

BEST Grant Application Review

Sample of online scoring system
and rubric utilized by the CCAB
updated FY2023-24

FY 2023-2024 Application

Applicant:
Project Name:
App #: - Page #:

Request Amount: \$-
Match Amount: \$-
Total Request: \$-
Match Percentage: #%

Recusal:

Member is recused from this project

Grant Application Statutory Need

Pursuant to 22-43.7-109(5) C.R.S., the board shall prioritize applications that describe public school facility capital construction projects deemed eligible for financial assistance based on the following criteria, in descending order of importance:

Priority 1

This application addresses safety hazards or health concerns at existing public school facilities, including concerns relating to public school facility security, and projects that are designed to incorporate technology into the educational environment. See glossary for definition of "technology".

Priority 2

This application will relieve current overcrowding in public school facilities, including but not limited to allowing students to move from temporary instructional facilities into permanent facilities.

Priority 3

This application will provide career and technical education capital construction in public school facilities.

Priority 4

This application will assist in the replacement of prohibited American Indian Mascots

Priority 5

This application is for other types of capital improvements not addressed in priorities 1-4.

Division Comments:

After review of the application, the division would consider this project a priority _.

1. After Review of the Application, the Evaluator would Consider this Application a Priority:

Priority 1 Priority 2 Priority 3 Priority 4 Priority 5

Evaluator Comments & Notes:

Review each section below and provide a score for each question based on your review of the application.

Provide comment for scores of 0, 1 or 2. Comments for scores of 3, 4 or 5 are optional.

Conditions of the Entire Public School Facility

Division FCI Comments:

Division Requirement and Deficiency Comments:

Evaluator Review of Conditions of the Entire Public School Facility

2. The proposed renovation or replacement is supported by the Facility Condition Index (FCI) from the statewide facility assessment, or an assessment provided by the applicant. (*a high FCI may indicate the need to replace an entire facility while a lower FCI may indicate the need to replace systems only)[Facility Insight Summary]

- Incomplete (0) Disagree (1) Marginal (2) Somewhat Agree (3) Agree (4) Strongly Agree (5)

3. The deficiencies presented in the application are compelling, well supported by the statewide facility assessment and/or investigations undertaken by the applicant, and necessitate capital assistance. [Question II.D, II.E, Facility Insight]

- Incomplete (0) Disagree (1) Marginal (2) Somewhat Agree (3) Agree (4) Strongly Agree (5)

Evaluator Comments & Notes:

Financial Capacity

Division Comments:

Evaluator Review of Financial Capacity

4. 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.V]

- Incomplete (0) Disagree (1) Marginal (2) Somewhat Agree (3) Agree (4) Strongly Agree (5)

5. The applicant has demonstrated a suitable commitment to the maintenance and renewal of this proposed project upon completion. [Question II.J]

- Incomplete (0) Disagree (1) Marginal (2) Somewhat Agree (3) Agree (4) Strongly Agree (5)

6. Historically the applicant has contributed a suitable amount towards the capital needs of their facilities, given available resources. [Question I.F, Question I.G]

- Incomplete (0) Disagree (1) Marginal (2) Somewhat Agree (3) Agree (4) Strongly Agree (5)
-

Evaluator Comments & Notes:

Project Proposal

Division Comments:

Evaluator Review of Project Proposal

7. The solution presented by the applicant effectively and efficiently resolves all critical deficiencies noted within the application. [Question II.F]

- Incomplete (0) Disagree (1) Marginal (2) Somewhat Agree (3) Agree (4) Strongly Agree (5)
-

8. The scope of work proposed in the solution appears to be reasonable and well planned as a result of appropriate due diligence. [Question II.F, II.G]

- Incomplete (0) Disagree (1) Marginal (2) Somewhat Agree (3) Agree (4) Strongly Agree (5)
-

9. The project is urgent in nature. [Question II.H]

- Incomplete (0) Disagree (1) Marginal (2) Somewhat Agree (3) Agree (4) Strongly Agree (5)
-

Evaluator Comments & Notes:

Other Application Considerations

Division Comments:

Evaluator Review of Other Application Considerations

10. The project cost is appropriate and an effective use of state resources, evaluated in terms of total cost, cost per SF, cost per pupil, and/or other metrics at reviewer's discretion. [Sections II and III]

- Incomplete (0) Disagree (1) Marginal (2) Somewhat Agree (3) Agree (4) Strongly Agree (5)

11. The proposed project uses facility square footage efficiently for the student population and program. In the case of narrow scope renovation projects, the affected area of the project is supportable and appropriate for the proposed scope of work. [Sections II and III]

- Incomplete (0) Disagree (1) Marginal (2) Somewhat Agree (3) Agree (4) Strongly Agree (5)

12. The applicant has or is willing to pursue a fair, competitive, and transparent selection process for contractors and consultants or has identified a reasonable alternative. [Question III.U]

- No (0) Yes (5)

Supplemental Grants

13. This application is for supplemental assistance to complete a previously awarded BEST grant, due to compelling unforeseen circumstances. [Question II.A]

- No (0) Yes (2)

Evaluator Comments & Notes:

14. Evaluator Recommendation to Shortlist this Application

- Yes No

If the Application is Not Recommended to the Shortlist, Please Provide the Evaluator's Justification:

Evaluator Notes Section for Information Only:

[Save & Return to Main Page](#)