

*Recommended by the Facilities Advisory Committee*  
**SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION**  
**CAPITAL FUNDING GOALS**  
**FOR**  
**PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS**

The following goals have been formulated to guide the Commission on Higher Education in making capital funding recommendations to the Governor and the General Assembly.

**STATEWIDE GOALS**

- To ensure campus health and safety by supporting projects designed to remedy existing issues that adversely affect human well being
- To address critical deferred maintenance needs of the institutions, thereby protecting the State's capital investment in higher education
- To alleviate problems resulting from critical enrollment and/or programmatic growth, including needs for state-of-the-art academic space.
- To support needs that are significant to continuing economic development in the state or service area

Points will be assigned on related standards and rating criteria. A maximum of 100 points may be generated through related standards and a maximum of 100 points may be generated through the rating criteria. Projects will be rated according to the total combined number of points generated, up to a maximum of 200 points overall.

**Related Standards applicable to all projects:**

Each proposed project will be reviewed and rated for consistency and compatibility with the following related standards.

1. The degree to which the proposed project is critical and central to the institution's approved mission – **up to 24 points.**
2. The degree to which the proposed project's ultimate outputs (e.g., degrees awarded by discipline, number of graduates, type and volume of research, etc.) are adding critical capacity and functionality to address defined state needs – **up to 24 points.**
3. The degree to which the need for the quantity and type of space can be defended through the application of objective space analysis, including space guidelines and appropriateness of offerings – **up to 20 points.**
4. The degree of non-capital improvement bond funding included in the project and/or documented savings and/or operational cost increase avoidance – **up to 12 points.**
5. The proposed project is consistent with the institution's Facilities Master Plan – **up to 10 points.**
6. Documentation that all alternatives have been explored and that the proposed remedy is the best option available – **up to 10 points.**

**Maximum points available through related standards – 100**

**Rating Criteria:****Health and Safety – Up to 25 points**

1. The degree to which an existing condition can be documented to be unsafe and unhealthy for human well being.
2. The appropriateness of the proposed solution to the defined health or safety issue.
3. The degree that the institution's and the State's well being would be adversely impacted through discontinuance of activities if the defined health and safety issues are not addressed.

**Deferred Maintenance – up to 25 points**

1. The degree to which the proposed project addresses deferred maintenance needs as reported in the institution's CHEMIS submission using a rolling average over the most recent three-year period.
2. The degree to which the institution's expenditures for building maintenance compare with the amount generated for building maintenance in the MRR (according to the percent funded) using a rolling average for the most recent three-year period.

**Enrollment and Programmatic Growth – up to 25 points**

1. The degree to which a space shortage can be objectively supported through space analysis both on an institutional macro level as well as the micro level of a particular program(s).
2. The degree to which the need for the outputs of the additional proposed space cannot be met through alternative delivery systems (e.g., distance learning technologies, etc.).

**Economic Development – up to 25 points**

1. The degree to which the proposed project can be shown to be consistent with the State's and/or service area's priorities for continuing economic development as defined by appropriate economic development entities (e.g., the State, Local, or Regional Departments of Commerce).
2. The degree to which the proposed project is a critical component of an articulated State, regional, or community comprehensive economic development plan.
3. The proportion of other overall economic development project funding commitments made by external parties to the institution that are critical to the overall success of the proposed economic development initiative.

**Maximum points available through rating criteria – 100****Other considerations: Essential Sequencing of Multiple Projects**

Projects that require a phasing sequence with other projects in the ranking list will be listed in the order required. An example of a phasing requirement would be a utility plant expansion request that would need to be completed before a new building request could come on line due to insufficient existing utilities capacities. If the rankings established by the process outlined in this document do not place projects in the appropriate phasing sequence, then the project rankings will be revised accordingly. This would be accomplished by ranking all other projects involved in the phasing sequence behind the initial phase project. If the second phase project has a higher percentage point total, then it will be moved to immediately after the first phase project. The rationale would continue for the third and subsequent phase projects as necessary. *(This may be used for projects that have received partial funding and for which the institution can document a continuing critical need and/or to differentiate between projects that have the same scores.)*