

DATE: July 20, 2016

SUBJECT: Drive to 55 Capacity Building Fund Criteria

ACTION RECOMMENDED: Approval

BACKGROUND

On June 28, THEC staff released the Drive to 55 Project Capacity Fund grant request for proposals (RFP). This grant is funded through a \$24.25 million non-recurring appropriation included in the 2016-17 budget and is intended to help public universities, community colleges, TCATs and other entities, such as the agricultural units and medical schools, increase program capacity in order to meet Drive to 55 objectives. Successful proposals will develop plans to increase academic or technical program capacities in a manner that increases postsecondary credentials that align with the state’s workforce needs.

Proposals must classify projects in one of two categories: *program expansion*—the purchase of new equipment or renovation of an existing facility to expand the capacity of an existing program; or *new capital construction/major renovation*—the construction of a new facility or the major renovation of existing facilities to expand or create programs.

Notices of Intent to apply were due Friday, July 15, and completed proposals are due Friday, October 7. The Commission will approve the final awards at the Fall Quarterly meeting in November. See Appendix A for a summary of the RFP and Appendix B for the complete RFP.

ACTION

The selection of the awards has two components. First, representatives from across state government, including the Department of Economic and Community Development and the Department of Labor and Workforce Development, will review and score proposals, as determined by the scoring rubrics outlined in the RFP.

Second, the Commission will determine the priority criteria for selection of the final approved projects. At the request of the Commission the following ideas are presented as examples of priority criteria for consideration:

1. Geographic representation across the Grand Divisions;
2. Sector representation creating a balance between community colleges, universities, TCATs, and nonformula units;
3. Industry and programmatic area representation (e.g. one recipient each from a specified group of Classification of Instructional Program [CIP] codes);
4. An agreed upon split between the two categories of projects (*program expansion* or *new capital construction/major renovation*) in overall funding;

5. An agreed upon split between the two classifications of projects in total awarded projects.

After approval of the selected criteria, THEC staff will notify institutions of the criteria. At the Fall Quarterly meeting, the Commission will combine the priority criteria and the proposal scores to determine the final approved projects.

Appendix A

Drive to 55 Project Capacity Fund Grant: Request for Proposal (RFP) Overview

The Drive to 55 Project Capacity Fund—totaling \$24.25M—will provide competitive grants to institutions to fund infrastructure costs, equipment acquisitions, facility expansions, technology needs, or new capital construction and major renovation. All Tennessee public universities, community colleges, non-formula units and TN Colleges of Applied Technology (TCATs) are eligible to submit one proposal; the Office of College of Applied Technology will serve as lead applicant for any proposal involving a TCAT project and the office may submit one proposal for each TCAT institution.

Proposals must classify projects as one of two categories: *program expansion* or *new capital construction/major renovation*. Projects that qualify as *program expansion* may entail purchasing new equipment to expand capacity of an existing program or renovating a portion of an existing facility to expand the capacity of an existing program. Those that qualify as *new capital construction/major renovation* may include new facility construction, expansion of current facilities that require significant programmatic or operation expansion, or major renovation of existing facilities that changes the function, use, or capacity of the facilities.

Each proposal must describe how the project will support the region and state's efforts to meet Drive to 55 goals of increasing higher education attainment and clearly aligning postsecondary credentials with the needs of employers. Proposals must also identify ongoing operating costs of the completed project and create a sustainability plan that describes how the institution plans to adjust—in terms of institutional capacity, personnel, dedicated funding and other resources—to support and maintain future operating costs. Because the impact on Drive to 55 goals and the sustainability of ongoing costs will differ greatly between the two categories, the RFP reports two different scoring rubrics to accommodate each of the categories:

Program Expansion:

- Project Description: 20
- Timeline: 5
- D55 Goals: 40
- Budget: 15
- Sustainability: 20

New Capital Construction/Major Renovation:

- Project Description: 15
- Timeline: 5
- D55 Goals: 35
- Budget: 15
- Sustainability: 30

THEC released the RFP on Tuesday, June 28 and institutions will submit proposals by Friday, October 7. The Workforce Subcabinet will review and score proposals and final awards will be determined by the Commission, based upon scores *and* priority criteria, such as regional representation, sector representation, etc., as determined at the Summer Quarterly Commission meeting. There is no set range for the size or number of awards granted, but grants will be awarded to projects with budgets that allow the available funding to meet these additional criteria. Grant winners will be announced at the Fall Quarterly Commission meeting in November. THEC will monitor the projects and require a progress report at the conclusion of the expansion or construction, or by December 2017, whichever comes first.

