



Guidelines for Raters of the FY2013 CIP Applications

Introduction

The Department of Education & Early Development is charged with the task of compiling a prioritized list of projects to be used in preparing a six-year capital plan for submittal to the governor and the legislature (AS 14.11.013 (a)(3)). The criteria for accomplishing the priorities are established in statute (AS 14.11.013 (B)) and are awarded points based on a scoring system developed by the Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee under their statutorily imposed mandate (AS 14.11.014 (b)(6)).

The guidelines provided here are to assure that raters are using a common set of terms and standards when awarding points for the subjective scoring criteria.

Base Philosophy

The following positions will define the base philosophy for rating applications.

Since districts are required to submit a request for a capital project no later than September 1 of the year preceding the fiscal year for which they are applying, no rater shall review, rank or give feedback regarding scoring a project prior to this deadline.

Applications will be ranked based on the information submitted with the application, or applicants may use information submitted to the department in support of a project, provided the submission occurs on or before September 1. Each rater shall arrive at the initial ranking of each project independently. Raters will be expected to go through each application question by question. They will also review all attachments for content, completeness and bearing on each scoring element. Consistency in scores from year-to-year shall be considered. It is expected that projects will demonstrate different levels of completeness in descriptions and detail depending on the stage of project development.

Projects are prioritized in two lists: the School Construction List and the Major Maintenance List and reflect the two statutory funds established for education capital projects. Under the definitions provided in statute and regulation, projects which add space to a facility are classed as School Construction projects and must fall in categories A, B, F, or G. Major maintenance projects (categories C, D, and E) may not include additional space for unhoused students. Only projects in which the primary purpose is Protection of Structure, Code Compliance, or Achieve an Operating Cost Savings, where the work includes renewal, replacement, or consolidation of existing building systems or components should be considered as maintenance projects.

Each rater should have an eligibility checklist available during rating. Eligibility items A, F, G, I, J and L will be evaluated by each rater. Other eligibility items will be the responsibility of support team members doing data input and capacity/allowable calculations. Discussion regarding project eligibility should be brought to the attention of the rating team as soon as it becomes an issue in one rater's mind.



Subjective Rating Guidelines

For each of the subjective rating categories, raters will consider the factors listed when evaluating and scoring applications. The list is not exclusive, nor exhaustive. As raters read and evaluate projects, review of the listed elements is to be done for referential purposes. Raters should also refer to the Application Instructions for each question.

Effectiveness of Maintenance & Facilities Management Program (Application Question 30; Points possible: 25)

<p>Maintenance Management Narrative (Points possible: 5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the described program address preventive maintenance as well as routine? • How well does the program work for each individual school? • Does the program address all building components? Mechanical, electrical, structural, architectural, exterior/civil? • Is there evidence supplied which demonstrates that the program is effective? • Who participates in the program and how does it function?
<p>Energy Management Narrative (Points possible: 5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the district engaged in reducing energy consumption in its facilities? • Is a comprehensive set of methods being used? • Is the program districtwide in scope? • Is the program achieving results? • Is there a method for reviewing and monitoring energy usage?
<p>Custodial Narrative (points possible: 5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the district's custodial program complete? • Is custodial program based on quantities from building inventories and frequency of care based on industry practice? • Has the district customized its program to be specific to each facility? • Is the program districtwide in scope? • Is the program achieving results?
<p>Maintenance Training Narrative (Points possible: 5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the program address training and on-going education of the maintenance staff? • Are maintenance personnel being trained in specific building systems? • Are training schedules attached? • How is Training Recorded? • How is effectiveness measured?
<p>Capital Planning Narrative (Points possible: 5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the district have a process for identifying capital renewal needs? • Are component/subsystem replacement cycles identified and used? • Does the system involve building occupants and users? • Are renewal schedules comprehensive and vetted for credibility? • Are systems up for renewal grouped into logical capital projects?



Emergency (Application question 14; Points possible: 50)

- If the district doesn't declare the project an emergency: NO points!
- Consider the 'level of threat' to both people and property in assessing the emergency.
- Consider how well points noted in instructions are addressed.
- Consider the 'immediacy' of the emergency (how time critical is it?).
- Consider the "nature" of the emergency.
- Consider information provided in all portions of the application in assessing the emergency.
- Scoring should be weighted in the case of mixed-scope projects (i.e., does the project address emergency and non-emergency conditions?)

