

CAPITAL OUTLAY CATEGORY AND PRIORITIZATION CRITERIA

Project: _____ Campus: _____ System: _____

Instructions: Fill in your appropriate column with Y, N, or NA.

Campus	Mgt. Board	Regents
--------	------------	---------

INITIAL SCREENING

1. IS THE PROJECT CONSISTENT WITH THE GOALS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION IN GENERAL, AS SET FORTH IN THE MASTER PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION?
2. DOES THE PROJECT FACILITATE THE INSTITUTION IN FULFILLING ITS ROLE, SCOPE, AND MISSION IN HIGHER EDUCATION?
3. DOES THE INSTITUTION HAVE A CURRENT FACILITIES MASTER PLAN? IS THE PROJECT CONSISTENT WITH THAT MASTER PLAN?
4. WAS THE PROJECT RECOMMENDED BY THE MANAGEMENT BOARD?
5. DID THE MANAGEMENT BOARD USE CRITERIA CONSISTENT WITH BOARD OF REGENTS' APPROVED POLICY FOR PRIORITIZING PROJECTS?
6. IS THE PROJECT CATEGORIZED IN A MANNER CONSISTENT WITH BOARD OF REGENTS' CAPITAL OUTLAY CATEGORY PRIORITIES? THOSE ARE, IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE: EMERGENCY, DESEGREGATION SETTLEMENT, SELF-GENERATED, MOVABLE EQUIPMENT, CONTINUING PROJECTS, NEW PROJECTS, AND PROJECTS TO BE INITIATED IN YEARS TWO THROUGH FIVE.
7. IS THE PROJECT TYPE, KIND, OR NATURE CONSISTENT WITH THE BOARD OF REGENTS' APPROVED POLICY FOR PRIORITIZING PROJECTS? THOSE ARE, IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE: (1) MASTERPLANNING, (2) CODE REQUIREMENTS AND/OR UNFUNDED MANDATES, (3) TECHNOLOGY AND INFRASTRUCTURE, (4) RENOVATIONS OF EXISTING FACILITIES, (5) TIMELY LAND ACQUISITION, (6) NEW CAMPUS START-UP, (7) UTILIZING VACANT CAMPUS BUILDINGS, AND (8) THE CONSTRUCTION OF NEW SPACE.
8. WITHIN THE CATEGORIES, DID THE MANAGEMENT BOARD RANK THE PROJECT RELATIVELY HIGH IN PRIORITY?
9. IS THE PROJECT OF SUCH A SIZE, BOTH IN SCOPE AND COST, THAT IT IS REALISTICALLY DOABLE?
10. IS THE PROJECT SMALL ENOUGH MONETARILY THAT IT MAKES SENSE TO ACT ON IT IMMEDIATELY, PERHAPS WITH A GROUP OF SIMILAR PROJECTS, ESPECIALLY IF ONE-TIME FUNDING WERE MADE AVAILABLE?
11. IS THE REQUEST FOR PRELIMINARY PROJECT APPROVAL WHERE SUCH APPROVAL IS NEEDED TO PERMIT THE MANAGEMENT BOARD AND/OR CAMPUS TO PROCEED TO RAISE FUNDING FOR THE PROJECT FROM OUTSIDE SOURCES?