Appendix B

**Tennessee Higher
Education Commission**



**Request for Proposals and
Guidelines for Submission**

***Drive to 55
Project Capacity
Fund Grants***

Notice of Intent Deadline: July 15, 2016

Proposal Deadline: October 7, 2016

Request for Proposals

Overview 3

Drive to 55 Project Capacity Fund Details..... 3

 Eligibility 3

 Timeline 4

 Award Amounts 5

 Notice of Intent 5

 Submission of Grant Proposal..... 5

 Progress Reporting..... 5

 Sustainability 6

Proposal Components 6

Application Procedures 9

Award Administration..... 10

Appendices

Appendix A – Application Checklist 12

Appendix B – Scoring Rubric: Program Expansion 13

Appendix C – Scoring Rubric: New Capital Construction/Major Renovation..... 17

Appendix D – Application Packet 21

Appendix E – Project Budget Tennessee Board of Regents DB70 Form 27

Appendix F – Project Budget University of Tennessee DB70 Form..... 28

I. Overview

In early 2015, Governor Haslam convened a Task Force on Higher Education Infrastructure and Capacity—composed of representatives from government, higher education systems, and public institutions—and charged them with developing long-term strategies to address higher education capital and facilities issues. The Task Force broadened the definition of capital projects to include not only infrastructure but higher education’s ability to deliver and expand program capacity to support the Governor’s Drive to 55 initiative, a statewide goal to reach 55 percent postsecondary attainment by 2025.

Over several months the Task Force discussed a variety of options that would improve higher education’s ability to respond to Tennessee’s workforce and education needs through capital infrastructure and program capacity building. One option considered and supported by the task force was a capital outlay fund that would allow institutions to create new or expand existing programs. In response, the Drive to 55 Project Capacity Fund was recommended to the Governor by the Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC) for inclusion in the 2016-17 Administration Budget.

Approved by the Governor and the General Assembly, the Drive to 55 Project Capacity Fund will provide competitive grants to public institutions to fund infrastructure costs, equipment acquisitions, facility expansions, technology needs, or new capital construction and major renovation. The Drive to 55 Project Capacity Fund will help institutions increase the production of postsecondary credentials that align with regional and statewide workforce development needs.

II. Drive to 55 Project Capacity Fund Grant Details

A. Eligibility

Eligibility for the Drive to 55 Project Capacity Fund grant is based on the following criteria:

- Applicants must be a Tennessee public university, community college, non-formula unit, or the Office of Colleges of Applied Technology. The Office of Colleges of Applied Technology must serve as the lead applicant and fiscal agent for all proposals submitted on behalf of individual Tennessee College of Applied Technology (TCAT) institutions.
- A proposal must classify the project as one of the two following categories:
 - Program Expansion: A project which may entail purchasing new equipment to expand the capacity of an existing program or renovating a portion of an existing facility to expand the capacity of an existing program.

- *New Capital Construction/Major Renovation*: New facilities, additions to current facilities that require significant programmatic or operation expansion, or major renovations which change the function, use, or capacity of existing facilities. This classification may also include property acquisitions on which new facilities will be constructed and/or existing facilities will undergo major renovation with the grant.
- A proposal must address how the project will support Tennessee’s Drive to 55 efforts to increase postsecondary credentials and align those credentials with workforce needs.
- Each applicant institution may submit only one proposal. The Office of Colleges of Applied Technology may submit up to one proposal per TCAT institution.

B. Timeline

To answer questions and provide further information regarding the Drive to 55 Project Capacity Fund grant goals and application process, THEC will conduct a webinar for interested agencies and institutions on **Friday, July 8, 2016, at 10:00 AM CDT (11:00 AM EDT)**. Participation in the webinar is not required to be eligible for the grant.

Institutions must submit a statement of their intent to apply for the grant by **Friday, July 15, 2016, 4:00 PM CDT (5:00 PM EDT)**. Final proposals are due **Friday, October 7, 2016, by 4:00 PM CDT (5:00 PM EDT)**.

Relevant dates for the Drive to 55 Project Capacity Fund grant are as follows:

Drive to 55 Project Capacity Fund Grant Timeline	
Item	Date/Deadline
THEC releases D55 Project Capacity Fund Grant RFP	06/28/2016
Proposal technical assistance webinar	07/08/2016 at 10AM CDT
Deadline to submit electronic Notice of Intent to THEC	07/15/2016 by 4PM CDT
Deadline for THEC receipt of electronic grant proposal	10/07/2016 by 4PM CDT
THEC announces grant award	11/17/2016
Contracts finalized	12/2016
Grants disbursed	01/2017

C. Award Amounts

No project funding range has been set for the size or number of awards granted through the Drive to 55 Program Capacity Fund grant. However, the fund—totaling \$24.25 million—is intended to support Drive to 55 capacity needs across the state and higher education sectors. Therefore, grants will be awarded to projects with budgets that allow the available funding to meet as many different state needs as possible.

