PINELLAS COUNTY SCHOOLS

I. CAPITAL OUTLAY GUIDELINES

A. Introduction

The educational plant, including buildings, equipment and grounds, is an important factor in the functioning of the total educational program. The nature, design and condition of the educational plant have an impact on student achievement, performance, self-concept and safety. It is the intent of the Pinellas County Schools to provide reasonable assurance that educational plants in the District contribute to the educational program and have a positive impact on student achievement, performance, self-concept and safety.

To this end, the planning, maintenance, operation and improvement of school and support plants, including facilities and sites, should serve to create physical environments that are conducive to learning and to successful implementation of programs designed to meet the educational needs of the students in the Pinellas County Schools. Each plant should be:

- Functional; that is, suitable to and adequate for existing programs
- Adaptable, to meet changing program needs
- Safe
- Sanitary
- Comfortable
- Attractive
- Energy efficient

B. Long-Range Facility Planning Commitment

The Pinellas County School District is committed to long-range, research-based planning and decision making in the design, construction, maintenance, operation and improvement of existing and new facilities. The District shall maintain a long-range facilities work program (“plan”) that relates school plant utilization, improvement and maintenance to educational goals and programs. This plan shall be annually updated to reflect the District's progress, as well as changing program, fiscal, demographic, technological, energy and other conditions. The District shall also maintain educational and materials specifications for school plants as supporting documents to its long-range facilities plan. These specifications shall specifically address the matters of facility capacity, energy efficiency and technology. Facility capacity can be defined in terms of physical site capacity or program design capacity. Preference shall be given to program design capacity over physical capacity whenever economically and administratively feasible, to achieve the District's educational goals as addressed through program design.

C. Capital Outlay Strategies
The Pinellas County School District is committed to a capital outlay planning and decision making process that is based on the District’s strategic directions and on established criteria. This approach is designed to provide the greatest benefits to the District in the most cost-effective manner through the expenditure of available capital funds. In this context, programs or projects promoting economy, efficiency and payback features should be funded, provided they are not detrimental to the educational program or to other capital needs. The capital outlay program in the District shall be developed and sustained using the following criteria as decisions are made regarding the importance of projected expenditures.

- **Safety, Health and Security Needs.** Safety, health and security needs affecting students and employees shall be funded.

- **Legal Requirements.** Applicable legal mandates shall be met and maintained by the funding system.

- **Student Capacity.** Adequate housing for students shall be provided and maintained in a functional configuration.

- **Existing Program Commitments.** Existing program commitments shall be funded to the extent that: affected programs become and remain fully functional; the school retains its accreditation status; and a systematic process is utilized to provide equality of facilities throughout the District.

- **Upgrading or Retrofitting Existing Facilities.** Instructional, support and administrative space and equipment shall be systematically assessed and scheduled for upgrading and retrofitting initiatives designed to complement the functions provided through these spaces.

- **Future Directions and Programs.** Future directions and programs which are not required to meet legal mandates or by accreditation standards could be funded.

In assessing potential capital outlay projects, the following data sources are to be utilized: annual district fire and safety reports; the District’s school plant survey; area and district maintenance assessments; technology plan; equipment and vehicle replacement schedules; pupil assignment projections; revenue projections; and school improvement plans.

A Capital Outlay Committee shall be established to prioritize the capital needs of the district into a multi-year plan. This plan shall be submitted to the Superintendent as part of the annual budgetary process.
II. CAPITAL OUTLAY PRIORITY SETTING SYSTEM

A. “Flow Chart” of Review & Approval Process

```
Area Superintendents and District Contact
Facilities Design & Construction and Maintenance
Capital Outlay Committee
Superintendent
School Board

Capital Outlay Criteria & Data Sources

Five-Year Educational Plant Survey, Annual Updated Needs, & Five-Year District Capital Outlay Work Program (annually updated)
```

B. Priority Matrix (Sample only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>(1) Safety, Health &amp; Security (0 - 10)</th>
<th>(2) Legal Requirements (0 - 10)</th>
<th>(3) Student Capacity (0 - 10)</th>
<th>(4) Existing Programs (0 - 10)</th>
<th>(5) Upgrading or Retrofitting (0 - 10)</th>
<th>(6) Future Directions &amp; Programs (0 - 10)</th>
<th>(7) Special Considerations (tbd)</th>
<th>Total Points (0 - 60)+</th>
<th>Estimated Cost of Project</th>
<th>General Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eagle’s Nest High</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>$8,600,000</td>
<td>(7) per School Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigeon's Roost Middle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>$4,250,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparrow Hill Elementary</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$2,275,000</td>
<td>(7) per School Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Priority Setting Process
**Step 1.** Staff reviews the latest Educational Plant Survey, any updated needs identified subsequent to the Survey, and other capital outlay data sources.

