		ur Regional Program Manager with any questions.	
Staff Evaluation Objective, based on backup documents, provided to the board and added to their scores Scale= 1-3 pts (as outlined below)		Board Evaluation Subjective, based on information in application Scale = 0-5 pts 0=Incomplete, 1=Disagree, 2= Marginal, 3=Somewhat Agree, 4=Agree, S=Strongly Agree	
I. Priority: Based on the identified deficiencies and proposed solutions, the division would categorize this application as Priority XX.	No Score	 Priority: Based on the identified deficiencies and proposed solutions, the division would categorize this application as Priority XX. 	No Score
2. Demonstrated Need: The proposed project is supported by the Facility Condition Index (FCI) from the st assessment, or an assessment provided by the applicant.	atewide facility		
High: The FCI AND additional assessment fully supports the project	3	 Historic Contributions: Historically the applicant has contributed a suitable amount towards the capital needs of their facilities, given available resources. 	0-5 possible
Mid: The FCI OR additional assessment partially supports the project	2		
Low: The FCI and/or additional assessment conflicts with the project	1		
3. Planning: Facility Master Plan has been			
High: Completed or updated within the last 5 years	3	3. Deficiencies: The deficiencies presented in the application are compelling.	0-5 possible
Mid: Completed greater than 5 years ago; or partial master plan, facility systems audit or capital planning effort completed, or narrow scope and conditions do not necessitate further planning	2		
Low: Not completed and scope warrants further planning	1		
I. Deficiencies: Deficiencies well supported by statewide facility assessment System Requirements and Ade and/or additional investigations undertaken by the applicant	equacy Items		
High: Deficiencies are supported by both CDE's facility assessments AND additional assessments performed by an outside entity within the last 5 years.	3	4. Solution Addresses Deficiencies: The solution presented by the applicant effectively and efficiently resolves all critical deficiencies noted within the application.	0-5 possible
Mid: Deficiencies are supported by CDE's facility assessments OR applicant provided additional assessments do support it.	2		
Low: Deficiencies are not supported by either CDE's facility assessments or third-party assessments.	1		
 Solution: Appropriate due diligence demonstrated and provided appropriate submittal documents for th project. 	e scope of the	5. Appropriate Solution: The scope of work proposed in the solution appears to be reasonable and well planned.	0-5 possible
High: Solution is supported by complete submittal requirements based on project type, demonstrating appropriate due diligence.	3		
Mid: Solution somewhat supported by complete submittal requirements based on project type, partially demonstrating due diligence.	2		
Low: Solution supported by incomplete submittal documents, inadequately demonstrating due diligence.	1		
5. Project Cost: The costs are clear, align with the solution presented and well supported by backup documents.		6. Time Sensitivity: The project is urgent in nature.	0-5 possible
High: Complete Detailed Project Budget submitted with appropriate soft/hard costs and multiple contractor quotes provided to support the hard costs.	3		o o possible
Mid: Complete Detailed Project Budget submitted with appropriate soft/hard costs and a single or partial contractor quote(s) provided to support the hard costs.	2	 Future Commitment: The applicant has demonstrated a suitable commitment to the maintenance and renewal of this proposed project upon completion. 	0-5 possible
Low: Complete Detailed Project Budget not submitted and/or contractor quotes missing to support the grant project budget.	1		
. Project Size: The proposed project uses facility square footage efficiently for the student population and ase of narrow scope projects, the affected area of the project is supportable and appropriate for the prop vork.		8. Efficient Use of Funds: The project cost is appropriate and an effective use of state resources.	0-5 possible
High: Gross sf/pupil and program appears efficient relative to the current and/or projected enrollment, and scope area is supportable (including narrow scope projects)	3		

Scoring Rubric

Total points/2

Staff Total Possible Points

Mid: Square footage inefficiencies exist, however the project is of a narrow scope and area is supportable.

High: Applicant has or intends to meet or exceed CDE's procurement policy for all vendors.

Mid: Applicant has or intends to follow their local policy, which is not as restrictive as CDE's policy.

Low: Applicant doesn't intend to follow CDE's procurement policy and has not provided copy of local policy

resolve stated issues.

Low: Square footage does not appear to be utilized efficiently and/or project area exceeds necessary scope to

3. Procurement: The applicant has or is willing to follow CDE's procurement policy to pursue a fair, competitive, and ransparent selection process for contractors and consultants or has identified a reasonable alternative.

2

1

3

2

1

10.5

Total Maximum Combined Points 52.5

Board Total Possible Points

0-5 possible

0 (no) or 2 (yes) possible

42

9. Partnership Efforts: The applicant has illustrated concerted efforts to leverage available state and

local resources or community partnerships to enhance their financial contribution to the project.

10. Supplemental Grants: This application is for supplemental assistance to complete a previously

awarded BEST grant, due to compelling unforeseen circumstances.