

CRITERIA DEFINITIONS AND SCORING STANDARDS

OVERARCHING EVALUATION CRITERIA	SCORING STANDARD	POINTS
Integral to achieving statewide policy goals (9 points possible)	Enables improvement on 2015-2016 academic year totals recorded in Statewide Public Four-Year Dashboard.	
	Increases number of bachelor's degrees awarded beyond 2015-16 level recorded in Statewide Public Four-Year Dashboard (a). Institutions to provide number of bachelor's degrees targeted for 2019 (b).	Up to 3
	If $a/b \geq 100\%$	0
	If $75\% \leq a/b < 100\%$	1
	If $50\% \leq a/b < 75\%$	2
	If $a/b < 50\%$	3
	Increases number of bachelor's degrees awarded in high-demand fields beyond 2015-16 level recorded in Statewide Public Four-Year Dashboard (a). Institutions to provide number of bachelor's degrees in high-demand fields targeted for 2019 (b).	Up to 3
	If $a/b \geq 100\%$	0
	If $75\% \leq a/b < 100\%$	1
	If $50\% \leq a/b < 75\%$	2
	If $a/b < 50\%$	3
	Increases number of advanced degrees awarded beyond 2015-16 level recorded in Statewide Public Four-Year Dashboard (a). Institutions to provide number of advanced degrees targeted for 2019 (b).	Up to 3
	If $a/b \geq 100\%$	0
	If $75\% \leq a/b < 100\%$	1
	If $50\% \leq a/b < 75\%$	2
	If $a/b < 50\%$	3

Integral to institutional planning and goals (8 points possible)	Achieves institutional planning goals and objectives.	Additive
	Integral to campus/facilities master plan or applicable strategic plan. Project must be initiated soon to sustain institutional program(s) and meet current demand for those program(s).	Up to 4:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the project been identified in the most recent campus/facilities master plan or strategic plan? 	Up to 2
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the project following the sequencing or strategy laid out in official planning documents? If not, explain why it is being requested now. 	Up to 2
	Integral to institution's academic programs plan. Project must be initiated soon to implement successive measures of the academic plan to meet projected program requirements, growth of existing programs or demand for new programs.	Up to 4:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must the project be initiated soon in order to meet academic certification requirements? 	Up to 2
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To permit enrollment growth and/or specific quality improvements in current programs? 	Up to 1
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To permit initiation of new programs? 	Up to 1

GROWTH CATEGORY CRITERIA

Access-related projects to accommodate enrollment growth.

SPECIFIC EVALUATION CRITERIA	SCORING STANDARD	POINTS
Access (4 points possible)	Promotes access for underserved regions and place-bound adults through distance learning and/or university centers.	Additive
	Is distance learning or a university center a large and significant component of the total project scope?	Up to 2
	Is the project likely to enroll a significant number of place-bound students or residents of underserved regions?	Up to 2
Enrollment growth (20 points possible)	Project adds capacity for state-supported enrollment growth. Points calculated according to the following equation, with maximum points given to a project providing capacity for 300 or more additional FTEs: $(\# \text{ of projected FTEs}) / 300 \times 15 = \text{total number of points}$.	Proportional; up to 15 points
	Growth is in one of the high-demand fields identified in Statewide Public Four Year Dashboard.	Up to 5
Availability of space (10 points possible)	Addresses insufficient space on campus to accommodate projected enrollment growth.	Select one
	Adds classroom space on a campus that currently exceeds the 22-hour per classroom seat HECB utilization standard, and adds class laboratory space to a campus that exceeds the 16-hour per station HECB utilization standard.	1-2
	Adds classroom space on a campus that does not exceed the 22-hour per classroom seat HECB utilization standard and project improves the utilization of classroom space.	Up to 5
	Adds class laboratory space on a campus that does not exceed the 16-hour per station HECB utilization standard and project improves the utilization of class laboratories.	Up to 5
	Adds space on a campus that does not meet HECB utilization standards and has no plan to achieve them and/or project has no impact on classroom or class laboratory utilization standards.	0
Efficiency of space allocation (5 points possible)	Proposed space allocations are consistent with FEPP benchmarks or other appropriate benchmark.	Select one
	Project is consistency with FEPP space standards.	3
	Project is not consistent with FEPP benchmarks, but: (1) proposes alternative standards; (2) makes a compelling case why those standards are more applicable to the proposed project than former HECB space standards; and (3) documents proposed space use against those standards.	Up to 3
	Project is not consistent with FEPP or other benchmarks.	0
	Proposed space allocations are consistent with building efficiency guidelines (ASF/GSF).	Select one
	More than 65% (science building more than 60%)	2
	60% – 65% (science building 55% – 60%)	1
	Less than 60% (science building less than 55%)	0

