Facility Resource Allocation Rubric & Scoring Tool - Draft

Committee: Facilities and Safety Committee
Institution: Santa Ana College

Purpose

To provide a transparent, equitable, evidence-based, and mission-aligned system for prioritizing facility requests submitted through the program review process, ensuring responsible stewardship of institutional resources and alignment with student success, safety, accessibility, and strategic planning goals.

I. Priority Buckets

Before scoring begins, every request shall be sorted into one of three priority tiers. Certain requests may qualify for Automatic Escalation due to legal, safety, or operational mandates.

Category	Description	Examples
High Need (Critical)	Life/safety issues, legal mandates (ADA/OSHA), critical infrastructure failures, or interruptions to core instructional capabilities or accreditation requirements.	Fire alarm failures, structural hazards, ADA access barriers, compromised lab ventilation, active water intrusion, failing HVAC in instructional spaces, accreditation deficiencies, electrical hazards.
Medium Need (Strategic)	Projects that improve student success, support Guided Pathways, modernize instructional spaces, improve operational efficiency, or address deferred maintenance before failure occurs.	Classroom technology upgrades, student collaboration hubs, aging furniture replacement, infrastructure modernization, enrollment growth support, and energy efficiency improvements.
Low Need (Enhancement)	Aesthetic, convenience-based, or	Cosmetic painting, decorative signage, specialty

Category	Description	Examples
	low-utilization improvements with limited impact on student outcomes, operations, or compliance.	enhancements for limited populations, non-essential remodels.

II. Automatic Escalation

The following categories may bypass the standard scoring matrix and be elevated directly to High Need status pending verification by Facilities and/or appropriate subject matter experts:

- Fire/life safety deficiencies
- ADA or legal compliance violations
- Structural hazards
- Active environmental or hazardous material concerns
- Critical infrastructure failure
- Accreditation deficiencies
- Security vulnerabilities
- Conditions creating significant institutional liability or risk of injury

III. Weighted Scoring Matrix

For all projects not automatically escalated, committee members shall score each criterion using the following scale:

- **0:** No Impact
- **1:** Minimal Impact
- **2:** Moderate Impact
- **3:** Significant Impact
- **4:** Critical / Maximum Impact

Criteria	Weight	Guiding Question
Health & Safety Risk	25%	Does the current condition pose a physical risk, liability, or threat to campus safety?
Compliance & Mandates	15%	Is this required by law, ADA, accreditation, code compliance, or external regulation?

Criteria	Weight	Guiding Question
Instructional & Student Impact	20%	Does this affect large numbers of students, gateway courses, instructional continuity, or essential student support services?
Equity & Accessibility	15%	Does this improve access, inclusion, or support for disproportionately impacted student populations or students with disabilities?
Strategic Stewardship	15%	Does this align with Guided Pathways, enrollment growth, sustainability goals, or long-term institutional planning?
Operational & Fiscal Stewardship	10%	Does this represent a sustainable, cost-effective investment with manageable long-term maintenance needs or operational savings?

IV. Deferred Maintenance & Infrastructure Considerations

Projects addressing aging infrastructure or deferred maintenance that may lead to future system failure, escalating repair costs, or instructional disruption may receive elevated consideration. Examples include HVAC systems nearing end of life, roofing deterioration, plumbing failures, electrical systems beyond service life, and building envelope deterioration.

V. Evidence Requirements

To support a consistent, data-informed process, all requests should include at least two of the following:

- Photos of current conditions or safety hazards
- Work order history demonstrating repeated failures

- Program Review data (enrollment, retention, equity gaps, utilization)
- Cost-benefit analysis or “Cost of Inaction” statement
- Accreditation findings or recommendations
- Accessibility or compliance documentation
- Estimates of operational savings or efficiency improvements

VI. Facilities & Technical Review

Facilities and Maintenance & Operations personnel may provide technical review regarding feasibility, lifecycle status, code implications, estimated urgency, maintenance implications, operational impact, and preliminary cost considerations.

VII. Committee Calibration & Consistency

Prior to formal scoring, the committee shall collaboratively review and score sample projects to promote consistency and shared interpretation of rubric criteria.

VIII. Funding Source Considerations

Final prioritization and implementation timelines may also consider eligibility for bond funding, scheduled maintenance funding, grants, accessibility funding, or restricted categorical sources.

IX. Committee Thresholds

Score	Priority Level	Recommended Action
80–100	Immediate Priority	Fund as soon as budget allows
50–79	Secondary Priority	Schedule for current or next fiscal cycle
Below 50	Deferred Priority	Re-evaluate during next Program Review cycle