



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

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT

December 3, 2020

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

FROM: Dr. Christina M. Kishimoto
Superintendent

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 (Department) is proposing the attached Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Prioritization Criteria to allocate CIP resources equitably, effectively, and transparently per the Board of Education (Board) 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 (GBM), 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 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.

At its August 15, 2019 meeting, FIC approved the work plan and timeline to ensure Board policies and structures enable the Department to complete all facilities projects

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

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 Department to complete CIP projects at our schools by order of greatest socioeconomic and academic needs and (2) an effective criteria sufficiently based on equity for the Department to use to appropriately determine the priority order in which it executes CIP projects.²

During the September 19, 2019 FIC meeting, the Department 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 Department 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 Department's priority criteria for executing CIP projects to its January 16, 2020 meeting to allow the Department to fully incorporate the new policy as described in Committee Vice Chairperson Voss's memorandum dated November 21, 2019⁶.

During the November 21, 2019 GBM, 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

At its February 20, 2020 meeting, FIC deferred action on the Department's priority criteria for executing CIP projects to the Committee's April 16, 2020 meeting to provide the Department with additional time to ensure that (1) all of the questions

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>

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 Department efforts on the global health pandemic.

At its November 19, 2020 meeting, FIC deferred action on the Department's priority criteria for executing CIP projects to the Committee's December 3, 2020 meeting to provide time for the Department to make revisions based on the discussion and recommendations of the meeting. (Committee minutes pending.)

III. Purpose of Report

Board Policy 301-10, Equitable Allocation of Facilities Resources was adopted to enable the Department 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 Department 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 (CSI) under the Hawaii Consolidated State Plan for ESSA. The CSI schools are schools with performance challenges that warrant the extensive support from federal and state resources for improvement. The Department identifies schools for CSI once every three years.

The proposed priority criteria for executing CIP projects incorporates factors to ensure (1) a baseline requirement of healthy, 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.

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

Board approval of the proposed priority criteria for executing CIP projects will enable the Department to proceed with completing its facilities projects in an equitable manner.

IV. List of Key Issues

1. FIC Strategic Priority 2 is to ensure Board policies and structures enable the Department to complete all facilities projects at 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 Department 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 criteria allows projects across the four lump sum categories of Capacity, Instructional, Support and Compliance to be ranked against each other to provide the overall prioritized list of CIP projects within the given budget. The first CIP project list under this new criteria is due to the Budget and Finance Office in December 2020 for the Fiscal Year (FY) 2021-2023 biennium budget.

2. The proposed criteria also provides the Department the means to rank the CIP project needs in a manner that will allow the Department to allocate CIP resources equitably, accounting for student socioeconomic and academic needs while also meeting compliance, health, safety and accessibility needs.
3. 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 accessibility and safety. Of the 19 criteria, in three categories, totaling 308 points, the criterion for health and safety carries the highest possible score of 48 followed by a maximum score of 40 for compliance, which includes accessibility concerns such as complying with the Americans with Disabilities Act and Title IX for gender equity.
4. To address the importance of the socioeconomic and academic needs of students, two additional 40-point criterion (one for each area) are included. Together, the socioeconomic needs and academic needs total score accounts for 26% of the total points.
 - i. The socioeconomic criteria is based on schools that are identified as eligible for Title I support.

- ii. The academic needs criteria 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.
5. Through the proposed CIP prioritization criteria, the Department has a method to quantify the needs of schools statewide and to prioritize the most urgent needs. This type of weighted decision tool is necessary given the wide range and scope of CIP projects. This tool will also allow the Department to incorporate comprehensive facilities condition information into the prioritization hierarchy as assessment information becomes available.

V. Discuss Any Financial Impact Evident In Subject Matter

No action may result in the delay of the Department formally submitting its CIP budget request to the Governor's office for the FY 2021-2023 fiscal biennium.

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

VI. Describe Any Community Or Public Engagement

OFO has engaged with the complex area superintendents who will reach out to their complex area principals for input on the weighted scoring rubric and list of DMP priority projects. Moving forward, OFO will incorporate school input as a standard practice in conjunction with identifying and prioritizing CIP and DMP plans.

