



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
P.O. BOX 2360
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96804

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT

November 19, 2020

TO: The Honorable Kenneth Uemura
Chairperson, Finance and Infrastructure Committee

FROM: Dr. Christina M. Kishimoto
Superintendent

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "CK", is placed over the name "Dr. Christina M. Kishimoto".

SUBJECT: **Committee Action on Department of Education's priority criteria for executing Capital Improvement Program projects, in accordance with Board Policy 301-10, Equitable Allocation of Facilities Resources (FIC Strategic Priority 2)**

I. **Executive Summary**

To ensure all students have safe, accessible, and supportive school facilities, the Hawaii State Department of Education (HIDOE) is proposing the attached Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Prioritization Criteria to allocate CIP resources equitably, effectively, and transparently per the Board of Education (Board) Policy 301-10, Equitable Allocation of Facilities Resources Policy. This equitable allocation takes into account the socioeconomic and academic needs of each school's student population.

II. **History of Subject Matter**

During the July 18, 2019 General Business Meeting, the Board adopted as one of the Finance and Infrastructure Committee (FIC) strategic priorities for the 2019-2020 school year to "establish the policies and structures necessary to direct and enable the Department [of Education] to complete all facilities projects at its schools with the greatest socioeconomic and academic needs as determined by a priority order intended to advance equity" (FIC Strategic Priority 2)¹.

¹http://boe.hawaii.gov/Meetings/Notices/Meeting%20Material%20Library/GBM_20190718_Action%20on%20standing%20committee%20strategic%20priorities%20for%20SY%202019-2020.pdf

At its August 15, 2019 meeting, FIC approved the work plan and timeline to ensure Board policies and structures enable the HIDOE to complete all facilities projects at our schools with the greatest socioeconomic and academic needs as determined by an equity priority order (FIC Strategic Priority 2). As part of its work plan, FIC would recommend for Board approval (1) a policy related to equitable school facilities that would, at a minimum, sufficiently direct the HIDOE to complete Capital Improvement Program (CIP) projects at our schools by order of greatest socioeconomic and academic needs and (2) an effective criteria sufficiently based on equity for the HIDOE to use to appropriately determine the priority order in which it executes CIP projects.²

During the September 19, 2019 FIC meeting, Superintendent Dr. Christina Kishimoto presented a draft Board policy entitled “Equitable School Facilities.” Due to concerns regarding equity, FIC elected to defer action on the draft Board policy.³

During the October 3, 2019 FIC meeting, Committee Chairperson Kenneth Uemura tasked Committee Vice Chairperson Bruce Voss to revise the draft equitable school facilities policy and tasked HIDOE to draft priority criteria for executing CIP projects. The draft policy and draft priority criteria would be presented to FIC at its November 21, 2019 meeting.⁴

During the November 21, 2019 FIC meeting, the committee unanimously voted to adopt Committee Vice Chairperson Voss’s proposed policy, which is now Board Policy 301-10, Equitable Allocation of Facilities Resources.⁵ FIC deferred action on the HIDOE’s priority criteria for executing CIP projects to its January 16, 2020 meeting to allow the HIDOE to fully incorporate the new policy as described in Committee Vice Chairperson Voss’s memorandum dated November 21, 2019⁶.

During the November 21, 2019 General Business Meeting, the Board unanimously voted to adopt Committee Vice Chairperson Voss’s proposed policy language, which is now Board Policy 301-10, Equitable Allocation of Facilities Resources.⁷

²<https://alala1.k12.hi.us/STATE/BOE/Minutes.nsf/7d59b00aff8d3cf50a2565cb00663e82/8b834d24799fe30b0a25847400716305?OpenDocument>

³<https://alala1.k12.hi.us/STATE/BOE/Minutes.nsf/7d59b00aff8d3cf50a2565cb00663e82/a26d56d5e9affdc30a2584a3000ca400?OpenDocument>

⁴<https://alala1.k12.hi.us/STATE/BOE/Minutes.nsf/7d59b00aff8d3cf50a2565cb00663e82/0a3407867caf4bb90a2584b400082eea?OpenDocument>

