

Public School Capital Construction Assistance Board Meeting Agenda



COLORADO
Department of Education

Vision

All students in Colorado will become educated and productive citizens capable of succeeding in a global society, in the workforce, and in life.

Goals

Every student, every step of the way



Date & Time:

July 23, 2014
1:00 p.m.

Location:

Double Tree Hotel, Iris Room
550 Village Road
Breckenridge, CO 80424

Capital Construction Assistance Board Members

Lyndon Burnett – Chair
John Conklin
Kathy Gebhardt

Ken Haptonstall
Denise Pearson
Tim Reed

David Tadlock
Matt Throop

- I. Call to order
- II. Pledge of Allegiance
- III. Roll call
- IV. Approve agenda
- V. Approve previous minutes from the May 20-21st, June 10th, June 25th, and July 17th, 2014 meetings
- VI. Board Report
- VII. Director's Report
- VIII. Discussion Items
 - a) Discuss new matching percentage for school district and BOCES grant applications;
 - b) Discuss the results of the 2014 BEST customer satisfaction survey;
 - c) Discuss "lessons learned" from the FY2014-15 BEST grant selection meetings;
- IX. Future meetings
 - August 27th, 2014 – 9:00am. Location: 890 Auraria Parkway, Suite 440A, Denver, 80204
 - September 24th, 2014 – 1:00pm. Location: 201 E. Colfax Avenue, Room 101, Denver, CO 80203
 - October 22nd, 2014 – 1:00pm. Location: 201 E. Colfax Avenue, Room 101, Denver, CO 80203
- X. Public comment
- XI. Adjournment.

PUBLIC SCHOOL CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE BOARD AGENDA SHEET

MEETING DATE: July 23, 2014

SUBJECT: Discuss new matching percentage for school district and BOCES grant applications

TYPE: Action Information X

BACKGROUND (Include any statutory authority):

Recommendation 3 of the audit states The Public School Capital Construction Assistance Board (Assistance Board) should take steps to better ensure that matching funds requirements reflect the financial capacity of the district and to ensure equity in the process.

To accomplish this the audit recommended evaluating whether statutory change is necessary to allow the Assistance Board to use the remaining bonded indebtedness capacity as a factor in determining the match percentage required from each district and whether adjustments are needed to the other statutory factors that should be considered when calculating the matching funds requirements.

Additionally, the audit recommended developing a methodology to determine the matching funds required for each school district that correlates them with school district's financial capacity to provide matching funds.

Capital Construction Assistance Board Response:

The Public School Capital Construction Assistance Board believes it is advisable to incorporate bonded indebtedness limits as a factor into the statutory matching funds formula to better assess the financial capacity of applicants. The Board will also evaluate the appropriateness of other statutory factors and work with the General Assembly to make statutory changes.

The Capital Construction Assistance Board will incorporate the new statutory criteria into the existing matching calculation to ensure the match accurately reflects school district financial capacity.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Review the proposed Capital Construction Assistance Board's subcommittee matching calculation, the proposed weighting factors and discuss any further changes to the new matching calculation for school districts and BOCES.

STAFF RECOMMENDED MOTION (If this is an action item)

N/A

ATTACHMENTS:

BEST Match Matching Percentage Calculation Narrative
140702 – New Match Calculation – Final

School District Minimum Matching Calculation for BEST Grant Applicants

The BEST Grant requires each applicant to provide a local contribution to the project in the form of a match. To determine the financial capacity for a school district, a match percentage is calculated annually using criteria identified in 22-43.7-109(9)(a) C.R.S. The range of all school district matching percentages is normalized so the statewide average is approximately 50%. Below is a guide explaining how school district minimum match percentages are calculated. The following criteria are considered when determining the applicant's minimum matching percentage:

- Per pupil assessed valuation;
- The district's median household income (using the most current census data);
- Percentage of pupils eligible for free or reduced cost lunch;
- Current bond mill levy;
- Unreserved general fund balance;
- Current bond capacity remaining;
- Bond election failures and successes in the last 10 years.

