed to remedy existing issues that adversely affect human well being
- To address critical deferred maintenance needs of the institutions, thereby protecting the State's capital investment in higher education
- To alleviate problems resulting from critical enrollment and/or programmatic growth, including needs for state-of-the-art academic space.
- To support needs that are significant to continuing economic development in the state or service area

Points will be assigned on related standards and rating criteria. A maximum of 100 points may be generated through related standards and a maximum of 100 points may be generated through the rating criteria. Projects will be rated according to the total combined number of points generated, up to a maximum of 200 points overall.

Related Standards applicable to all projects:

Each proposed project will be reviewed and rated for consistency and compatibility with the following related standards.

1. The degree to which the proposed project is critical and central to the institution's approved mission – **up to 24 points.**
2. The degree to which the proposed project's ultimate outputs (e.g., degrees awarded by discipline, number of graduates, type and volume of research, etc.) are adding critical capacity and functionality to address defined state needs – **up to 24 points.**
3. The degree to which the need for the quantity and type of space can be defended through the application of objective space analysis, including space guidelines and appropriateness of offerings – **up to 20 points.**
4. The degree of non-capital improvement bond funding included in the project and/or documentable savings and/or operational cost increase avoidance – **up to 12 points.**
5. The proposed project is consistent with the institution's Facilities Master Plan – **up to 10 points.**
6. Documentation that all alternatives have been explored and that the proposed remedy is the best option available – **up to 10 points.**

Maximum points available through related standards – 100

Rating Criteria:

Health and Safety – Up to 25 points

1. The degree to which an existing condition can be documented to be unsafe and unhealthy for human well being.
2. The appropriateness of the proposed solution to the defined health or safety issue.
3. The degree that the institution's and the State's well being would be adversely impacted through discontinuance of activities if the defined health and safety issues are not addressed.

Deferred Maintenance – up to 25 points

1. The degree to which the proposed project addresses deferred maintenance needs as reported in the institution's CHEMIS submission using a rolling average over the most recent three-year period.
2. The degree to which the institution's expenditures for building maintenance compare with the amount generated for building maintenance in the MRR (according to the percent funded) using a rolling average for the most recent three-year period.

Enrollment and Programmatic Growth – up to 25 points

1. The degree to which a space shortage can be objectively supported through space analysis both on an institutional macro level as well as the micro level of a particular program(s).
2. The degree to which the need for the outputs of the additional proposed space cannot be met through alternative delivery systems (e.g., distance learning technologies, etc.).

Economic Development – up to 25 points

1. The degree to which the proposed project can be shown to be consistent with the State's and/or service area's priorities for continuing economic development as defined by appropriate economic development entities (e.g., the State, Local, or Regional Departments of Commerce).
2. The degree to which the proposed project is a critical component of an articulated State, regional, or community comprehensive economic development plan.
3. The proportion of other overall economic development project funding commitments made by external parties to the institution that are critical to the overall success of the proposed economic development initiative.

Maximum points available through rating criteria – 100

Other considerations: Essential Sequencing of Multiple Projects

Projects that require a phasing sequence with other projects in the ranking list will be listed in the order required. An example of a phasing requirement would be a utility plant expansion request that would need to be completed before a new building request could come on line due to insufficient existing utilities capacities. If the rankings established by the process outlined in this document do not place projects in the appropriate phasing sequence, then the project rankings will be revised accordingly. This would be accomplished by ranking all other projects involved in the phasing sequence behind the initial phase project. If the second phase project has a higher percentage point total, then it will be moved to immediately after the first phase project. The rationale would continue for the third and subsequent phase projects as necessary. *(This may be used for projects that have received partial funding and for which the institution can document a continuing critical need and/or to differentiate between projects that have the same scores.)*