

## Development and State Approval of Projects

1. Provide local school systems with flexibility to design schools that meet local needs and programmatic priorities.
2. Review design guidelines to ensure that they are aligned with funding allowances for each type of space (*e.g.*, health suites, classrooms, community use areas, etc.).
3. Maintain a role for the State to review and approve State funded projects, but streamline the process to minimize unnecessary delays:
  - a. Maintain mandatory Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) review and IAC approval of educational specifications and schematic designs for major construction projects, but explore the possibility of merging the two review processes to save time.
  - b. Eliminate required Department of General Services (DGS) review and IAC approval of design documents, construction documents, and change orders for both major construction and systemic renovation projects.
  - c. Allow local school systems to request that DGS review and provide feedback on their design and construction documents on a voluntary basis.
  - d. Eliminate MSDE review of any projects that are funded wholly with local funds unless they substantially alter or expand an existing school built in part with State funds.
  - e. Maintain IAC review and approval of procurement contracts and payments/closeout.
4. Provide incentives for the use of prototype school designs, including expedited State review of projects that use them, but do not mandate use of prototypes.
5. Repeal the requirement that all schools undergoing renovation qualify as emergency management shelters; designation of schools as emergency shelters should be consistent with local emergency management plans and criteria as well as funding availability.

## Areas for Further Discussion

1. How often should prototype designs be updated? Construction best practices change constantly, but updating designs too frequently undercuts the rationale for their use.
  - 2a. What variations in safety-related features should be allowed, if any, based on local determinations? Some safety features may not be priorities in every community.
  - 2b. Should the State revisit its square footage standards? Should they be increased or decreased? (Build smaller schools, reduce the square feet per student allocation). Is there an alternative approach to using square footage standards that would encourage appropriately sized facilities?
  - 3a. Should the due date for submission of ed specs be moved from July 10 to a date within September 1 to October 1? And combined with schematic submission (currently due Sept 1)? Or could they be submitted on a rolling basis with maximum review time after which it is considered approved?
  - 3b. Any risk to not having DGS reviews?
4. Should potential community use of school buildings be reflected in prototype designs?

6. Allow local school systems to bundle (for approval purposes) similar systemic renovation projects at different schools (*e.g.*, roofs at three schools) and interrelated systemic projects at a single school (*e.g.*, windows and HVAC at one school).
7. Enable and allow secure electronic document submission of all required documents/data to the IAC.

#### Procurement

1. Reorient school construction procurement toward obtaining best value rather than lowest price, consistent with State procurement law for State projects.
2. Examine further the effect of prevailing wage requirements on school construction costs.
3. Provide technical assistance and support to local educational agencies on the use of alternative project delivery methods.
4. Request that the Green Building Council develop guidelines for achieving the equivalent of LEED Silver standards without requiring LEED certification of new school buildings. Explore providing incentives for “net zero” buildings.
5. Encourage bulk purchasing, bundling, and intergovernmental purchasing for common items (*e.g.* HVAC, windows).
6. Require site approval only within three years of local planning submittal instead of at the time of new land purchase.
7. Continue to allow LEAs choice in construction materials but provide incentives for energy efficient or other preferred materials.

#### Areas for Further Discussion

2. Should LEAs be required to solicit side-by-side bids for major new projects in designated areas of the State so that comparable data on the impact of prevailing wage can be analyzed?
2. How will local school systems be held accountable for using green building strategies in the absence of external certification?
5. What effect does bundling have on minority business enterprise (MBE) access to school construction projects? MBEs often do not have the capacity to participate on large-scale projects or intergovernmental purchasing arrangements.
6. Are local governments willing to buy land for school construction projects without reassurance and verification that the site will be approved for that use?

## Areas that Overlap with Funding Subcommittee

### Areas of potential consensus

1. Examine/update the State Rated Capacity process to address special programs/adjacent schools/etc. utilizing enrollment projects provided by the Maryland Department of Planning.
2. Local school systems with declining enrollment should be encouraged to consolidate buildings and/or find alternative uses for undersubscribed school buildings. However, final authority for redistricting should remain with local governments.
3. The State should continue to provide increased support to local school systems with increasing enrollment.
4. Use the IAC as a central repository for information on the use of pre-fab options
5. Provide incentives for local school systems to prioritize preventive maintenance.

### Areas for Further Discussion

3a. To what extent should State funding policies protect local school systems with declining enrollments from dramatic decreases in State support?

3b. What incentives could the State provide to encourage school consolidation?

4. Should the State incorporate a growth factor to school buildings that are built in communities anticipated to experience enrollment growth? Lower levels of occupancy in the short-term may be worth the long-term savings.

5. How can the maintenance program be more responsive to LEAs, specifically in those needing more guidance?

## Structure and Process

### Areas of potential consensus

1. Final project proposals should be subject to review and approval by the IAC.

### Areas for Further Discussion

1. Should final approval of school construction projects be made by IAC or the Board of Public Works?

DRAFT