

Capital Development Priority Guidelines: Prioritization

Quantitative Scoring Rubric

Industry/Economic Demand (30%)

How the project fulfills Utah industry/economic demand.

5 points: Majority of programs supported by project on High-Yield Award List (*High Yield*)

4 points: Majority of programs supported by the project lead to jobs within GOEO’s targeted industries (*GOEO*), and/or lead to jobs paying at or above the local or statewide average wage (*Wage +*)

3 points: Majority of programs supported by the project lead to jobs of significant importance as evidenced by local employers (*Locally Significant*)

2 points: Less than a majority but a significant number of programs supported by the project are High Yield, GOEO, Wage +, and or Locally Significant

1 point: Some programs supported by the project are High Yield, Wage +, GOEO, and or Locally Significant

0: No evidence that the project supports industry/economic demand

Utilization (30%)

Utilization of existing space in the project’s category(ies) based on the Board’s Room Utilization Rate (RUR) & Seat Occupancy Rate (SOR) standards.

15 points: >= 100% of RUR standard

(0.5 points per additional 1% of RUR standard above 70%)

0 points: <70% of RUR standard

15 points: >= 100% of SOR standard

(0.5 points per additional 1% of SOR standard above 70%)

0 points: <70% of SOR standard

Space Need (15%)

How the project addresses an institution’s existing space needs in the project’s space category(ies).

Points allocated based on % of classroom, teaching lab, open lab, automotive/construction/and research lab space need that the project addresses

Imminent Non-functionality (10%)

If the project addresses building conditions that have reached a level of imminent non-functionality on account of a catastrophic event or critical life safety, fire, or seismic deficiencies

0 points for most projects; it is anticipated that points will be awarded in rare circumstances, based on consultation with DFCM

Cost Effectiveness (10%)

Cost-effectiveness of the project based on the DFCM cost database (all projects must meet the standard of cost-effectiveness established in Board Policy R741, Threshold Requirements for Capital Development Project Requests)

3 points: Cost per square foot for project type less than or equal to DFCM cost database average

2 points: Cost per square foot for project type between 100% and 110% of DFCM cost database

1 point: All other projects

Alternative Funds (5%)

Share of project costs supported by alternative funds (including value of land donations)

	Research	Regional	Community/Tech
5 points:	75% or more	61% or more	47% or more
4 points:	50% - 74.9%	41% - 60.9%	32% - 46.9%
3 points:	30% – 49.9%	25% - 40.9%	20% - 31.9%
2 points:	10% - 29.9%	9% - 24.9%	8% - 19.9%
1 point:	5% - 9.9%	5% - 8.9%	3% - 7.9%

Qualitative Board Assessment

The Board will evaluate projects for compliance with minimum threshold requirements and competitiveness with respect to the quantitative scoring rubric above. The Board may adjust the results of the quantitative scoring ranking based on a qualitative assessment of how well the project supports system-level strategic pillars of Access, Completion, Financial Value, and Economic Development, or other Board considerations (e.g. projected state revenue environment, specific workforce development and placement objectives, etc.).