D. Notice of Intent

Letters of intent are required by applicant institutions to indicate plans to submit a grant proposal. The Office of Colleges of Applied Technology must send a letter of intent that specifies which TCATs will have grant proposals submitted on their behalf.

The letter of intent must identify a campus liaison with whom THEC will communicate for the remainder of the grant application and disbursement process. Proposals submitted on behalf of the TCATs by the Office of Colleges of Applied Technology must identify a person from the applying TCAT or the Tennessee Board of Regents that will serve as the grant liaison.

Each letter must include the signature of the university or college president or chancellor, the non-formula unit president or chancellor, or the Vice Chancellor of the Office of Colleges of Applied Technology. Letters are due from institutions to THEC via email to Steven Gentile at Steven.Gentile@tn.gov by **4:00 PM CDT (5:00PM EDT) on Friday, July 15, 2016**. The subject line should read 'Drive to 55 Project Capacity Fund Grant' with the institution's name.

E. Submission of Grant Proposal

The grant proposal submission deadline is **4:00 PM CDT (5:00 PM EDT), October 7, 2016**. Submissions should be emailed to Steven Gentile at Steven.Gentile@tn.gov. Proposals should be no longer than twelve pages (excluding the cover sheet, project abstract, table of contents, budget items, and letters of support). Neither incomplete applications nor applications received after the deadline will be considered.

THEC will announce the grants on **Thursday, November 17, 2016**, and disburse funds in **January 2017**. Please see the rubrics in Appendices B and C for scoring details for projects classified as *program expansion* and *new capital construction/major renovation*, respectively.

F. Progress Reporting

To monitor and ensure proper use of grant funds, THEC will require a detailed progress report at the conclusion of the program expansion or new capital construction/major renovation project, or by December 1, 2017, whichever comes first. THEC reserves the

right to require additional progress reports after December 1, 2017 if the planned project is not yet completed.

The progress report requirements will be contingent upon the nature of the project and will be explained upon awarding of the grant.

G. Sustainability

Proposals must address how the project will be sustained financially after either the program expansion is implemented or the construction/renovation is concluded. Applications must illustrate how the institution will maintain ongoing operating costs while continuing to increase postsecondary credentials that align with regional and statewide labor needs.

III. Proposal Components

A. Cover Page

Applicants must complete the Drive to 55 Project Capacity Fund Grant cover page and include all required signatures (Appendix D). Applicants must designate a project manager and a primary contact (these can be the same individual) to report to THEC.

Applicants should identify the contact(s) by listing first and last name, title, and contact information on the cover page.

B. Project Abstract

Applicants should include a project abstract no longer than half a page. In addition to a brief description of the project, the abstract should state whether the project classifies as a *program expansion* or a *new capital construction/major renovation* and report the requested funding for the project.

Note: The project abstract does not count toward the 12-page proposal limit.

C. Project Proposal

(Program Expansion: 25 Points; New Capital Construction/Major Renovation: 20 Points)

Proposals must include a detailed description of the project. Descriptions must classify the project as either a *program expansion* or *new capital construction/major renovation*.

- If the project is classified as a *program expansion*, the description must identify what academic or technical program is to be expanded.
 - If the *program expansion* entails purchasing new equipment, the description must identify the type, amount, and costs of equipment to be purchased to expand the program.

- If the *program expansion* is a renovation of an existing facility, the description must address how the space is to be repurposed or improved.
- If the project is classified as *new capital construction/major renovation*, the description must identify what academic or technical program will occupy the new space. The description must also specify whether the project is a new facility or an addition to a current facility that requires significant programmatic or operation expansion, or if the project is a major renovation that changes the function, use, or capacity of an existing facility.
 - If the project is a *new facility or an addition* to a current facility, the description must detail how much new gross square feet will be constructed.
 - If the project is a *major renovation*, the description must explain how the existing facility will change in function, use, or capacity.
 - If the project includes acquiring property on which a *new facility or an addition* to a current facility is to be constructed or acquiring property and an existing facility that will undergo *major renovation*, the description must verify whether or not the property has been identified for acquisition in the campus master plan's land acquisition plan.

Note: If the property is identified in the land acquisition plan, verification should include a copy of the land acquisition plan with the property properly demarcated. The inclusion of the land acquisition plan will not count toward the 12-page limit.

- For either classification, the description must report estimated annual operating costs associated with the project after expansion and/or construction/renovation is concluded.
- Institutions are not required nor expected to submit a proposal in partnership with another organization, but projects that are proposed in partnership with a local workforce or economic development agency (e.g., development district, chamber of commerce, or Local/Regional Workforce Investment Board) or another entity that is not the applying institution must include letters of support from all partnering parties.