⁵<https://alala1.k12.hi.us/STATE/BOE/Minutes.nsf/7d59b00aff8d3cf50a2565cb00663e82/2b92768f8d5a463a0a2584dc006b32e0?OpenDocument>

⁶http://boe.hawaii.gov/Meetings/Notices/Meeting%20Material%20Library/FIC_2019-11-21_%20Board%20Action%20on%20new%20Board%20Policy%20on%20equitable%20facilities.pdf

⁷<https://alala1.k12.hi.us/STATE/BOE/Minutes.nsf/ebb43af14ca5cdb30a2565cb006622a8/e19678a1be9c850e0a2584c2000446e5?OpenDocument>

At its February 20, 2020 meeting, FIC deferred action on the HIDOE's priority criteria for executing CIP projects to the Committee's April 16, 2020 meeting to provide the HIDOE with additional time to ensure that (1) all of the questions posed by committee members at previous meetings are answered; (2) the proposals fulfill the intent of the Board policy on Equitable Allocation of Facilities Resources; and (3) the proposals fulfill the Board's expectations, as described in Committee Vice Chairperson Voss's November 21, 2019 memorandum.⁸

The April 16, 2020 FIC meeting was cancelled due to the COVID-19 related state closure and a refocusing of HIDOE efforts on the global health pandemic.

III. **Purpose of Report**

Board Policy 301-10, Equitable Allocation of Facilities Resources was adopted to enable HIDOE to complete all facilities projects at our schools with the greatest socioeconomic and academic needs to advance equity (FIC Strategic Priority 2). To effectively implement Board Policy 301-10, the HIDOE was tasked with drafting priority criteria for executing CIP projects.

Both socioeconomic and academic needs were factored into the establishment of the proposed priority criteria for executing CIP projects. Socioeconomic needs are identified using a current list of schools eligible for support under Title I, Part A (Title I) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). Title I is the federal education program that provides financial assistance to local educational agencies and schools with high numbers or high percentages of children from low-income families to help ensure that all children meet state academic standards.

Academic needs are identified using a current list of schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement under the Hawaii Consolidated State Plan for ESSA. The Comprehensive Support and Improvement schools are schools with performance challenges that warrant the extensive support from federal and state resources for improvement. The HIDOE identifies schools for comprehensive support and improvement once every three years.

The proposed priority criteria for executing CIP projects was created to ensure (1) a baseline requirement of safe and accessible facilities and (2) facilities that support the socioeconomic and academic needs of a school's student population as defined in Committee Vice Chairperson Voss's November 21, 2019 memorandum. The resulting

⁸<https://alala1.k12.hi.us/STATE/BOE/Minutes.nsf/7d59b00aff8d3cf50a2565cb00663e82/7c066c6a29916d1f0a25853d00086b4b?OpenDocument>

CIP priority list will inform the Office of Facilities and Operations budget request as part of the HIDOE's budget process.

FIC approval of the proposed priority criteria for executing CIP projects will enable the HIDOE to proceed with completing our facilities projects in an equitable manner.

IV. **List of Key Issues**

During the time following the February 19, 2020 FIC meeting, the HIDOE reviewed the newly-adopted Board policy 301-10, Equitable Allocation of Facilities Resources and revisited and updated our priority criteria, which informed the following responses to previous Board questions:

1. Describe the process the HIDOE used to develop its priority criteria for executing CIP projects in accordance with the new facilities Board policy.

During the last nine months, the HIDOE reviewed and evaluated the previous processes and priority criteria for executing CIP projects. To conduct this work, a committee was formed with three engineers, two architects and one facilities planner who each brought their unique expertise and background in R&M and/or CIP projects to the process. Due to the demands that the COVID-19 pandemic brought upon our schools and complex areas and the need to focus on mitigating the impact of the public health emergency on our students' education, the Office of Facilities and Operations opted to not include representatives from complex area-level and school-level leadership on this committee. As the demands of COVID-19 lessen, broader representation from the complex area and school-level leadership will be included in the future for any updates to the prioritization criteria.

Through its review of the previous processes and criteria, the committee determined that the previous CIP priority matrix, which used four categories with five levels of priority in each category, was too limiting. The category of Health, Safety, Security and Emergency overruled all other criteria and there was no procedure to prioritize for equity, or the socioeconomic and academic needs of students.

