

**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 2004 CPIP included requests for CIB funds for 2005-2006 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. There were no projects meeting these conditions in the 2005-2006 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 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 staff recommends approval of the scores for the year two CPIP requests for CIB funding.

Rating Criteria and Application of Criteria

**Maximum
Points**

1. Type of space represented by the project:

up to 30

	<u>Points by Type of Space</u>
a. Instruction, Library Research, Infrastructure	30
b. Academic Support	20
c. Student Services	15
d. Institutional Support	10
e. Non-E&G	00

Application:

- Points are assigned based on the percentage of proposed use

2. The degree to which the proposed project addresses the deferred maintenance needs as defined and included in the CHE's most recent Study of Deferred Maintenance.

up to 25

Application:

- Points are assigned based on the respective facilities scores in the study.

<u>Facility Score</u>	<u>Points Assigned</u>
90-100	10
80-89	15
70-79	20
Less than 70	25
Infrastructure Project	25
Not addressed in the study	0

3. Documentation that the institution meets:

up to 25

- A. efficiency rating based on space utilization for instructional purposes; and
- B. Guidelines for Assignable Square Feet (ASF) of academic space per FTE or
- C. ASF of research space per \$ of research expenditures.

Note: Application of Criterion 3 may be waived and the full 25 points awarded for Libraries if the institution has received a negative accreditation recommendation and scores less than 25 points; or if the project is a required historical project and the institution scores less than 25 points.

Application:

- Efficiency rating¹ : a space utilization factor at or below

¹ Does not apply to MUSC or the USC School of Medicine, up to 25 points are allocated by ASF/Research Expenditures only.

the space factor guideline of 1.22 will generate 12.5 points. For space utilization factors above the 1.22, points will be deducted from the 12.5 maximum for part A on a percentage basis.

- Growth Rating: Research Institutions – at or below 9,000 ASF per \$1,000,000 of restricted research expenditures = 12.5 points; for Teaching Institutions – at or below 93 ASF of Academic Space per FTE = 12.5 points; and for two-year institutions – at or below 70 ASF per FTE = 12.5 points. For institutions above the guidelines, points will be deducted from the 12.5 maximum on a percentage basis.

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

Application:

- Institutional/external documentation, and project has score of 80 or less in in deferred maintenance study – 10 points
- Project is infrastructure or mechanical repair/replacement (etc) – 10 points
- Internal/external documentation, and project has score greater than 80 in deferred maintenance study, was not addressed in study, or significant deterioration since study – 7 points

5. Documentation that the space programmed for the proposed project is based on the application of objective space planning guidelines (i.e., Space Planning Guidelines for Public Colleges and Universities, CHE, revised 1997. up to 10

Application:

- Institutional/external documentation provided - 10 points
- Infrastructure/Repair/Replacement (mechanical) - 10 points
- Not addressed – 0 points

Total up to 100

Extra Points: Health and Safety Issues up to 10

Application:

- Documentation through external reports (CHE consultants, institutional consultants, specialized accreditation 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 – 10 points
- Documentation by the institution without external documentation (66 percent of available points, rounded up) – 7 points
- Not applicable or not addressed – 0 points

Grand Total up to 110

Examples of Health and Safety Concerns:

Documented Health Concerns

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

Documented Safety Concerns

Threat of physical danger associated with condition of the facility; life/safety issues (egress, fire-code compliance, etc.)

RATING PROCESS

- Institutions may determine the priority of their respective projects through the CPIP submission process.
- Institutions will provide the appropriate documentation required by the rating criteria for all of the projects they choose to have included in the process. If appropriate documentation for one or more of the criteria has already been included in the original submission, the institution will not have to resubmit the documentation. However, institutions should submit any additional documentation that they believe would assist the staff in determining that a criterion has been met.
- Library Exemption: application of Criterion 3 may be waived for library projects responding to recommendations from an accrediting body and where the institution scored fewer than 25 points. For these projects, the full 25 points will apply.
- Required Historical Facility Exemption: application of Criterion 3 may be waived for projects which are uninhabitable and unsafe for use which the institution is required to maintain because of historical status.
- Because legislative requests have specifically stated that safety concerns should be a primary criterion, up to an additional 10 points may be assigned to projects that address specific documented health and/or safety needs.
- CHE staff will determine if the projects have met the basic criteria for rating, and the degree to which the criteria have been met.
- Scores will be assigned up to the maximum number of points for each criterion.
- Scores for all criteria will be totaled for a single comprehensive score for each project.