Note: Letters of support do not count toward the 12-page limit.

- Proposal must include a timeline from January 2017 through planned completion of program expansion or construction/renovation, with grant activities—including the progress report due at the completion of the project or by December 1, 2017,

whichever comes first—and key project milestones.

D. Drive to 55 Goals

(Program Expansion: 40 Points; New Capital Construction/Major Renovation: 35 Points)

Proposals must include a description of how the project will support the region and state's efforts to meet Drive to 55 goals of increasing higher education attainment and clearly aligning postsecondary credentials with the needs of employers.

The description must include both of the following components:

- *Increased higher education attainment.* Explain to what extent the project will increase the earning of postsecondary credentials in Tennessee.
- *Clear linkages between grant activities and regional and state workforce needs.* Illustrate how the project is directly linked to addressing the workforce needs and skillset deficiencies in the region or state. Successful applications will provide a thorough description of the region or state's high-demand industrial occupations and will identify how the proposed program addresses the identified demonstrable regional or state workforce need in those areas.

Preferred data sources to help address the above descriptions are the following:

- THEC *Master Plan for Tennessee Postsecondary Education 2015-2020* (<https://www.tn.gov/assets/entities/thec/attachments/MasterPlan2025.pdf>);
- THEC/Boyd Center for Business and Economic Research labor supply/demand reports (e.g., <http://cber.haslam.utk.edu/pubs/mnm130c.pdf> or https://www.tn.gov/assets/entities/thec/attachments/SupplyandDemand_011415.pdf);
- Tennessee Department of Labor and Workforce Development Occupations in Demand reports (<https://www.tn.gov/workforce/topic/occupations-in-demand>);
- Data provided by the Tennessee Department of Economic and Community Development's Center for Economic Research in Tennessee (CERT) (<https://www.tn.gov/ecd/>).

E. Project Budget

(Program Expansion: 15 Points; New Capital Construction/Major Renovation: 15 Points)

Proposals must include a completed DB70 form reflecting the project's budget. The DB70 form used in the proposal must be the form issued by the applying institution's respective system of governance (for reference, see Appendix E for the Tennessee Board of Regents' DB70 form; see Appendix F for the University of Tennessee's DB70 form).

Because the forms are embedded with formula calculations, applicants must complete the Microsoft Excel version of the forms. If the Excel versions do not accompany this document, email Steven Gentile at Steven.Gentile@tn.gov for copies. The DB70 tabs of the Excel workbooks must be submitted in order for the proposal to be complete, but other tabs must be completed and submitted as required by the respective systems. The total funding request for the Drive to 55 Project Capacity Fund grant proposal must correspond with the value reported in cell E41 (under label "This Request: State funds").

Proposals must include letters of validation from the institutions' respective systems of governance (University of Tennessee or Tennessee Board of Regents) that support the reported expenditures associated with the program expansion or new capital construction/major renovation budget.

Note: The state's requirement of an institutional matching component for capital outlay projects has been waived for the Drive to 55 Project Capacity Fund projects. The DB70 form and letter of validation do not count toward the 12-page limit.

F. Sustainability

(Program Expansion: 20 Points; New Capital Construction/Major Renovation: 30 Points)

Applicants must provide a detailed explanation of how the completed project will continue to meet Drive to 55 goals of increasing postsecondary credentials and aligning those credentials with labor and workforce needs. This sustainability plan should describe how the institution plans to adjust—in terms of institutional capacity, personnel, dedicated funding, and other resources—to support and maintain future operating costs.

If the project entails purchasing new equipment, the proposal must also provide a detailed plan for maintenance, housing, and upkeep of this equipment.

IV. Application Procedures

A. Preparation of the Application

Listed below are the required components of an acceptable application. The narrative sections of the proposal must have one-inch margins, be 1.5-spaced, and the font used must not be smaller than 11-point. *This narrative portion of the application shall not exceed 12 pages.* The cover sheet, project abstract, table of contents, budget items, and letters of support do not count toward the 12-page limit. The proposal sections are labeled and must be returned in order, as shown:

- Cover Page, signatures required
- Project Abstract
- Project Proposal

- Drive to 55 Goals
- Project Budget
- Sustainability

B. Submission

A *Notice of Intent to Submit* must be transmitted via email to **Steven.Gentile@tn.gov** no later than **4:00 PM CDT on Friday, July 15, 2016**.

Applicants must submit a completed application packet electronically, with signatures, to **Steven.Gentile@tn.gov**.

To be considered for funding, completed proposals must be received by THEC no later than 4:00 PM CDT on Friday, October 7, 2016. Incomplete applications will not be considered. An application checklist is included in the application packet (Appendix A).