A new prioritization criteria, with a rating scale and weights added to each item, was thus created and used in sample rankings of CIP projects. The inclusion of weights, a decision-making strategy sometimes referred to as a Pugh analysis, allows the four-point rating scale to stay consistent (critical/crucial to neutral) while addressing the importance of each criteria. During these trial rankings, item

descriptions were fine-tuned, weights were adjusted, and consensus was reached on the final proposed prioritization criteria.

2. Describe how the criteria meets the outcomes described in the new facilities Board policy memorandum.

The proposed criteria will provide HIDOE the means to rank the CIP project needs in a manner that will allow the HIDOE to allocate CIP resources equitably, accounting for student socioeconomic and academic needs while meeting safety and accessibility needs.

3. Describe how the criteria aligns with the policy's intent and the Board's expectations as described in the new facilities Board policy memorandum and as described during the November 21, 2019 FIC meeting.

The CIP prioritization criteria aligns with the policy's intent of ensuring that all schools will meet a baseline of safety and accessibility by providing higher weights to the criteria which address safety and accessibility. Of the nineteen criteria, in three categories, the criterion including accessibility carries the highest possible score of 48 followed by a maximum score of 40 for health and safety.

To address the importance of the socioeconomic needs of students, a criteria with a 20-point score is now included for schools that are identified as eligible for Title I support.

An additional criteria, with a score of 12, is reserved for schools with high academic needs as identified by the current list of schools needing comprehensive support and improvement services under the Hawaii State Consolidated Plan for ESSA.

4. Describe how the Department will quantify the needs described in FIC Strategic Priority 2 and further described in the new facilities Board policy memorandum.

FIC Strategic Priority 2 is to ensure Board policies and structures enable the HIDOE to complete all facilities projects at our schools with the greatest socioeconomic and academic needs as determined by an equity priority order.

The Board policy passed to meet this priority includes direction for the HIDOE to allocate CIP resources equitably, effectively, and transparently. The new CIP prioritization criteria will be used to create the CIP project list for CIP budget requests, allowing for a more equitable allocation of funds. The first CIP project

list under this new criteria will be submitted to the Budget and Finance Office in December 2020 for the FY 2021-23.

In addition, the CIP projects will be grouped into eight Lump Sum categories for the budget request which allows for more effective completion of CIP projects in two ways:

- 1) Funds will be released in a timely manner. When the budget is presented and appropriated as individual line items, the level of effort on the already lean workforce is over seven times greater during the allotment request phase of each project. The paperwork for each allotment request is worked on by six different people before leaving the Office of Facilities and Operations, and the level of effort continues with the Department of Budget and Finance, negatively impacting the time before funds are approved and released by the governor and work can begin.
- 2) The HIDOE will be able to make minor adjustments in the budget of each project within the lump sum category over the course of our design and construction phases. If one project is underfunded, the HIDOE will have the flexibility to use the funds allotted for another project that will be completed under budget to allow work to continue. The HIDOE will not have to wait an entire year for additional funds to become available in the next budget cycle to complete the underfunded project.

The proposed CIP prioritization criteria becomes public once the Board approves it and HIDOE is ramping up the use of our CIP Project Tracking System, an online platform to track the status of CIP projects, to increase transparency.

5. Describe how the Department will address capacity, current structures, demand, sufficiency, procurement, staffing, wages, and any other issues relating to implementation.

The HIDOE is currently looking to modernize our operations within the Office of Facilities and Operations to address some of the issues that may arise with the implementation of this endeavor.

Our next steps will include a comparison of the HIDOE prioritization criteria to the prioritization criteria other states use for their CIP allocations. The process of allocating CIP funds in other states differ from our process due to the delineation between state funding and school district funding. However, school facility prioritization issues will be similar in states with a variety of school districts

(urban, suburban and rural), and states with similar climates and geography (cooling, hurricanes, sea level rise).