The per pupil assessed valuation, district median household income, percentage of pupils eligible for free or reduced cost lunch, current bond mill levy, unreserved general fund balance and current bond capacity remaining for each school district are individually sorted and assigned a number 1-178. The number, 1-178, represents the school district's rank relative to the statewide average for any given criteria.

Example: 1

District	PPAV	Rank PPAV	Household Income	Rank Household Income	FRED	Rank FRED	Bond Mill Levy	Rank Bond Mill Levy	Unreserved General Fund Balance	Rank Unreserved General Fund Balance	Bond Capacity Remaining	Rank Bond capacity Remaining
A	\$100,000	30	\$30,000	67	79%	7	4.2	34	\$350,000	35	\$1,000,000	92
B	\$ 79,000	11	\$40,000	172	34%	89	11	4	\$700,000	98	\$20,000	2
C	\$217,000	107	\$25,000	8	25%	114	0	80	\$1,500,000	120	\$12,000,000	114

After each criteria is assigned a rank, the rank is then multiplied by a normalization factor and a weighting factor to produce a matching percentage for that individual criteria.

The normalization factor is used to cap the overall matching requirement at 100% and generate a statewide average of 50%. To achieve this, 100 is divided into 178 to produce a normalization factor of .5618.

The Weighting factor is used to assign a specific weight to each statutory criteria.

Example: 2

District	Rank PPAV	PPAV Normalized and Weighted at 10%	Rank Household Income	Household Income Normalized and Weighted at 10%	Rank FRED	FRED Normalized and Weighted at 10%	Rank Bond Mill Levy	Bond Mill Levy Normalized and Weighted at 20%	Rank Unreserved General Fund Balance	Unreserved General Fund Balance Normalized and Weighted at 25%	Rank Bond capacity Remaining	Bond capacity Remaining Normalized and Weighted at 25%
A	30	3%	67	4%	7	1%	34	4%	35	5%	92	13%
B	11	1%	172	10%	89	5%	4	1%	98	14%	2	1%
C	107	6%	8	1%	114	6%	80	9%	120	17%	114	16%

All the individual criteria percentages are then combined to arrive at a minimum matching requirement for those specific criteria.

Example: 3

District	PPAV Normalized and Weighted at 10%	Household Income Normalized and Weighted at 10%	FRED Normalized and Weighted at 10%	Bond Mill Levy Normalized and Weighted at 20%	Unreserved General Fund Balance Normalized and Weighted at 25%	Bond capacity Remaining Normalized and Weighted at 25%	Combined Criteria Percentages
A	3%	4%	1%	4%	5%	13%	30%
B	1%	10%	5%	1%	14%	1%	32%
C	6%	1%	6%	9%	17%	16%	55%

The final matching percentage takes the matching percentage listed in example 3 and subtracts 1% for each bond election failure and success during the last 10 years to arrive at the final minimum matching requirement for a school district.

Example: 4

District	Number of Bond Election Successes	Number of Bond Election Failures	Final Minimum Adjusted Match Percentage
A	0	0	30%
B	1	2	29%
C	2	0	53%

BOCES matching percentages are calculated by taking an average of the member districts matching percentages that comprise a particular BOCES to give that BOCES a unique matching percentage.

Proposed School District Minimum Matching Calculation for BEST Grant Applicants

DISTRICT CODE	COUNTY	DISTRICT/BOCES/CSDB	OLD BEST FY14-15 ADJUSTED MINIMUM DISTRICT MATCH	NEW Minimum Match Using Weighted Criteria	Difference (G and D)	RANK OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME	RANK OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME WEIGHTED	RANK OF FREE REDUCED LUNCH	RANK OF FREE REDUCED LUNCH WEIGHTED	RANK OF PPAV	RANK OF PPAV WEIGHTED	RANK MILL LEVY	RANK MILL LEVY WEIGHTED	RANK BOND CAPACITY REMAINING	RANK BOND CAPACITY REMAINING WEIGHTED	RANK UNRESERVED GENERAL FUND BALANCE	RANK UNRESERVED GENERAL FUND BALANCE WEIGHTED	BOND ELECTION EFFORTS ADJUSTMENT	NUMBER OF BOND ELECTIONS PASSED LAST 10 YEARS 2004 thru 2013	NUMBER OF BOND ELECTIONS FAILED IN LAST 10 YEARS 2004 thru 2013
						L TO H	10%	H TO L	10%	L TO H	10%	H TO L	20%	L TO H	25%	L TO H	25%			
COLORADO PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS																				
2780	ROUTT	SOUTH ROUTT RE 3	62%	52%	-10%	131	7.40	119	6.72	130	7.34	66	7.46	95	13.42	58	8.19	-1%	1	0
0250	BACA	SPRINGFIELD RE-4	35%	39%	4%	14	0.79	42	2.37	57	3.22	135	15.25	51	7.20	69	9.75	0%	0	0
0470	BOULDER	ST VRAIN RE 1J	53%	64%	11%	160	9.04	143	8.08	63	3.56	15	1.69	139	19.63	149	21.05	-1%	1	0
2770	ROUTT	STEAMBOAT SPRINGS RE-2	81%	84%	3%	156	8.81	171	9.66	146	8.25	108	12.20	158	22.32	152	21.47	-1%	1	0
0060	ADAMS	STRASBURG 31J	59%	52%	-7%	171	9.66	162	9.15	47	2.66	45	5.08	64	9.04	112	15.82	-1%	1	0
1480	KIT CARSON	STRATTON R-4	49%	35%	-14%	80	4.52	55	3.11	78	4.41	135	15.25	42	5.93	12	1.69	0%	0	0
3000	SUMMIT	SUMMIT RE-1	79%	82%	4%	158	8.93	145	8.19	158	8.93	102	11.53	170	24.01	138	19.49	-1%	1	0
2570	OTERO	SWINK 33	32%	31%	-1%	83	4.69	113	6.38	12	0.68	29	3.28	19	2.68	90	12.71	-1%	1	0
2830	SAN MIGUEL	TELLURIDE R-1	88%	68%	-20%	169	9.55	154	8.70	171	9.66	135	15.25	160	22.60	9	1.27	-1%	0	1
1560	LARIMER	THOMPSON R-2J	54%	74%	20%	139	7.85	126	7.12	64	3.62	57	6.44	163	23.02	174	24.58	-1%	1	0
1580	LAS ANIMAS	TRINIDAD 1	33%	41%	8%	24	1.36	32	1.81	86	4.86	101	11.41	112	15.82	37	5.23	-1%	0	1
1828	LOGAN	VALLEY RE-1	31%	49%	18%	49	2.77	83	4.69	51	2.88	44	4.97	96	13.56	135	19.07	-1%	1	0
0260	BACA	VILAS RE-5	42%	28%	-14%	8	0.45	81	4.58	75	4.24	135	15.25	21	2.97	7	0.99	0%	0	0
0230	BACA	WALSH RE-1	57%	51%	-7%	75	4.24	86	4.86	110	6.21	135	15.25	56	7.91	87	12.29	0%	0	0
2505	MORGAN	WELDON VALLEY RE-20(J)	43%	36%	-8%	46	2.60	130	7.34	40	2.26	90	10.17	33	4.66	60	8.47	0%	0	0
2190	MONTROSE	WEST END RE-2	46%	48%	2%	25	1.41	66	3.73	109	6.16	135	15.25	78	11.02	68	9.60	-1%	0	1
1340	GRAND	WEST GRAND 1-JT	71%	69%	-3%	136	7.68	111	6.27	160	9.04	113	12.77	124	17.51	96	13.56	-2%	1	1
0070	ADAMS	WESTMINSTER 50	18%	45%	28%	89	5.03	6	0.34	29	1.64	8	0.90	103	14.55	154	21.75	-1%	1	0
0990	EL PASO	WIDEFIELD 3	46%	65%	19%	133	7.51	102	5.76	7	0.40	83	9.38	128	18.08	166	23.45	0%	0	0
2515	MORGAN	WIGGINS RE-50(J)	41%	41%	0%	105	5.93	50	2.82	73	4.12	59	6.67	69	9.75	81	11.44	0%	0	0
2680	PROWERS	WILEY RE-13 JT	48%	45%	-3%	104	5.88	69	3.90	31	1.75	135	15.25	39	5.51	88	12.43	0%	0	0
3100	WELD	WINDSOR RE-4	60%	63%	4%	168	9.49	168	9.49	79	4.46	14	1.58	132	18.64	131	18.50	-1%	1	0
3020	TELLER	WOODLAND PARK RE-2	58%	64%	6%	141	7.97	137	7.74	74	4.18	60	6.78	121	17.09	146	20.62	0%	0	0
3070	WASHINGTON	WOODLIN R-104	48%	43%	-5%	16	0.90	51	2.88	139	7.85	135	15.25	55	7.77	59	8.33	0%	0	0
3210	YUMA	WRAY RD-2	44%	53%	9%	84	4.75	60	3.39	100	5.65	74	8.36	99	13.98	111	15.68	-1%	1	0
3200	YUMA	YUMA 1	41%	57%	17%	53	2.99	39	2.20	107	6.05	88	9.94	111	15.68	144	20.34	0%	0	0
AVERAGE			48.96%	50.82%		89.50	5.06	89.50	5.06	89.50	5.06	84.19	9.51	89.50	12.64	89.50	12.64	-0.85%	58.43%	26.97%
LOW			5%	8%	-28%	1.00	0.06	1.00	0.06	1.00	0.06	1.00	0.11	1.00	0.14	1.00	0.14	-0.04	0.00	0.00
HIGH			90%	90%	37%	178.00	10.06	178.00	10.06	178.00	10.06	135.00	15.25	178.00	25.14	178.00	25.14	0.00	2.00	4.00
RANGE			85%	82%	65%	177.00	10.00	177.00	10.00	177.00	10.00	134.00	15.14	177.00	25.00	177.00	25.00	0.04	2.00	4.00