C. Notification

Notice will be sent to the project director listed on the grant application confirming receipt by THEC within two business days. It is the sole responsibility of the applying institution to verify receipt of the proposal.

D. Review and Award Process

Grant proposals will be submitted to THEC for review by members of the Workforce Subcabinet.

The Workforce Subcabinet will score proposals utilizing the standardized rubric included in this RFP (Appendix B for projects classified as *program expansion*; Appendix C for projects classified as *new capital construction/major renovation*).

The Workforce Subcabinet will recommend to the Commission awards from highest to lowest score until funds are exhausted, but the Workforce Subcabinet reserves the right to deviate from the rank order of scores in order to strike a balance based on regional representation, classification of projects, or other criteria as approved by the Commission at the Summer Quarterly Commission meeting. The Commission will approve the final awards at the Fall Quarterly Commission meeting.

To maximize the impact of funds, or address unallowable costs included within the proposal, the Commission may approve modifications to the proposed budget.

V. Award Administration

A. Title VI

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 requires that federally assisted programs be free of

discrimination. Should you feel you have been discriminated against, contact your local Title VI representatives. The Title VI Coordinator at THEC is Scott Sloan (615-741-7571).

B. Award Conditions

THEC reserves the right to fund a proposal in full or in part, to request additional information to assist in the review process, and to re-issue the RFP and accept new proposals if the Workforce Subcabinet or THEC determines that doing so is in the best interest of the State of Tennessee. Following award selections, THEC will contact the project director of the selected proposals to discuss any modifications to the project plan or budget that may be required before the grant is awarded.

If the project includes the acquisition of property that was not identified in the campus master plan's land acquisition plan, the institution will need to request THEC to amend the land acquisition plan before the grant is awarded. THEC reserves the right not to amend the land acquisition plan.

Grants will be disbursed through the Department of Finance and Administration. Disbursement and reconciliation of funds will therefore follow the Department of Finance and Administration's standard protocol.

All costs incurred in preparation of proposal shall be borne by the Applicant. Proposal preparation costs are not recoverable from grant funds. THEC reserves the right to withhold funding if at any point the program is not adhering to state requirements or the goals and objectives declared in this RFP. THEC staff reserve the right to attend any project activity or meeting to ensure the fidelity of this program, and conduct regular monitoring of the project.

Appendix A – Application Checklist

Drive to 55 Project Capacity Fund Grant

Application Checklist

Status	Item	Date(s)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Potential applicants participate in webinar	10AM CDT, Friday, July 8
<input type="checkbox"/>	Applicants submit electronic Letter of Intent to Participate to THEC	4PM CDT, Friday, July 15
<input type="checkbox"/>	Completed Electronic Proposal due to THEC from Applicants	4PM CDT, Friday, October 7
<input type="checkbox"/>	Grant Awards Announced by THEC	Thursday, November 17
<input type="checkbox"/>	Contracts Finalized	December
<input type="checkbox"/>	Grants Disbursed	January

Appendix B – Scoring Rubric: *Program Expansion* Classification

Total Score _____

Drive to 55 Project Capacity Fund Grant

Applying Institution _____

Project Title _____

Total Project Budget _____

Funding Recommendation (yes, no, yes with modifications) _____

Evaluation Criteria	Maximum Points	Reviewer Score	Comments/Recommendations
<p>Project Proposal: <i>Project Description</i></p> <p>-Does the proposal include a detailed description of the project and identify what academic or technical program(s) will be expanded?</p> <p>-If the project entails purchasing new equipment, does the proposal address the type, amount, and costs of equipment to be purchased to expand the program?</p> <p>-If the project involves renovation of an existing facility, does the proposal clarify how the space is to be repurposed or improved?</p> <p>-Are estimated annual operating costs provided?</p> <p><u>Scoring Range</u></p> <p>20 – Proposal includes a detailed description of the project, details the type, amount, and costs of equipment and/or the extent of the renovation, and provides a detailed estimation of annual operating costs expected to be incurred after the expansion is completed. If the proposer is partnering with another organization, the letter of support from the organization indicates strong and long-term collaboration.</p> <p>10 – Proposal includes a description of the project and proposed equipment or facilities expansion but may lack detail. Minor detail is used to support estimated annual operating costs. If the proposer is partnering with another organization, the letter of support indicates some collaboration.</p> <p>1 – The proposal is lacking key information about the proposed expansion and any estimation of annual operating costs. If the proposer is partnering with another organization, no apparent evidence of collaboration is suggested.</p>	<p align="center">20</p>		