Reasonableness of cost (12 points possible)	Consistency with OFM cost standards.	Additive; up to 12 points
	Total project cost is less than or equal to the expected cost per square foot for the facility type, escalated to the construction mid-point.	10
	Project cost is between 100% and 111% of expected cost.	6
	Project cost is between 111% and 137% of expected cost.	3
	Project cost is more than 137% of expected cost.	0
	Demonstrates that project provides more cost-effective enrollment access than alternatives such as university centers and distance learning.	Select Yes (2)/No (0)
	Additional cost considerations (applies only if project cost exceeds OFM cost standards)	Points
	Demonstrates that total project cost is outside OFM standards due to exigent circumstances (such as extensive site work), the inclusion of highly-specialized equipment or design features necessary to the programmatic purpose of the facility, or selected systems alternates with significantly lower-than-baseline life cycle costs over 50 years in terms of net present savings.	1-2
Total project cost not affected by exigent circumstances, programmatic needs, or selection of energy efficient systems alternates.	0	
Program-related space allocation (weighted average, 6 points possible)	Assignable square feet. Percentage of total x points = score	Points
	Instructional space (classroom, lab, library)	6
	Student advising/counseling services	4
	Child care	1
	Faculty offices	4
	Administrative	3
	Maintenance/central stores/student center	4
		= Total Score

RENOVATION CATEGORY CRITERIA

Projects that renovate buildings (or distinct portions of buildings) to extend facility life and upgrade space for program requirements.

SPECIFIC EVALUATION CRITERIA	SCORING STANDARD	POINTS
Age of building since last major remodel (6 points possible)	Age of building or portion proposed for renovation since last major remodel. For renovation projects with areas of differing ages, calculate a weighted average age based on square feet.	Select one
	More than 40 years	6
	31 – 40 years	4
	20 – 30 years	2
	Less than 20 years	0
Availability of space (10 points possible)	Project renovates space on campus that meets or exceeds HECB utilization standards.	Select one
	Renovates classroom space on a campus that currently exceeds the 22-hour per classroom seat HECB utilization standard, and renovates class laboratory space to a campus that exceeds the 16-hour per station HECB utilization standard.	1 – 2
	Renovates classroom space on a campus that does not exceed the 22-hour per classroom seat HECB utilization standard and project improves the utilization of classroom space.	Up to 5
	Renovates class laboratory space on a campus that does not exceed the 16-hour per station HECB utilization standard and project improves the utilization of class laboratories.	Up to 5
	Renovates space on a campus that does not meet HECB utilization standards and has no plan to achieve them and/or project has no impact on classroom or class laboratory utilization standards.	0
Condition of building or portion proposed for renovation (10 points possible)	Building condition per 2016 comparable framework.	Select one
	Superior (condition score 1)	0
	Adequate (condition score 2)	4
	Fair (condition score 3)	8
	Needs Improvement — Limited Functionality (condition score 4)	6
	Needs Improvement — Marginal Functionality (condition score 5)	2
	Buildings of historic significance listed on Washington Heritage Register, with condition scores 3, 4 or 5	Additional 2

Significant health, safety and code issues (10 points possible)	Project improves one or more of the following areas by bringing it within current standards or applicable codes (provide supporting documentation).	Additive
	Life safety (cite applicable code and issue), including seismic and ADA issues	Up to 8
	Energy code	Up to 2
Reasonableness of cost (12 points possible)	Consistency with OFM cost standards.	Select one
	Total project cost is between 60% and 80% of expected cost for new construction of the facility type, escalated to the construction mid-point.	12
	Project cost is between 80% and 90% of expected cost.	7
	Project cost is between 90% and 109% of expected cost.	3
	Project cost is more than 109% of expected cost.	0
	Additional cost considerations (applies only if project cost exceeds OFM cost standards)	Points
	Demonstrates that total project cost is outside OFM standards due to exigent circumstances (such as extensive site work), the inclusion of highly-specialized equipment or design features necessary to the programmatic purpose of the facility, or selected systems alternates with significantly lower-than-baseline life cycle costs over 50 years in terms of net present savings.	1-2
Total project cost not affected by exigent circumstances, programmatic needs, or selection of energy efficient systems alternates.	0	
Efficiency of space allocation (5 points possible)	Proposed space allocations are consistent with FEFG benchmarks or sufficient explanation is provided.	Select one
	Project demonstrates consistency with space standards in FEFG benchmark.	3
	Project is not consistent with FEFG benchmarks, but: (1) proposes alternative standards; (2) makes a compelling case why those standards are more applicable to the proposed project than HECB space standards; and (3) documents proposed space use against those standards.	Up to 3
	Project is not consistent with FEFG or other benchmarks.	0
	Proposed space allocations are consistent with building efficiency guidelines (ASF/GSF).	Select one
	More than 65% (science building more than 60%)	2
	60% – 65% (science building 55% – 60%)	1
	Less than 60% (science building less than 55%)	0
Adequacy of space (5 points possible)	Addresses adequacy of space issues.	Additive
	Space upgrades needed to meet modern pedagogical standards.	Up to 3
	Improves program space configuration.	Up to 2

