

CIP Matrix Briefing Sheet

1. As background, the capital improvements program (CIP) matrix was originally developed in 1978 out of recognition that the Department of Education (DOE) did not have sufficient funding to meet the capital improvements needs of all schools statewide. The matrix was updated in 1995 to account for additional needs such as telecommunications improvements and athletic trainer rooms.
2. The matrix was and continues to be intended to provide an equitable and objective means for prioritizing many competing needs in the wake of reduced levels of capital funding. With funding appropriated at the statewide level, the matrix serves as a valuable tool for ensuring that the limited funds are distributed equitably and that the most critical needs are met first.
3. The matrix is structured such that the general order of priority is health and safety, followed by classroom needs, then support facility needs, and finally improvements to state and district facilities (see attached).

Within each category, there are five levels of priority. A matrix designation, therefore, reflects both the relative priority of the category (e.g., health and safety is in general a higher priority than support facilities) as well as the priority or urgency unique to each request.

4. The matrix category itself provides the criteria by which the prioritization is made. In some instances, the criteria are quantifiable and determine the appropriate matrix designation (e.g., special classrooms below 70 percent of standard). For these criteria, available data such as inventory data and enrollment projections are used in the evaluation.

In other cases the criteria describe the conditions which are applicable for a particular matrix category (e.g., moderate health and safety problems vs. secondary health, safety and security problems). In these situations, the evaluations are based on a variety of sources. Primarily, written justifications from the schools requesting the projects are used to make a determination as to the proper matrix category. In addition, field verifications are done as needed to gain further clarification as to whether a request is of, say, moderate or secondary status.

Regulations from other government entities such as the Environmental Protection Agency or the fire department also have a bearing on establishing the priorities. For example, cesspool removal projects are considered as category 1A due to the federal mandate to convert the cesspools.

5. Within a matrix category, priorities are determined by a combination of factors, including the overall condition or deficiency (determined by school submittals and/or onsite visits), available alternatives, and length of time a school has been waiting for the project.
6. It is possible for a project's matrix designation to change over time. For example, a request for drainage improvements at a school would have its priority elevated if ground conditions at the site worsened due to a storm.
7. The CIP funding process is pulled in many different directions by various interest groups. The CIP matrix has proven to be a robust tool for objectively guiding the CIP priority process and reflecting the needs of all schools in the state. We will revisit the matrix to verify that it is continuing to meet our needs.

Attachment