Evaluation Criteria	Maximum Points	Reviewer Score	Comments/Recommendations
<p>Project Proposal: <i>Implementation Timeline</i></p> <p>-Does the proposal include a timeline with stated grant activities (including delivery of progress report) and key milestones?</p> <p>-Is the proposed timeline feasible and likely to result in successful grant implementation in a timely manner?</p> <p><u>Scoring Range</u></p> <p>5 - The proposal includes a detailed implementation timeline including grant activities, key milestones, and responsible parties.</p> <p>3 - The proposal includes a timeline but may lack sufficient detail.</p> <p>1 - It is unclear how the proposed project will be implemented and completed based on the information provided.</p>	5		

Evaluation Criteria	Maximum Points	Reviewer Score	Comments/Recommendations
<p align="center">Drive to 55 Goals</p>	<p align="center">40</p>		
<p>-Is the proposal aligned with state Drive to 55 efforts and does it demonstrate a capacity to support the state's efforts to meet Drive to 55 goals?</p> <p>-Does the proposal explain to what extent the project will increase postsecondary credentials? Does the project clearly illustrate how the project directly addresses workforce needs and skillset deficiencies in the regional or state workforce?</p> <p><u>Scoring Range</u></p> <p>40 – The proposal clearly aligns with the Drive to 55 and provides empirical data that demonstrates how the project will increase postsecondary credentials and provide clear linkages between education and the state/regional workforce needs. Evidence provided suggests the project will make a substantial impact on the state's Drive to 55 efforts.</p> <p>20 – The proposal states postsecondary credential goals and describes how workforce area needs are met, but little empirical data is used to support assertions. Evidence provided suggests the project will have some impact on the state's Drive to 55 efforts.</p> <p>1 –The proposal does not address how the project will increase postsecondary credentials or how the project will align with the regional or state's workforce needs. Evidence provided suggests the project will have minimal to no impact on the state's Drive to 55 efforts.</p>			

Evaluation Criteria	Maximum Points	Reviewer Score	Comments/Recommendations
<p align="center">Budget</p> <p>-Are budget requests detailed and justified?</p> <p>-Are resources aligned with and appropriate to the needs of the proposed project?</p> <p>-Does the proposal include a letter of validation from the institution's governing system supporting the estimated program expansion costs?</p> <p><u>Scoring Range</u></p> <p>15 – Budget is complete with sufficient justifications and detail listed for each line item. A letter from the governing system validates the estimated costs.</p> <p>7 – Budget lacks sufficient detail, but expenditures seem to be reasonable given the scope of the proposal and the letter from the governing system validating the estimated costs.</p> <p>1 – Budget is incomplete and/or unreasonable given the scope of the proposal. The governing system does not validate the estimated costs.</p>	15		
<p align="center">Sustainability</p> <p>-Does the proposal provide a detailed explanation of how the completed project will meet Drive to 55 goals in the long-term?</p> <p>-Does the proposal describe how the institution will adjust institutional resources to maintain future operating costs?</p> <p>-Does the proposal provide a detailed plan for maintenance, housing, and upkeep of purchased equipment?</p> <p><u>Scoring Range</u></p> <p>20 – Proposal includes a detailed explanation of how the completed project will meet Drive to 55 goals and how institutional resources will be adjusted to maintain future operating costs.</p> <p>10 – Proposal includes intention for project to continue to meet Drive to 55 goals and some detail is included as to how the institution plans to maintain future operating costs.</p> <p>1 – Proposal offers little indication that the project will continue to meet Drive to 55 goals or that the institution will be able to sustain operating costs.</p>	20		

Appendix C – Scoring Rubric: New Capital Construction/Major Renovation Classification

Total Score _____

Drive to 55 Project Capacity Fund Grant

Applying Institution _____

Project Title _____

Total Project Budget _____

Funding Recommendation (yes, no, yes with modifications) _____

Evaluation Criteria	Maximum Points	Reviewer Score	Comments/Recommendations
<p>Project Proposal: <i>Project Description</i></p>	<p>15</p>		
<p>-Does the proposal include a detailed description of the project and identify what academic or technical program(s) will occupy the new space?</p> <p>-If the project creates a new facility or an addition to a current facility, does the proposal indicate how much gross square feet will be constructed?</p> <p>-If the project involves major renovation of an existing facility, does the proposal clarify how the existing space will change in function, use, or capacity?</p> <p>-Are estimated annual operating costs provided?</p> <p><u>Scoring Range</u></p> <p>15 – Proposal includes a detailed description of the project, describes the nature of the construction or renovation, and provides a detailed estimation of annual operating costs expected to be incurred after the expansion is completed. If the proposer is partnering with another organization, the letter of support from the organization indicates strong and long-term collaboration.</p> <p>8 – Proposal includes a description of the project and construction/renovation but may lack detail. Minor detail is used to support estimated annual operating costs. If the proposer is partnering with another organization, the letter of support indicates some collaboration.</p> <p>1 – The proposal is lacking key information about the construction/renovation and any estimation of annual operating costs. If the proposer is partnering with another organization, no apparent evidence of collaboration is suggested.</p>			