Program-related space allocation (weighted average, 6 points possible)	Assignable square feet	Points
	Percentage of total x points = score	
	Instructional space (classroom, lab, library)	6
	Student advising/counseling services	4
	Child care	1
	Faculty offices	4
	Administrative	3
	Maintenance/central stores/student center	4
		= Total score

REPLACEMENT CATEGORY CRITERIA

Projects that replace failing permanent buildings to restore building life and upgrade space for program requirements.

SPECIFIC EVALUATION CRITERIA	SCORING STANDARD	POINTS
Age of building since last major remodel (6 points possible)	Provide documentation to verify age of building or portion proposed for replacement. For replacement projects with areas of differing ages, calculate a weighted average age based on square feet.	Select one
	More than 40 years	6
	31 – 40 years	4
	20 – 30 years	2
	Less than 20 years	0
Condition of building or portion proposed for replacement (10 points possible)	Building condition per 2016 comparable framework.	Select one
	Superior (condition score 1)	0
	Adequate (condition score 2)	2
	Fair (condition score 3)	4
	Needs Improvement—Limited Functionality (condition score 4)	8
Needs Improvement—Marginal Functionality (condition score 5)	10	
Significant health, safety and code issues (10 points possible)	Project improves one or more of the following areas by bringing it within current standards or applicable codes (provide supporting documentation).	Additive
	Life safety (cite applicable code and issue), including seismic and ADA issues	Up to 8
	Energy code	Up to 2
Reasonableness of cost (12 points possible)	Consistency with OFM cost standards.	Select one
	Total project cost is less than or equal to expected cost per square foot for facility type, escalated to the construction mid-point.	12
	Project cost is between 100% and 111% of expected cost.	8
	Project cost is between 111% and 133% of expected cost.	6
	Project cost is more than 133% of expected cost.	0
	Additional cost considerations (applies only if project cost exceeds OFM cost standards)	Points
	Demonstrates that total project cost is outside OFM standards due to exigent circumstances (such as extensive site work), the inclusion of highly-specialized equipment or design features necessary to the programmatic purpose of the facility, or selected systems alternates with significantly lower-than-baseline life cycle costs over 50 years in terms of net present savings.	1-2
Total project cost not affected by exigent circumstances, programmatic needs, or selection of energy efficient systems alternates.	0	

Availability of space (10 points possible)	Addresses insufficient space on campus to accommodate projected enrollment growth.	Select one
	Replaces classroom space on a campus that currently exceeds the 22-hour per classroom seat HECB utilization standard, and replaces class laboratory space to a campus that exceeds the 16-hour per station HECB utilization standard.	1 – 2
	Replaces classroom space on a campus that does not exceed the 22-hour per classroom seat HECB utilization standard and project improves the utilization of classroom space.	Up to 5
	Replaces class laboratory space on a campus that does not exceed the 16-hour per station HECB utilization standard and project improves the utilization of class laboratories.	Up to 5
	Replaces space on a campus that does not meet HECB utilization standards and has no plan to achieve them and/or project has no impact on classroom or class laboratory utilization standards.	0
Efficiency of space allocation (5 points possible)	Proposed space allocations are consistent with FEPG benchmarks or sufficient explanation is provided.	Select one
	Project demonstrates consistency with space standards in FEPG benchmark.	3
	Project is not consistent with FEPG benchmarks, but makes a compelling case and provides documentation why benchmarks are not applicable.	Up to 3
	Project is not consistent with FEPG or other benchmarks.	0
	Proposed space allocations are consistent with building efficiency guidelines (ASF/GSF).	Select one
	More than 65% (science building more than 60%)	2
	60% – 65% (science building 55% - 60%)	1
	Less than 60% (science building less than 55%)	0
Adequacy of space (5 points possible)	Addresses adequacy of space issues.	Additive
	Space upgrades needed to meet modern pedagogical standards.	Up to 3
	Improves program space configuration.	Up to 2
Program-related space allocation (weighted average, 6 points possible)	Assignable square feet Percentage of total x points = score	Points
	Instructional space (classroom, lab, library)	6
	Student advising/counseling services	4
	Child care	1
	Faculty offices	4
	Administrative	3
	Maintenance/central stores/student center	4

RESEARCH CATEGORY CRITERIA

Projects that promote economic growth and innovation through expanded research activity; equipment may be included.