VII. Recommendation

The Department recommends that the Board approve the proposed CIP Prioritization Criteria (see attachment B1).

CMK:rmt
Attachment: B1 - CIP Prioritization Criteria

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

Maximum Total Score (from 3 different categories)		308
BOE/DOE Priorities Score		140
Building Priorities Score (Maximum 120 pts)	or New Schools Priority (Maximum 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 I status for School Year 2020/21 given full points	4	10	40
A.2		Academic Needs: School given full points if identified as "CSI" by the latest ESSA report	4	10	40
A.3	Office of Facilities and Operations (OFO) Goals/Directives Consideratons for cost effectiveness, timing and implementation, and other OFO criteria considerations needed to balance out projects in the six diverse CIP program areas	Shared Use: Facility at one campus is intended for use by others (ie CTE, Athletics, Multipurpose)	4	5	20
A.4		Community Use: Facility can be shared through Use of Facilities program	4	4	16
A.5		Standardization/Prototype: Development of prototypes leads to future efficiencies/cost savings	4	4	16
A.6		Geographically Isolated: Points for schools that have no option for shared use	4	1	4
A.7		High Utilization: Classrms vs auditorium - not used everyday; Synthetic turf/multi use field vs baseball	4	1	4
BOE & DOE Priorities Score					140

Use 'B' for existing facilities and use 'b' for new schools

B	Building Priorities	Critical	Urgent	Prudent	Practical	Neutral	Max. Score	Weight	Total Score
		4	3	2	1	0			
B.1	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 identifiable 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	12	48
B.2	Compliance (Accessibility) Building Codes, ADA, Title IX Gender Equity	Risk to lifemeans 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	10	40
B.3	Condition Building Systems: structural, electrical, hvac, water/sewer, roof, telecom, fire alarm systems, 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 Facility* (no points since it doesn't fix problems, unless new project includes demolition of old)	4	8	32
Building Priorities Score									120

Attachment B1 - Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Prioritization Criteria

b	New Schools / Capacity (in place of Building Priorities criteria)	4	3	2	1	0	Max. Score	Weight	Total Score
b.1	Review of Current Capacity Projected enrollment vs. capacity of school and neighboring schools. Need multiple schools or new classrooms on existing campus?	Projected enrollment is much higher than available capacity (projections show 2 new schools needed) by more than 2 new school.	Projected enrollment is higher than capacity by a full school. No nearby schools with available 'seats' in consistent quantity to accommodate growth.	Enrollment projected to be 30% beyond capacity. Distance to closest school with available 'seats' is beyond reasonable bus commuting distance.	Enrollment projected to be 20% beyond capacity. Distance to a closest school with available 'seats' is unreasonable for student commuting.	Some consistently available 'seats' at surrounding schools.	4	9	36
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? Are old structures beyond useful life / slated to be demolished?	Enough projected students for two (2) new schools. Very certain of need.	Enough projected students to require at least one (1) new school.	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? Completing a 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; and nearby development continues to increase student counts.	School and surrounding schools <u>projected</u> to be extremely crowded due to various reasons.	School and surrounding school <u>projected</u> to be crowded and there is time to react.	Time not an issue.	4	5	20
New Schools Priority Score									84

C	Program Priorities	Crucial 4	Essential 3	Necessary 2	Desirable 1	Neutral 0	Max. Score	Weight	Total Score
C.1	Functional Capacity To support student enrollment: new schools, building additions, classrooms, dining capacity, restrooms, (replace portables?), etc.	Inoperable/ program needs exceed available square footage (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 Educational Specifications (Ed Specs).	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 requirements, i.e. # of rooms or severe lack of space, out of date equipment/technology).	Dysfunctional lack of space negatively affects curriculum electrical capacity needed, modernization needed.	Compromised lack of space inhibits learning, outdated infrastructure.	Meets current Ed Specs.	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 Specs.	4	2	8
Program Priorities Score									48