Evaluation Criteria	Maximum Points	Reviewer Score	Comments/Recommendations
<p>Project Proposal: <i>Implementation Timeline</i></p> <p>-Does the proposal include a timeline with stated grant activities (including delivery of progress report) and key milestones?</p> <p>-Is the proposed timeline feasible and likely to result in successful grant implementation and completion of construction or renovation in a timely manner?</p> <p><u>Scoring Range</u></p> <p>5 – The proposal includes a detailed implementation timeline including grant activities, key milestones, and responsible parties.</p> <p>3 – The proposal includes a timeline but may lack sufficient detail.</p> <p>1 – It is unclear how the proposed project will be implemented and completed based on the information provided.</p>	5		

Evaluation Criteria	Maximum Points	Reviewer Score	Comments/Recommendations
<p align="center">Drive to 55 Goals</p>	<p align="center">35</p>		
<p>-Is the proposal aligned with state Drive to 55 efforts and does it demonstrate a capacity to support the state's efforts to meet Drive to 55 goals?</p> <p>-Does the proposal explain to what extent the project will increase postsecondary credentials? Does the project clearly illustrate how the project directly addresses workforce needs and skillset deficiencies in the regional or state workforce?</p> <p><u>Scoring Range</u></p> <p>35 – The proposal clearly aligns with the Drive to 55 and provides empirical data that demonstrates how the project will increase postsecondary credentials and provide clear linkages between education and state/regional workforce needs. Evidence provided suggests the project will make a substantial impact on the state's Drive to 55 efforts.</p> <p>18 – The proposal states postsecondary credential goals and describes how workforce area needs are met, but little empirical data is used to support assertions. Evidence provided suggests the project will have some impact on the state's Drive to 55 efforts.</p> <p>1 – The proposal does not address how the project will increase postsecondary credentials or how the project will align with the regional or state's workforce needs. Evidence provided suggests the project will have minimal to no impact on the state's Drive to 55 efforts.</p>			

Evaluation Criteria	Maximum Points	Reviewer Score	Comments/Recommendations
<p align="center">Budget</p> <p>-Are budget requests detailed and justified? -Are resources aligned with and appropriate to the needs of the proposed project? -Does the proposal include a letter of validation from the institution's governing system supporting the estimated construction or renovation costs?</p> <p><u>Scoring Range</u> 15 – Budget is complete with sufficient justifications and detail listed for each line item. A letter from the governing system validates the estimated costs. 7 – Budget lacks sufficient detail but expenditures seem to be reasonable given the scope of the proposal and the letter from the governing system validating the estimated costs. 1 – Budget is incomplete and/or unreasonable given the scope of the proposal. The governing system does not validate the estimated costs.</p>	15		
<p align="center">Sustainability</p> <p>-Does the proposal provide a detailed explanation of how the completed project will meet Drive to 55 goals in the long-term? -Does the proposal describe how the institution will adjust institutional resources to maintain future operating costs? -Does the proposal provide a detailed plan for maintenance, housing, and upkeep of purchased equipment?</p> <p><u>Scoring Range</u> 30 – Proposal includes a detailed explanation of how the completed project will meet Drive to 55 goals and how institutional resources will be adjusted to maintain future operating costs. 15 – Proposal includes intention for project to continue to meet Drive to 55 goals and some detail is included as to how the institution plans to maintain future operating costs. 1 – Proposal offers little indication that the project will continue to meet Drive to 55 goals or that the institution will be able to sustain operating costs.</p>	30		

Appendix D – Application Packet

**Tennessee Higher Education Commission
Drive to 55 Project Capacity Fund Grant
Section A: COVER PAGE**

Applying Organization:	
Designated Fiscal Agent for this Organization:	
Capital Project Classification:	
Project Title:	
Project Manager:	
Contact Name:	
Title:	
Address:	
Telephone:	Fax:
E-Mail:	
Amount of Funding Requested	\$
Anticipated Number of Students to Be Served	

Certification by Authorized Official of the Designated Fiscal Agent:

The designee certifies that, to the best of his/her knowledge, the information in this application is correct and that the filing of this application is duly authorized by the applicant organization specified above.

Name and Title of Authorized Official of Designated Fiscal Agent

Signature of Authorized Official of Designated Fiscal Agent

Date

Section B: Project Abstract

Supply a project summary/abstract no longer than half a page. This will be used to describe funded proposals in publications and on THEC's website.

Note: The Project Abstract does not count toward the 12-page proposal limit.