SPECIFIC EVALUATION CRITERIA	SCORING STANDARD	POINTS
Impact on economic development (15 points possible)		Additive
	Demonstrates that project is a critical component of an articulated state, regional or local comprehensive economic development plan.	Up to 5
	Provides documentation of federal or private funding available for research supported by project.	Up to 5
	Demonstrates economic impact benefits of project to the region through an economic impact study.	Up to 5
Impact on innovation (10 points possible)	Demonstrates research activities proposed for the project will.	Select one:
	Advance areas of existing preeminence.	Up to 10
	Position the institution for preeminence in a field or area of research.	Up to 7
Availability of research space (5 points possible)	Project addresses insufficient space on campus to accommodate research needs.	Proportional
	Adds research space to a campus in need of additional research facilities.	Up to 5
Adequacy of research space (5 points possible)	Addresses suitability of existing space for research needs.	Additive
	Space upgrades needed to meet current research standards or needs.	Up to 5
	Space upgrades needed to meet future research standards or needs.	Up to 2
Availability of instructional space (10 points possible)	Addresses insufficient space on campus to accommodate projected enrollment growth.	Select one:
	Adds/renovates classroom space on a campus that currently exceeds the 22-hour per classroom seat HECB utilization standard, and adds/renovates class laboratory space to a campus that exceeds the 16-hour per station HECB utilization standard.	1 - 2
	Adds/renovates classroom space on a campus that does not exceed the 22-hour per classroom seat HECB utilization standard and project improves the utilization of classroom space.	Up to 5
	Adds/renovates class laboratory space on a campus that does not exceed the 16-hour per station HECB utilization standard and project improves the utilization of class laboratories.	Up to 5
	Adds/renovates space on a campus that does not meet HECB utilization standards and has no plan to achieve them and/or project has no impact on classroom or class laboratory utilization standards.	0

Reasonableness of cost (12 points possible)	Provides detailed baseline comparison to OFM cost standards.	Select one:
	Total project cost is less than, or equal to, the expected cost per square foot for the type of facility escalated to the mid-construction date using provided construction cost index.	12
	Project cost is between 100% and 111% of expected cost.	8
	Project cost is between 111% and 137% of expected cost.	6
	Project cost is more than 137% of expected cost.	0
	Additional cost considerations (applies only if project cost exceeds OFM cost standards)	Points
Demonstrates that total project cost is outside OFM standards due to exigent circumstances (such as extensive site work), the inclusion of highly-specialized equipment or design features necessary to the programmatic purpose of the facility, or selected systems alternates with significantly lower-than-baseline life cycle costs over 50 years in terms of net present savings.	1-2	
	Total project cost not affected by exigent circumstances, programmatic needs, or selection of energy efficient systems alternates.	0
Contribution of other funding sources (10 points possible)	Percent of project funded by sources other than state appropriations or building fund (projects with 50% or more of their funding coming from outside sources get maximum points).	Proportional
	(Percent of project funded by non-state sources) x 20 = total points.	Up to 10
Integral to achieving statewide policy goals (4 points possible)	Increases economic development through theoretical or applied research.	Up to 4
	Is the proposed project necessary to conduct the proposed research?	Up to 1
	Is there clear and compelling evidence that the proposed research is likely to create or retain high-paying jobs?	Up to 1
	Is there clear and compelling evidence that the proposed research is likely to contribute to the solution of significant regional, national, or global challenges?	Up to 1
	Is there clear and compelling evidence that the proposed research is likely to increase the stability or competitiveness of the local or regional economy through the creation or retention of high-growth, high-paying companies?	Up to 1

INFRASTRUCTURE CRITERIA

Major stand-alone infrastructure projects.