MASTER PLAN AND PROGRAMMATIC NEEDS

1. DOES THE PROJECT REQUEST FUNDING FOR MASTER PLANNING, THE USE OF WHICH CAN BE EXPECTED TO IDENTIFY OTHER CAPITAL NEEDS AND ASSIST IN THE PRUDENT USE OF LIMITED TAX DOLLARS?
2. DOES THE MASTER PLAN FOR THE INSTITUTION CALL FOR THE FACILITY?
3. IS THE PROJECT FOR THE REQUESTING CAMPUS CONSISTENT WITH THE FACILITY NEEDS OF ITS PEER INSTITUTIONS?
4. DOES THE CAMPUS HAVE SOME SPECIAL DESIGNATION OR DEFINING CHARACTERISTIC WHICH ADDS TO THE PROJECT JUSTIFICATION?
5. HAS THE PROGRAM WHICH IS TO BE HOUSED OR ACCOMMODATED IN THE PROPOSED FACILITY BEEN APPROVED AS AN ACADEMIC PROGRAM BY THE BOARD OF REGENTS?
6. DOES THE PROJECT RELATE TO A PROGRAM WHICH IS IN GREAT DEMAND, FOR WHICH STUDENTS ARE ON WAITING LISTS TO BE ACCEPTED, AND GOOD PAYING JOBS ARE AVAILABLE UPON GRADUATION?
7. DOES THE PROPOSED FACILITY AVOID UNNECESSARY DUPLICATION WITH FACILITIES OR PROGRAMS AT OTHER CAMPUSES?
8. IS THE CAMPUS UNABLE TO SOLVE THIS PARTICULAR PROBLEM BY ANY OTHER MEANS OTHER THAN WITH A CONSTRUCTION PROJECT?
9. WITHIN ITS OWN CAPABILITIES, HAS THE CAMPUS GENERALLY BEEN GOOD STEWARDS OF ITS FACILITIES?

Project: _____ Campus: _____ System: _____

Instructions: Fill in your appropriate column with Y, N, or NA.

Campus	Mgt. Board	Regents
--------	------------	---------

SPACE UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

1. DOES A REVIEW OF THE CURRENT FACILITIES INVENTORY AND UTILIZATION STUDY INDICATE A NEED FOR THE PROPOSED PROJECT?
2. IS THE NEED FOR SPACE, AS SUGGESTED BY SPACE UTILIZATION DATA, CONFIRMED BY WHAT WAS OBSERVED AT THE ON-SITE VISIT OR BY AN ON-GOING AWARENESS OF THE CAMPUS SITUATION?
3. DOES THE PROJECT RELATE MORE TO A CONSTANT AND EVER-PRESENT LACK OF SUFFICIENT SPACE, RATHER THAN TO PRIME -TIME OVERCROWDING?
4. IF THE CAMPUS IS NOT STATISTICALLY SHORT OF SPACE, IS THE PROBLEM THAT THEY DO NOT HAVE THE CORRECT TYPE OF SPACE?
5. IF THE CAMPUS IS NOT STATISTICALLY SHORT OF SPACE, CAN EXISTING SPACE BE ADAPTED, CONVERTED, OR ALTERED TO SERVE THE INTENDED PURPOSE?
6. WITH REGARD TO SPACE NEEDS, DO ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS AND DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSES BEAR OUT THE NEED FOR THE FACILITY DURING ITS USEFUL LIFE CYCLE?
7. IF THE CAMPUS IS ONE FOR WHICH STATISTICS ARE NOT COMPARABLE TO OTHER IN-STATE INSTITUTIONS, SUCH AS AG CENTERS OR MEDICAL SCHOOLS, HAVE SPACE NEEDS BEEN COMPARED TO SREB PEER INSTITUTIONS?

ACCREDITATION

1. IS THE PRIME JUSTIFICATION FOR THE PROJECT TO FACILITATE THE PROCESS OF RECEIVING ACCREDITATION FOR THE PROGRAM TO BE HOUSED THEREIN?
2. IF ACCREDITATION IS THE PRIME JUSTIFICATION FOR THE PROJECT, IS ACCREDITATION ACTUALLY DESIRABLE IN THIS INSTANCE?
3. IS THE PROJECT JUSTIFIED MORE UPON ITS DIRECT EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS THAN TO ANY DEPARTMENTAL CONSOLIDATION CONCERNS?

