

**Capital Project Scores for Year 2 of Approved
Comprehensive Permanent Improvement Plan**

Background

The Comprehensive Permanent Improvement Plan (CPIP) Process is a comprehensive five-year planning process with Year One becoming a statement of the annual plan, Year Two becoming the requests for capital improvement bond (CIB) funds, and years three, four, and five becoming broad estimates of future needs and plans. The CPIP is updated each year during the spring and submitted for approval.

Year Two of the 2003 CPIP included requests for CIB funds for 2004-2005 and was adopted by CHE in June, and will be adopted by the Joint Bond Review Committee (JBRC), the Budget and Control Board and submitted to the Legislature. The projects are submitted to the Legislature by CHE in institutional priority order, along with the project scores. Once CPIP has been approved by the JBRC and the Budget and Control Board and submitted to the Legislature, no additional projects may be added to the current Year Two Requests. Any additional projects for which an institution wishes to request CIB funding must be included in the next year's CPIP.

Institutional Project Scores were calculated using the Commission's approved criteria for scoring institutional capital requests. There are five criteria totaling 100 points with a possibility of an extra 10 points for projects addressing health and safety concerns. The criteria are as follows:

- | | |
|---|-----------------|
| 1. Type of space represented by the project: | Up to 30 Points |
| a. Instruction, Library, Research, Infrastructure | 30 |
| b. Academic Support | 20 |
| c. Student Services | 15 |
| d. Institutional Support | 10 |
| e. Non-Educational and General (E&G) | 00 |
| 2. The Degree to which the proposed project address the deferred maintenance needs as defined and included in the CHE's most recent study of deferred maintenance. | Up to 25 Points |
| 3. Documentation that the institution meets | Up to 25 Points |
| a. An efficiency rating based on space utilization for instructional purposes (12.5 points); and | |
| b. Guidelines for assignable square feet (ASF) of academic space per Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) student or | |
| c. ASF of research space for \$ of research expenditures. | |
| 4. Documentation that all reasonable 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. | Up to 10 Points |
| 5. Documentation that the space programmed for the proposed project is based on the application of objective space planning guidelines. | Up to 10 Points |

Extra Points:

Up to 10 Points

Documentation that the project addresses health and safety issues.

A complete description of the Rating Criteria, Application of the Criteria, and the Rating Process is included as Attachment 1.

Per Commission action, these criteria give greater weight to instructional projects and those that address deferred maintenance items (up to 30 points and up to 25 points respectively). Utilization and Growth are addressed through Criterion 3.

There are two circumstances where the application of Criterion 3 (Utilization and Growth) may be waived. These are:

1. Required projects (facilities that may not be demolished for historical reasons) where an institution scored less than 25 total points on Criterion 3 and the facility is unsafe for occupancy, application of Criterion 3 is waived and the full 25 points applied. The Lowman Hall project at S.C. State was the only project meeting these conditions for the current year's requests.
2. Library Projects responding to recommendations from an accrediting body and where the institution scored fewer than the maximum 25 points on the criterion, the application of Criterion 3 is waived and the full 25 points applied. The Library projects at The Citadel, SC State, USC-Lancaster, and Spartanburg TC were the projects meeting these conditions for the current year's requests.

Project Scores

A summary listing of each institution's request in institutional priority order, along with the scores, is included as Attachment 2.

Recommendation

The Committee on Finance and Facilities recommends approval of the scores for the year two CPIP requests for CIB funding.