Seriousness of Life Safety and Code Conditions (Application Questions 14 and 17; Points possible: 50)

- Consider the documentation provided: how specific?, source/author?, reasonable categories?
- Consider information provided on type and nature of code violations. How specific?
- Mandatory or optional? Especially consider this in light of code condition comparisons between standards for new buildings and the requirements for older buildings.
- Does the project provide relief from life safety & code conditions for facilities affected by the project?
- Seriousness of emergency conditions?
- Seriousness of code conditions?
- Scoring should be weighted in the case of mixed scope projects.
- Life safety description should provide relationship to definitions provided in Appendix B.

Existing Space (Application Question 26; Points possible: 40)

- This score should be adjusted for mixed scope projects (i.e., does the project only involve improvements to inadequate space or does it also incorporate work in adequate spaces?)
- Rating should consider the adequacy of the space in terms of both form and function.
- There should be a balance between consideration of educational adequacy of physical arrangement versus functional factors.
- Points are awarded based on the inability of existing space to adequately serve the educational program. No points for code violations!
- Mandated programs can receive 40 points maximum, existing local programs can receive 20 points maximum, and new local programs can receive 15 points maximum (should be spelled out in the application).



Cost or Cost Estimate (Application Questions 18; Points possible: 30)

- Check to assure that the estimate matches the proposed project scope.
- Check for double entries, especially for factored items.
- Primary evaluation should test both the “reasonableness” and the “completeness” of the cost estimate (i.e., How well can this estimate be used to advocate for this project?)
- Rating considers the full range of estimates: from conceptual to detail design to actual construction costs. It should be noted that because this scoring element covers the full range of estimate possibilities, it is anticipated that conceptual estimates score less than more detailed construction estimates and actual construction cost documentation.
- Review and evaluate backup for cost estimate or actual construction costs.
- Check percentages and justification (**with backup**) when percentages exceed EED guidelines.
- Check cost after adjustment for geographic factor.
- Review cost benefit analysis and life cycle cost analysis. Note if these are not present. Note specific deficiencies.

Relationship of the Project Cost to the Annual Operating Cost (Application question 29; Points possible: 30)

- This should be rated based on information provided which specifically address this issue.
- Evaluation should be based on district provided data and analysis rather than opinion.
- Evaluation may reward efforts to contain or reduce operating costs even if the project doesn’t save money or have a payback (i.e. – utilizing LEED or CHPS standards for construction).
- Top scores should be reserved for those projects that can demonstrate a payback within a relatively brief period of time.
- Should be consistent with life cycle cost analysis and cost benefit analysis (if provided).
- This may have either a positive or a negative relationship to justification of a project.



Alternative Facilities (Application question 27; Points possible: 5)

- Consider the effort/results in identifying alternative facilities.
- Where reasonable alternative facilities have been identified, is there **documentation** with the facility owner regarding availability?
- Is a community “inventory” provided?
- Were judgments about the viability of alternate facilities made with “institutional knowledge”, professional assessment, third party objectivity and/or economic analysis?
- Is the rationale behind alternative facility viability provided?
- Are facilities listed in a narrative discussion or are they documented with supplemental data such as photos, maps, facility profile, etc.?

Options (Application Question 28; Points possible: 25)

- Consider how completely this topic is addressed.
- Was the option to phase the project considered?
- Should consider boundary changes where applicable.
- For equipment: was a re-conditioned or re-built option considered in lieu of new.
- For over-crowding, was double shifting considered? If not, why not?
- Were the options considered viable alternatives?
- The rating of this scoring element should consider the range of options considered and the rigor of the comparison to each other.
- Scoring should increase in accordance with the amount of detailed information; graduated into three levels of: 1. unsupported narrative 2. well supported narrative and 3. detailed cost analysis.

Adequacy of Documentation (Points possible: 30)

- This score should be the last score awarded.
- Consider all attachments in evaluating this element.
- Points awarded for this element should reflect how well information needed to assess each of the other scoring elements was provided.
- Consideration should be given to congruency between documents supporting an application.
- Consideration should be given to how well documents and submittals responded to both the letter and the intent of questions.