ARCHITECTURAL CONSIDERATIONS

1. DOES THE PROJECT RENOVATE AN EXISTING FACILITY?
2. IF THE PROJECT RENOVATES EXISTING SPACE, IS THE WORK PRIMARILY AN AESTHETIC ENHANCEMENT, FACE-LIFTING, AND/OR MODERNIZATION?
3. IF THE PROJECT PROPOSES TO RENOVATE EXISTING SPACE, IS THE CONDITION OF THAT EXISTING SPACE TRULY IN NEED OF RENOVATION AND WOULD IT PRODUCE A SUITABLE FACILITY IF RENOVATED?
4. HAVE ISSUES BEEN CONSIDERED WHICH RELATE TO THE HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE EXISTING FACILITY?
5. DOES THIS PROJECT RENOVATE EXISTING SPACE, WITH WORK RELATING PRIMARILY TO FUNCTIONAL ADAPTATION OF THE FACILITY FOR NEW USE?
6. IS THE PROJECT TECHNOLOGY AND/OR INFRASTRUCTURE ORIENTED WHERE AN EMPHASIS ON TECHNOLOGY AND INFRASTRUCTURE IS APPROPRIATE?
7. IS THIS PROJECT PRIMARILY MECHANICAL OR ELECTRICAL IN NATURE?
8. IF THIS PROJECT IS A RENOVATION AND ADDITION, DOES OVER HALF OF THE PROPOSED FUNDING RELATE TO THE RENOVATION ASPECTS OF THE PROJECT?
9. DOES THE PROJECT RELATE TO AN EXISTING ON-CAMPUS FACILITY WHICH IS OR SOON WILL BE VACANT?
10. ARCHITECTURALLY SPEAKING, DOES THE PROJECT AS PROPOSED SOLVE THE STATED PROBLEM?
11. IF THE PROJECT REQUESTS LAND ACQUISITION, IS THE CAMPUS LANDLOCKED, IN NEED OF LAND, AND IS THE TIMING OF ACQUISITION CRITICAL?
12. IS THE PRIME INTENT OF THE PROJECT TO PROVIDE PRIMARY FACILITIES OR UTILITIES, AS CONTRASTED WITH BACK-UP OR REDUNDANT SYSTEMS?
13. IS THIS PROJECT FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW BUILDING OR NEW SPACE WHICH HAS NOT RECEIVED PREVIOUS ACTUAL FUNDING?

Project: _____ Campus: _____ System: _____

Instructions: Fill in your appropriate column with Y, N, or NA.

Campus	Mgt. Board	Regents

14. IS THE NET TO GROSS RATIO, AND RESULTANT BURDEN FACTOR REASONABLE FOR THE TYPE OF FACILITY INVOLVED?
15. IS THE PRELIMINARY ARCHITECTURAL PROGRAM APPROPRIATE IN THAT THE RESULTANT NET SQUARE FOOT AREA REDUCES THE SHORTAGE OF SPACE OR TYPE OF SPACE.
16. IS THE UNIT COST PER SQUARE FOOT APPROPRIATE FOR THE PROJECT, BASED ON RECENT BID HISTORY FOR SIMILAR CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS, TAKING INTO ACCOUNT PROPER INFLATION?
17. ARE RELATED AND ANCILLARY COST FACTORS SUCH AS PLANNING, ABATEMENT, MISCELLANEOUS, MOVABLE EQUIPMENT, LANDSCAPING, AND PARKING INCLUDED IN THE OVERALL ESTIMATE FOR THE PROJECT?
18. WOULD THE PROJECT AVOID THE PROBLEM OF CAUSING ANY ADVERSE AFFECTS ON THE ENVIRONMENT?