**Step 2.** Area Superintendents, assisted by Area Maintenance Supervisors (AMS’s) and appropriate staff (including Curriculum & Instruction program staff), validate capital project needs with school/site managers. The district-level contact validates district-level and district-wide project needs with appropriate managers. The scope of the work to be rated, using the priority rating system, is determined at this step.

**Step 3.** Area Superintendents and the district-level contact, assisted by Facilities Design & Construction (FD&C) and Maintenance staff, “screen” projects over $0.5 million and prepare a preliminary grouping of projects as Immediate, Intermediate or Out-Year. The capital outlay guidelines and data sources are utilized in this preliminary screening process. Projects under $0.5 million, and certain projects identified as maintenance capital outlay or infrastructure projects, will be addressed using the capital outlay priority-rating criteria (step 4) by the Project Committee, working with appropriate staff (AMS’s, FD&C, Maintenance, etc.).

**Step 4.** Beginning with the Immediate group, projects are rated by a cross-functional team from FD&C, Maintenance, Operations, and other appropriate "experts". Project ratings are performed using the Capital Outlay Criteria (see part D. Priority Point System). Each criterion is assigned a point range, with a maximum of 60 total points for the six categories (excluding Special Considerations). A lower score indicates lower priority and a higher score indicates higher priority. The capital outlay guidelines and data sources are utilized in this rating process, with responsibility for rating as shown in part D. Priority Point System.

**Step 5.** The Capital Outlay Committee reviews the resulting recommendations of the cross-functional team and either accepts the ratings as recommended or modifies the ratings using the criteria, recommendations and data sources.

**Step 6.** The Capital Outlay Committee prioritizes projects across a five-year time period based on project ratings, projected available funding, and other special considerations.

**Step 7.** “Special cause” projects, such as projects involving safety issues or specific Board-identified priorities, may be accelerated on the timeline. Justification is required for any points added to a project’s rating under this provision.

**Step 8.** The Capital Outlay Committee submits the proposed (Tentative) Five-Year Capital Outlay (Facilities) Work Program (“Plan”) to the Superintendent and School Board for approval.

**Step 9.** The Superintendent and School Board review the recommended plan and either accept or modify project priorities, timelines and costs.

**Step 10.** Staff conducts a public hearing to review the (Tentative) Five-Year Capital Outlay Work Program and to receive public input.

**Step 11.** After again reviewing the tentative five-year work program and subsequent public input, the School Board adopts the Five-Year Capital Outlay Work Program.

**Step 12.** The Capital Outlay Committee monitors progress of the five-year plan on a regular basis. Annually, the committee recommends any necessary adjustments to the plan resulting from updated revenue projections, progress of current projects, newly identified capital needs, changing conditions and mandates, or other factors affecting the capital outlay program.
D. PRIORITY POINT SYSTEM

For each category, scores must be supported by appropriate data source(s). The score for a project is computed by assigning the most appropriate number of points per category to the project, and then totaling the points. The total number of possible points for a project ranges from 0 to 60, for categories (1) through (6). The addition of points to the total as a result of any special considerations [category (7)] requires accompanying justification.

(1) SAFETY, HEALTH & SECURITY

Any need classified as ‘imminent danger’ will be corrected immediately.

Points
10 … Safety, health or security needs must be addressed within two (2) years.
6 … Safety, health or security needs should be addressed within three (3) to five (5) years.
3 … Safety, health or security needs can be addressed in conjunction with any construction project.

Rating Responsibility: Area Superintendents, Area Maintenance Supervisors, Facilities Design & Construction, Maintenance, Capital Outlay Committee

Related Data Sources: Annual District Fire & Safety Reports; Educational Plant Survey; Area and District Maintenance Assessments; Sub-Project Review Committee (Sub-PRC) Reports and Recommendations; School Improvement Plans; OSHA Reports; SACS Self-Studies and Accreditation Reports; Indoor Air Quality Reports; County Health Department Reports.