Section C: Project Proposal

Provide a detailed description of the proposed capital project, estimated annual operating costs, and a timeline from awarding of grant to projected completion. Descriptions must classify the project as a *program expansion* or *new capital construction/major renovation*. If the proposed capital project involves an acquisition of property, include a copy of the acquisition plan of the institution's master plan with the property demarcated. If applicable, describe proposed partnerships and include letters of support from all partnering organizations.

Provide a timeline, from January 2017 through planned completion of the proposed capital project, with grant activities and key project milestones.

Note: Copy of acquisition plan and letters of support do not count toward the 12-page limit.

Section D: Drive to 55 Goals

Provide a narrative of how the project will support the region and state's efforts to meet Drive to 55 goals of increasing higher education attainment and establishing clear linkages between postsecondary credentials and the needs of employers.

Section E: Project Budget

Proposals must include a completed DB70 form reflecting the project's budget. The DB70 form used in the proposal must be the form issued by the institution's respective system of governance (for reference, see Appendix E for the Tennessee Board of Regents' DB70 form; see Appendix F for the University of Tennessee's DB70 form). Include letters of validation from institutions' respective system of governance (University of Tennessee or Tennessee Board of Regents) that support the reported expenditures associated with the program expansion or new capital construction/major renovation budget.

Note: The DB70 form and letter of validation do not count toward the 12-page limit.

Section F: Sustainability

Applicants must provide a detailed explanation of how the completed project will continue to meet Drive to 55 goals of increasing postsecondary credentials and aligning those credentials with labor and workforce needs beyond the grant's completion. The sustainability plan should detail how the institution plans to adjust institutional resources to support and maintain future operating costs and, if applicable, how the institution plans to provide maintenance, housing, and upkeep of purchased equipment.

Appendix E: Project Budget TBR DB70 Form

1 Department:

Institution:

Project:

City/County:

2 Fiscal Year: 2016/ 2017

3		New		Reno/Maint
<input type="checkbox"/>	Capital Outlay			
<input type="checkbox"/>	Capital Maintenance	0	Gross Sq.Ft.	0
<input type="checkbox"/>	Disclosure	0	Net Sq.Ft.	0
<input type="checkbox"/>	Designer Required	0.00	Cost/Sq.Ft.	0.00

4 Project Description:

5	Total Project	Allocation	Estimated Construction Cost:	
	0.00	0.00		0.00
	0.00	0.00		Building Construction
	0.00	0.00		Site & Utilities
	0.00	0.00		Built-in Equipment
	0.00	0.00		Bid Target
	0.00	0.00	n/a	Contingency: n/a percent
	0.00	0.00		M.A.C.C.
	0.00	0.00	n/a	Fee: 35/LogP-1.15 = n/a Renovation
	0.00	0.00		Movable Equipment
	0.00	0.00		first other
	0.00	0.00		second other
	0.00	0.00		Administration & Miscellaneous
	0.00	0.00		Total Cost

6 Funding Request:

THIS REQUEST

0.00	0.00	STATE funds
0.00	0.00	FEDERAL funds
0.00	0.00	Local and Institutional Funds

7 Sources of Available Funding:

	fund year	description
already approved for existing SBC project	0.00	
	0.00	
0.00	0.00	
plus This Request	0.00	
0.00	0.00	

8 SBC Action:

If an existing project, SBC Project No.:

n/a

9 Designer:

t b a

Appendix F: Project Budget UT DB70 Form

1 Department: University of Tennessee
Institution: UTxx
Project: Project Name
City/County:

2 Fiscal Year: 2016-2017

3	<input type="checkbox"/> Capital Outlay	New		Reno/Maint
	<input type="checkbox"/> Capital Maintenance	0	Gross Sq.Ft.	0
	<input type="checkbox"/> Disclosure	0	Net Sq.Ft.	0
	<input type="checkbox"/> Designer Required	\$0.00	Cost/Sq.Ft.	\$0.00

4 Project Description:

5	Total Project	Allocation	Estimated Construction Cost:	0.00
	0.00	0.00	Building Construction	
	0.00	0.00	Site & Utilities	
	0.00	0.00	Built-in Equipment	
	0.00	0.00	Bid Target	
	0.00	0.00	Contingency:	5% percent
	0.00	0.00	M.A.C.C.	
	0.00	0.00	Fee:	5% <input style="width: 50px;" type="text" value="New"/>
	0.00	0.00	Movable Equipment	
	0.00	0.00	First other	
	0.00	0.00	Second other	
	0.00	0.00	Administration & Miscellaneous	
	0.00	0.00	Total Cost	

6 Funding Request: THIS REQUEST
 0.00 STATE funds
 0.00 FEDERAL funds
 0.00 Local and Institutional Funds

7 Sources of Available Funding:
 0.00
 0.00
 0.00
 0.00
 0.00

8 SBC Action:

9 Designer: