

Scoring Rubric

The below table outlines the revised BEST Scoring Rubric, starting in the FY26 grant round. Staff will use the eight evaluation criteria below to help support applicants and share details of supporting documentation with the board. The board will have the Staff Evaluation available for their consideration while scoring their ten evaluation criteria. The total Staff Evaluation score will be added to the total Board Evaluation score and both will be accounted for in the overall score, and eventual ranking, of projects. Please reach out to your Regional Program Manager with any questions.

Staff Evaluation		Board Evaluation		
Objective, based on backup documents, provided to the board and added to their scores Scale= 1-3 pts (as outlined below)		Subjective, based on information in application Scale = 0-5 pts 0=Incomplete, 1=Disagree, 2= Marginal, 3=Somewhat Agree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree		
	Staff Points		Board Points	
STAFF EVALUATION		PRIORITY		
1. Priority: Based on the identified deficiencies and proposed solutions, the division would categorize this application as Priority XX.	No Score	1. 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 statewide facility assessment, or an assessment provided by the applicant.		CURRENT CONTEXT		
High: The FCI AND additional assessment fully supports the project	3	2. Historic Contributions: Historically the applicant has contributed a suitable amount towards the capital needs of their facilities, given available resources. [Question I.G, Question I.H]	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. Deficiencies: The deficiencies presented in the application are compelling. [Question II.D and II.E, Facility Insight]	0-5 possible	
3. Planning: Facility Master Plan has been...				
High: Completed or updated within the last 5 years	3			
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	PROJECT PROPOSAL	0-5 possible	
Low: Not completed and scope warrants further planning	1			
4. Deficiencies: Deficiencies well supported by statewide facility assessment System Requirements and Adequacy Items and/or additional investigations undertaken by the applicant				
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 Effectiveness: The solution presented by the applicant effectively and efficiently resolves all critical deficiencies noted within the application. [Question II.F]	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			
5. Solution: Appropriate due diligence demonstrated and provided appropriate submittal documents for the scope of the project.		5. Appropriate Due Diligence: The scope of work proposed in the solution appears to be feasible and well planned based on due diligence. [Question II.G]	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 minimally supported by incomplete submittal documents, inadequately demonstrating due diligence.	1	6. Time Sensitivity: The project is urgent in nature. [Question II.H]	0-5 possible	
6. Project Cost: The costs are clear, align with the solution presented and well supported by backup documents.				
High: Complete Detailed Project Budget submitted with appropriate soft/hard costs and multiple contractor quotes provided to support the hard costs.	3			
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	FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS	0-5 possible	
Low: Complete Detailed Project Budget not submitted and/or contractor quotes missing to support the grant project budget.	1			
7. Project Size: The proposed project uses facility square footage efficiently for the student population and program. In the case of narrow scope projects, the affected area of the project is supportable and appropriate for the proposed scope of work.				
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	7. Future Commitment: The applicant has demonstrated a suitable commitment to the maintenance and renewal of this proposed project upon completion. [Question II.J]	0-5 possible	
Mid: Square footage inefficiencies exist, however the project is of a narrow scope and area is supportable.	2			
Low: Square footage does not appear to be utilized efficiently and/or project area exceeds necessary scope to resolve stated issues.	1			
8. Procurement: The applicant has or is willing to follow CDE's procurement policy to pursue a fair, competitive, and transparent selection process for contractors and consultants or has identified a reasonable alternative.		8. Efficient Use of Funds: The project cost is appropriate and an effective use of state resources.	0-5 possible	
High: Applicant has or intends to meet or exceed CDE's procurement policy for all vendors.	3			
Mid: Applicant has or intends to follow their local policy, which is not as restrictive as CDE's policy.	2			
Low: Applicant doesn't intend to follow CDE's procurement policy and has not provided copy of local policy.	1	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. [Question III.W]	0-5 possible	
Staff Total Possible Points				10.5
				42
		Board Total Possible Points	42	
		Total Maximum Combined Points	52.5	

Total points/2

Final Staff Recommendation

Project exceeds staff standards and demonstrates readiness for funding	10.5
Project meets staff standards and demonstrates readiness for funding	9.5-10
Project may benefit from additional time and planning	8.5-9
Additional time and planning needed	8 or below

Updated FY27