(2) LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

Points
10 … Compliance with legal requirements required within two (2) years.
6 … Compliance must be completed within three (3) to five (5) years.
3 … Compliance can be addressed in conjunction with any construction project.

Rating Responsibility: Facilities Design & Construction, Maintenance, Pupil Assignment, Capital Outlay Committee

Related Data Sources: Educational Plant Survey; District Desegregation Plan; Federal, State or Other Audits; Agency Notifications; Americans With Disabilities Act; AHERA; SREF; SACS Self-Studies and Accreditation Reports.
(3) STUDENT CAPACITY

Based on five-year enrollment projections. Needs cannot be satisfactorily addressed through school zoning.

Points
10 … Five-year projections exceed existing permanent student stations by 25%.
9 … Five-year projections exceed existing permanent student stations by 20%.
8 … Five-year projections exceed existing permanent student stations by 15%.
7 … Additional permanent student stations are required to replace unsatisfactory capacity.
6 … Additional permanent student stations are required for mandated program expansion.
5 … Additional student stations are needed for planned program expansion.
4 … Five-year projections exceed existing permanent student stations by 10%.
3 … Additional student stations are needed for desirable program expansion.
2 … Adequate student capacity is provided for Five-Year Work Program.
1 … Student stations (capacity) are not affected.
0 … Permanent student capacity is negatively impacted.

Rating Responsibility: Pupil Assignment, Area Maintenance Supervisors, Facilities Design & Construction, Capital Outlay Committee

Related Data Sources: District Enrollment Projections; Educational Plant Survey; Inventory of Relocatables; County Demographic and Growth Data; Desegregation Plan; Florida Inventory of School Houses (FISH).

(4) EXISTING PROGRAMS

Including equality of program initiatives.

Points
10 … Mandated by State or School Board.
8 … Required to meet accreditation standards.
6 … Accommodates authorized instructional or other program initiatives or program discontinuation.
4 … Converts existing space to meet changing program functions.
2 … Provides desirable program space.

Rating Responsibility: Curriculum & Instruction, Area Superintendents, Facilities Design & Construction, Capital Outlay Committee

Related Data Sources: District Comprehensive Plan; Education Plant Survey; District Instruction & Curriculum Plans; District Technology Plan; School Improvement Plans; SACS Self-Studies and Accreditation Reports.
(5) **UPGRADING OR RETROFITTING**

*Including equality of facilities and equipment, adequacy of site, and protection of investments.*

**Points**

10 … At or exceeds anticipated life cycle.
8 … Addresses highest priority infrastructure needs, including inadequate site size.
5 … Supported by performance-based replacement payback or potential operating cost savings.
3 … Addresses lower priority infrastructure needs.

**Rating Responsibility:** Area Superintendents, Area Maintenance Supervisors, Facilities Design & Construction, Maintenance, Capital Outlay Committee

**Related Data Sources:** Educational Plant Survey; Equipment Replacement Schedules; Vehicle Replacement Schedules; FISH; District Technology Plan; Area and District Maintenance Assessments; Maintenance Department Project Data Base; Sub-Project Review Committee Reports and Recommendations; School Improvement Plans; Energy Utilization Reports; A Tradition of Excellence (History of Pinellas County Schools).

(6) **FUTURE DIRECTIONS AND PROGRAMS**

*Including increased effectiveness and efficiency of program delivery.*

**Points**

10 … Facilitates implementation of new initiatives to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of program delivery.
8 … Increases effectiveness and efficiency in usage of facilities or equipment.
6 … Increases flexibility in usage of facilities or equipment.
3 … Converts existing facilities or equipment to new “state-of-the-art” delivery systems.

**Rating Responsibility:** Curriculum & Instruction, Area Superintendents, Facilities Design & Construction, Maintenance, Capital Outlay Committee

**Related Data Sources:** District Comprehensive Plan; Education Plant Survey; District Instruction & Curriculum Plans; District Technology Plan; School Improvement Plans.

(7) **SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

*Any other special considerations affecting facilities and the capital outlay program that are not covered by criteria (1) through (6) above.*

**Points:** To be determined, based on justification provided.

**Rating Responsibility:** This determination may be recommended by staff in preparing the Five-Year Work Program; by the Superintendent in recommending the Work Program to the School Board; or by the School Board in reviewing the plan or in assessing public input. See Step 7 in part C. **Priority Setting Process.**

**Related Data Sources:** Varies.