6. Include discussion points, rationale, and an analysis of the priority criteria being proposed.

The proposed CIP prioritization criteria builds off of past efforts, such as the CIP priority matrix and earlier iterations of prioritization criteria, and the need for a weighted system to balance the variety of CIP program needs. It includes nineteen different criteria, including criteria to address the socioeconomic and academic needs of schools and other HIDOE goals and directives such as being fiscally responsible and placing value on shared use of facilities.

To ensure a safety and accessibility baseline, as intended by Equitable Allocation of Facilities Resources policy, a category of Building Priorities which addresses Compliance, Health Safety, and Condition, is included. These priorities are heavily weighted as they address CIP needs at existing schools in order to provide that level of equity across all campuses.

New schools and capacity projects present a special challenge when prioritizing alongside safety and accessibility needs since new facilities are not correcting existing conditions. Therefore, a separate group of criteria is proposed for these projects in place of the Building Priorities.

The third category of criteria, Program Priorities, provide for the “supportive facilities” intent of the Equitable Allocation of Facilities Resources policy. These criteria address the functional and educational adequacy of a school’s facilities from the perspective of the Educational Specifications to prioritize CIP projects to improve equity across all school facilities.

Through the proposed CIP prioritization criteria, the HIDOE has a method to quantify needs of the schools statewide and prioritize the most urgent needs.

This type of weighted decision tool is necessary given the wide range of CIP project scopes. It also allows for overarching needs and Board policies to be given preference.

V. Discuss Any Financial Impact Evident In Subject Matter

No action may result in the delay of HIDOE formally submitting our CIP budget request to the Governor’s office for the 2021-2023 fiscal biennium.

The Honorable Kenneth Uemura
November 19, 2020
Page 8

Any reduction in the CIP budget allocation will negatively impact the HIDOE's ability to complete CIP projects.

VI. **Describe Any Community Or Public Engagement**

The Office of Facilities and Operations Facilities Development Branch developed this CIP prioritization criteria based in part on prior input from the community during the 2018 stakeholder advisory group process for the Statewide Facilities Master Plan.

VII. **Recommendation**

The HIDOE recommends that the Board approve the proposed CIP Prioritization Criteria (see attachment).

CMK:rmt

Attachment: Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Prioritization Criteria

c: Office of Fiscal Services
Office of Facilities and Operations
Facilities Development Branch

Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Prioritization Criteria

Maximum Total Score (from 3 different categories)						268			
BOE/DOE Priorities Score						100			
Building Priorities Score (Maximum 120 pts)			or New Schools or Classroom Bldg (Max. 84 pts)			120			
Program Priorities Score						48			
A	BOE / DOE Priorities		Score	Weight	Total Score				
A.1	BOE Policy 301-10 Equitable Allocation of Facilities Resources	Socioeconomic Needs: School with Title 1 status for Sch Year 2020/21 given full points	4	5	20				
A.2		Academic Needs: School given full points if identified as "CSI" by the latest ESSA report	4	3	12				
A.3	Office of Facilities and Operations Goals/Directives Considerations for cost effectiveness, timing and implementation, and other OFO criteria considerations needed to balance out projects in the six diverse CIP program areas	Fiscally Responsible: Immediate funding needed for a specific reason (ie Kihei/LUC)	4	5	20				
A.4		Shared Use: Facility at one campus is intended for use by others (ie CTE, Athletics, Multipurpose)	4	5	20				
A.5		Cost Value/System: Full pts if the project is a past priority, partial if it has current or past funding	4	2	8				
A.6		Geographically Isolated: points for schools that have no option for shared use	4	1	4				
A.7		Standardization/Prototype: development of prototypes leads to future efficiencies/cost savings	4	1	4				
A.8		High Utilization (ie classrms vs auditorium-not used everyday; syn. turf - multi use field vs baseball)	4	1	4				
A.9		Strategic Location	4	1	4				
A.10		Community Use	4	1	4				
						BOE & DOE Priorities Score	100		
B		Building Priorities	Critical 4	Urgent 3	Prudent 2	Practical 1	Neutral 0	Max. Score	Weight
B.1	Compliance Building Codes, ADA, Title IX Gender Equity	Risk to life (means of egress, fire suppression, vertical circulation not per code, handrail height, etc)	Risk to health / Risk of Litigation	Limiting Access (architectural barriers)	Well Being (psychological, development)	Compliant	4	12	48
B.2	Health Safety Public Safety; Environmental Hazards/Heat Abatement/Security/ Flood Mitigation /Campus Traffic, etc	Severe Bodily Harm (death, loss of limb, paralyzation, etc.)	Compromise Health (immediately assessible toxins, severe exposure to the elements, etc.)	Dangerous Situation (lead paint, extended heat exposure, campus security, etc.)	Unnecessary Risk (flooded areas, poor traffic management, etc.)	No Risk	4	10	40
B.3	Condition Building Systems: structural /electrical/hvac/water-sewer/roof/telecom /fire systems-alarm, expired building, etc.	Imminent Failure (of systems that can cause bodily harm or immediate health risk) (OR demo/replace)	Predicted Failure	Compromised Condition (inadequate electricity, system showing failure-excessive wear, damage, etc.)	Doesn't meet modern Building Standards	New Facilities*(no points since it doesn't fix problems - Unless demolishing & replacing old)	4	8	32
						Building Priorities Score	120		

Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Prioritization Criteria

b	New Schools / Capacity (in place of Building Priorities)	4	3	2	1	0	Max. Score	Weight	Total Score
		b.1	Capacity Projected enrollment vs. capacity of school and neighboring Schools. Need multiple schools or new classrooms? In general, no school in new subdivision is more important than school that is crowded.	Projected enrollment is much higher than capacity, by more than 2 new school.	Projected enrollment is higher than capacity by a full school. Distance to closest school (with space) is really far away.	Enrollment projected to be 30% beyond capacity. Distance to closest school with space is far away.			
b.2	Certainty of long term need Temporary or long term problem? Development size overwhelming? Factors for likelihood of plan changes? New 6th grades or detrack certain? Old structures about to be torn down?	Enough projected students for two (2) new schools. Very certain of need	Enough projected students for more at least one (1) new schools	Enough projected students for many new classrooms (20+) with needs for at least 20 years. Detrack likely	Enough projected students for a new classroom building (8+) with needs for at least 20 years. De-track possible	Crowding fluctuates pending enrollment projection, of about 4 classrooms or so, pending on school size.	4	7	28
b.3	Timing How quickly will the school crowding problem happen? Speed of enrollment growth? Are old structures already falling apart? Is this follow through construction phasing required to open school? Master plan?	School and surrounding schools are already too crowded and have had difficulty operating for years already. New subdivision still growing quickly.	School and surrounding schools are already quite crowded.	School and surrounding schools projected to be extremely crowded due to various reasons.	School and surrounding school projected to be kind of crowded and there is time to react.	Time not an issue	4	5	20
New Schools Priorities Score									84
C	Program Priorities	Crucial	Essential	Necessary	Desirable	Neutral	Max. Score	Weight	Total Score
		4	3	2	1	0			
C.1	Functional Capacity To support student enrollment: new schools, building additions, classrooms, dining capacity, restrooms, (replace portables?), etc.	Inoperable/ program needs exceed available SF by more than 40%	Grossly Deficient/ programs needs exceed available SF by 30% - 40%	Inadequate/ program needs exceed available SF by 20%-30%	Program needs exceed available SF by 10%-20%	Meets current Ed. Spec.	4	6	24
C.2	Instructional Spaces Special Education, Career Tech Ed, STEM, Arts Language/Cultural Immersion, etc.	Non Existent	Severely Limited (less than 50% of req'mnts, i.e. # of rooms or severe lack of space, out of date equipt./tech.)	Dysfunctional lack of space negatively affects curriculum elec capacity needed modernization needed	Compromised lack of space inhibits learning outdated infrastructure	Meets current Ed. Spec.	4	4	16
C.3	Admin/Support Library, Gyms, PE Athletics, Food service, Admin, parking, etc. (Not including Auditoriums or Pools)	Non Existent	Severely Limited (less than 50% of req'mnts, i.e. # of rooms or severe lack of space, out of date equipt./tech.)	Dysfunctional lack of space negatively affects operations, elec capacity needed, modernization needed	Compromised, lack of space inhibits operations, outdated infrastructure	Meets current Ed. Spec.	4	2	8
Program Priorities Score									48