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

1. IF THE PRIME INTENT OF THE PROJECT IS TO SAVE OPERATING FUNDS, IS THE TERM OF THE PAYOUT ATTRACTIVE?
2. IF THE PRIME INTENT OF THE PROJECT IS TO SAVE OPERATING FUNDS, WOULD THE SAVINGS GENERATED BY THE PROJECT BE DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY RETURNED TO OR SHARED WITH THE STATE?
3. IS THERE A REASONABLE EXPECTATION THAT THE INSTITUTION, OR STATE, WILL BE ABLE TO FUND THE OPERATION OF THE FACILITY ONCE IT COMES ON LINE?
4. FOR SELF-GENERATED PROJECTS, IS THERE A BUSINESS PLAN FOR THE OPERATION OF THE FACILITY WHICH PROVIDES FOR OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF THE FACILITY OVER ITS PROJECTED LIFE-CYCLE?
5. DOES THE PROJECT CAPTURE OUTSIDE FUNDING, PERHAPS BY PROVIDING MATCHING FUNDS?
6. IF THE PROJECT CAPTURES OUTSIDE FUNDING, CAN THE STATE REALISTICALLY AFFORD TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THE OPPORTUNITY?
7. IF THE PROJECT INVOLVES A THIRD PARTY, HAS THE PROPOSAL BEEN RESEARCHED TO DETERMINE THAT RELEVANT ASPECTS OF THE ARRANGEMENT ARE CONSISTENT WITH THE GOALS OF HIGHER EDUCATION?
8. IF A PROJECT IS PARTIALLY FUNDED AND MONEY HAS BEEN SPENT, WOULD IT BE A WASTE OF MONEY TO HALT THE PROJECT?
9. CAN WE ASSIST THE STATE BY OBTAINING OUTSIDE FUNDING FOR THE PROJECT?

ECONOMIC IMPACT AND STATE INITIATIVES

1. AS A SECONDARY BENEFIT, DOES THE PROJECT RESPOND TO STATE PRIORITIES AND INITIATIVES?
2. AS AN ADDITIONAL BENEFIT OR JUSTIFICATION, DOES THE PROJECT HAVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IMPLICATIONS?
3. AS AN ADDITIONAL BENEFIT OR JUSTIFICATION, IS THE PROJECT PARTIALLY MOTIVATED BY A NEED TO RELATE TO, PROVIDE A SERVICE FOR, OR OUTREACH TO THE SURROUNDING COMMUNITY?
4. DOES THE PROJECT AVOID POSING A THREAT OR UNFAIR COMPETITION TO ANY ASPECT OF THE PRIVATE SECTOR OF THE SURROUNDING ECONOMY?
5. RELATIVE TO THE PROJECT, ARE THERE EXTENUATING CIRCUMSTANCES WHICH SHOULD BE CONSIDERED?

PROJECT TIMING

1. WAS THE SUBMITTAL FOR THE PROJECT PROPERLY PREPARED? DO THE SUBMITTAL DOCUMENTS ADEQUATELY CONVEY THE NATURE OF THE PROJECT?
2. WAS THE PROJECT REQUESTED PREVIOUSLY, AND REPRESENTED IN THE FIVE-YEAR PLAN, THEREBY REFLECTING LONG-STANDING NEEDS AND EFFECTIVE LONG-RANGE PLANNING?
3. IF THE PROJECT HAS BEEN REQUESTED PREVIOUSLY, IS THE JUSTIFICATION FOR THE PROJECT STILL AS VALID AS IT WAS WHEN THE PROJECT WAS FIRST REQUESTED?
4. IS THE PROJECT TIME SENSITIVE, SUCH AS INITIATING A NEW CAMPUS, OR SEQUENTIAL CONSTRUCTION?
5. IF THERE IS A "DOMINO EFFECT" ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROJECT, EITHER WITH REGARD TO RELATED CONSTRUCTION OR APPROPRIATE PLANNING, IS THE REALTED WORK AT A POINT WHICH CALLS FOR THIS PROJECT TO PROCEED?
6. IF THE PROJECT MUST BE SEQUENCED TO PERMIT CONTINUED OPERATION OF THE CAMPUS DURING CONSTRUCTION, HAS THAT NEED BEEN DULY CONSIDERED IN THE TIMING OF THE REQUEST?

Project: _____ Campus: _____ System: _____

Instructions: Fill in your appropriate column with Y, N, or NA.

Campus	Mgt. Board	Regents
--------	------------	---------