SPECIFIC EVALUATION CRITERIA	SCORING STANDARD	POINTS
Significant life safety and code issues (14 points possible)	Project improves one or more of the following areas by bringing it within current standards or applicable codes (provide supporting documentation).	Additive Up to 14 points maximum
	Life safety (cite applicable code and issue), including seismic and ADA issues	Up to 8
	Energy code	Up to 2
	Utilities issues	Up to 2
	Transportation issues	Up to 2
Evidence of failure/ability to defer (6 points possible)	Provide documentation showing.	Select one
	Multiple repairs and/or service interruptions over past 5 years.	5 - 6
	Multiple repairs and/or service interruptions over past 2 years.	3 - 4
	Increasing utility or maintenance costs; system unreliable.	1 - 2
Impact on institution's operations without infrastructure project (6 points possible)	Provide documentation showing that without the infrastructure project there will be.	Select one:
	Serious impact on existing operations or programs.	6
	Serious impact on funded future construction projects.	5
	Serious impact on planned construction projects or future program needs.	3
Reasonable estimate (6 points possible)	Reliability of cost estimate.	Select one:
	A detailed cost estimate by applicable specialty professionals.	5 – 6
	A recent, detailed cost estimate by an experienced project manager.	2 – 4
	A brief cost estimate lacking specific detail.	0 – 1
Engineering study (6 points possible)	Level of study.	Select one:
	Comprehensive engineering study	6
	Site survey and recommendations	4
	Opinion letter	2
Supports facilities plan (6 points possible)	Level of support.	Additive up to 6 points maximum
	Integral to Facilities or Campus Master Plan or other applicable strategic plan.	Up to 3
	Integral to ongoing academic and research program needs.	Up to 3

Resource efficiency and sustainability (9 points possible)	Project provides documented benefits in the following areas.	Additive up to 9 points maximum
	Incorporates low-impact stormwater management techniques.	0 - 3
	Improvements in energy and resource conservation.	0 - 3
	Incorporates use of alternative energy sources.	0 - 3

ACQUISITION CRITERIA

SPECIFIC EVALUATION CRITERIA	SCORING STANDARD	POINTS
Support by planning (15 points possible)	Level of support.	Additive
	Integral to Facilities or Campus Master Plan.	Up to 10
	Integral to Strategic Plan.	Up to 5
Reasonableness of cost (15 points possible)	Provides baseline comparison of costs per acre of 2 comparable properties in same region as proposed land acquisition.	Additive
	Cost per acre is less than or equal to 80% of average cost/acre of 2 comparables.	13 – 15
	Cost per acre is 81% – 100% of average cost/acres of 2 comparables.	10 – 12
	Cost per acre is 101% – 120% of average cost/acres of 2 comparables.	7 – 9
	Cost per acre is 121 % – 140% of average cost/acres of 2 comparables.	4 – 6
	Cost per acre is greater than 140% of average cost/acres of 2 comparables.	1 – 3
	No comparables provided.	0
Intended use (6 points possible)		Select one:
	Instructional building site.	6
	Non-instructional building site.	3
	Non-building site or no specific use determined at this time.	1
	No specific use determined at this time.	0
Land acquisition with non-usable buildings percentage of buildable area (8 points possible)	Indicate the percentage of total property suitable for development based on the results of an environmental review and engineering inspection of property.	Select one
	At least 75% of site is buildable.	6 - 8
	50% – 74% of site is buildable.	3 - 5
	Less than 50% of site is buildable.	1 - 2
	No information provided.	0
OR		
Facility acquisition or land acquisition with usable facilities (8 points possible)	Indicate the condition of the facility, using the methodology prescribed in the 2016 Comparable Framework study as evaluated by an architect or engineer.	Select one:
	Superior (condition score 1)	4

	Adequate (condition score 2)	3
	Fair (condition score 3)	2
	Needs Improvement – Limited Functionality (condition score 4)	1
	Needs Improvement – Marginal Functionality (condition score 5)	0
AND		
	Capital Improvements required to adapt facility to proposed use.	Select one:
	Facility requires no funding to adapt facility to proposed use.	4
	Facility requires less than 10% of appraised value to adapt facility to proposed use.	3
	Facility requires between 10% and 30% of appraised value to adapt facility to proposed use.	1 - 2
	Facility requires 30% or more than appraised value to adapt facility to proposed use.	0
Savings to operating costs (8 points possible)	Submit calculations demonstrating any cost savings to operating costs due to the acquisition.	Select one
	Estimated savings to operating costs will pay back the total cost of the acquisition in 10 years or less.	5 - 8
	Estimated savings to operating costs will pay back the total cost of the acquisition in 10-20 years.	2 - 4
	Estimated savings to operating costs will pay back the total cost of acquisition in more than 20 years.	0