PUBLIC SCHOOL CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE BOARD AGENDA SHEET

MEETING DATE: July 23, 2014

SUBJECT: Discuss the results of the 2014 BEST customer satisfaction survey

TYPE: Action Information X

BACKGROUND (Include any statutory authority):

Every year the Division conducts a client satisfaction survey for all grant applicants who participated in the previous BEST grant cycle and for all grantees who were awarded a BEST grant prior to the previous grant cycle. The goal is to receive feedback in a continued attempt to improve our processes, procedures and resources available for BEST grant applicants, grantees and all Colorado K-12 schools. This survey is designed for School Districts, Charters, BOCES and Colorado School for the Deaf and Blind who have participated in the BEST grant program. The Division received 47 total responses from the 105 grantees and applicants the survey was sent to.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Please review the attached list of survey questions and summary of results.

STAFF RECOMMENDED MOTION (If this is an action item)

N/A

ATTACHMENTS:

FY2014 BEST Customer Satisfaction Survey

FY2014-15 BEST Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

Question	Favorable Response	Average Response	Unfavorable Response	Key Comments
Applicant Name (Optional):	NA	NA	NA	NA
Project Title/Description (Optional):	NA	NA	NA	NA
Did you apply for a BEST grant in 2014?	55.3% Applicant		44.7% Existing Grantee	
How would you describe the BEST grant online application?	80.70%	19.30%	0.00%	
How would you describe the technical assistance provided to you by Division Staff to help complete the BEST grant application process?	76.90%	23.10%	0.00%	
Please rate the BEST FY2014-15 grant cycle selection process performed by the Capital Construction Assistance Board.	61.50%	34.50%	0.00%	4% answered "did not attend the meeting"
Based on your response, what would you suggest to improve the grant selection process?	Waiver evaluation could be improved; One comment stating evaluation scores felt arbitrary.			
Did the grant selection meeting venue meet your expectations? (i.e. good location, video, audio, access to restaurants & hotels)	76.00%	4.00%	4.00%	16% answered "did not attend"; one unfavorable result stated the desire to have meeting outside Denver
Specific to the grant selection meetings is there any other feedback you would like to offer to the Division Staff or Capital Construction Assistance Board?	Overall pleased with the process; one comment stated their appeared to be bias amongst reviewers			
Did you receive an award for your BEST FY2014-15 grant application?	72% Yes		28% No	
Have your funding reimbursements been processed in a timely manner?	75.00%	NA	16.70%	8.30% answered "have not submitted a funding request yet"
Based on your response, did Division Staff explain the issues causing the delay?	Largely yes, one comment stated Division is very picky about dollar differences as small as a penny; one comment said long turn around times			
Are the reports and forms required as part of the BEST grant easy to use and understand?	85.30%	NA	14.70%	Required backup is concerning; Assessment data is difficult to update
Is the Division of Capital Construction website user-friendly and easy to navigate?	64.70%	NA	14.70%	20.60% answered "Have not visited the website"; Division website is easier to use than main CDE website
The Division of Capital Construction website offers many resources for Colorado K-12 school facilities. Do you find these resources valuable?	64.70%	NA	8.80%	26.50% answered "Have not visited the website"; Assessment data is difficult to update
Level of satisfaction with the technical support received for ability to provide a thorough understanding of the program requirements	76.00%	18.00%	6.00%	A few comments indicated they would like more training or guidance on what is required and when; One comment indicated they felt the requirements changed during the process; One comment suggested more resources for charter schools; Overall good comments on staff and program support
Level of satisfaction with the technical support received for Division staff works in a collaborative manner with the grantee and consultants	79.00%	12.00%	9.00%	
Level of satisfaction with the technical support received for Division staff is available when needed	79.00%	15.00%	6.00%	
Level of satisfaction with the technical support received for communication is timely, thorough and appropriate	74.00%	12.00%	15.00%	
Level of satisfaction with the technical support received for provided resources to manage the grant project effectively	74.00%	24.00%	3.00%	
Level of satisfaction with the technical support received for provided value-added knowledge and support to the project	71.00%	21.00%	9.00%	
Were there any Division processes or procedures in place that hindered productivity or caused hardships on the grant project?	66.70%	NA	33.30%	Changes to proceses mid-project; Backup required for funding requests.
Any other comments or recommendations you have to help make this program the "BEST" it can be?	More local control; More flexibility with FF&E items			

Positive:

- 47 respondents this year up from 33 last year
- Technical assistance provided by staff to help complete the online application
- Grant selection process was effective, transparent, but at times a little difficult to follow
- Venue met everyone's expectations
- Information & resources on website are valuable
- Technical assistance provided as a whole

Needs Improvement

- Online application is somewhat difficult to navigate
- Funding request reimbursement turnaround time – from Lease-Purchase projects
- Process for updating assessment data
- Website – needs to be more user friendly

PUBLIC SCHOOL CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE BOARD AGENDA SHEET

MEETING DATE: July 23, 2014

SUBJECT: Discuss lessons learned from the FY2014-15 BEST grant selection meetings

TYPE: Action Information X

BACKGROUND (Include any statutory authority):

The Capital Construction Assistance Board, with the support of the Division, is focused on continually improving its processes and procedures to provide better customer service to our applicants and stakeholders. Each year the Capital Construction Assistance Board holds a “lessons learned” meeting to evaluate the effectiveness of the processes and procedures performed during the prior grant cycle and to identify areas of improvement for future grant cycles.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Discuss Capital Construction Assistance Board and Division’s lessons learned from the prior grant cycle. Discuss proposed changes to the grant application, review process, grant selection meetings and the Capital Construction Assistance Board evaluation sheets.

STAFF RECOMMENDED MOTION (If this is an action item)

N/A

ATTACHMENTS:

None