

Department of General Services  
Public School Design & Construction Process Program Review  
Program Review Expert Workgroup – **Design** Sub-group Charter

**Design Sub-group Chair:**

Bill Savidge, West Contra Costa USD

**Planning Sub-group Team Members:**

1. Steve Adamo, San Jose USD
2. Karl Bradley, Sweetwater Union HSD
3. Dave Clinchy, Los Rios CCD
4. Chris Ferguson, Dept. of Finance
5. Fred Yeager, California Department of Education
6. Ian Knutilla, Office of Public School Construction
7. Chip Smith, Division of the State Architect
8. Debi Deal, Fiscal Crisis & Management Assistance Team

**Mission Statement**

To build safe, timely, cost effective, and educationally appropriate school facilities for the students of California.

**Background**

In response to the recent Assembly Education Oversight Committee hearing and with the State Allocation Board's encouragement, the Department of General Services is pursuing a collaborative effort to identify and institute improvements to the public school design and construction processes.

**Goal**

To recommend improvements to the planning portion of the public school construction process, while noting those aspects of the process that are working well.

**Objectives**

1. In one meeting, identify and prioritize the top ten problems and issues in the **design** process. Note processes and policies that are working well (best practices).
2. To recommend solutions to the problems and issues identified by the type of change needed (legislative, regulatory, policy, procedural, education/training, communication, collaboration).
3. To recommend timeframes for implementing the proposed solutions:
  - Short Term (within 3-12 months)
  - Intermediate (within 12-36 months)
  - Long term (within 36-60 months).
4. To recommend performance measures to determine the effectiveness of each recommended solution.

**Scope**

Limited to Public School Construction Design.

**Responsibilities of Participants**

1. Attend the meeting scheduled on Monday, August 9<sup>th</sup>, 2010.
2. Complete the reporting template for presentation to the Expert Workgroup

**Ground Rules:**

1. Physical attendance is required.
2. No substitutes are allowed.
3. No visitors are allowed.
4. No PDAs

**WHAT IS WORKING:**

- DSA reduced bin times
- OPSC helps school districts to maximize funding
- Architects design high quality school facilities
- Conducting a review of the current process, positive change
- Kathy Hicks and staff (DSA) are great
- Districts embracing High Performance schools, sustainable building standards
- Building and student achievement
- Increased collaboration with clients



DSA/OPSC Program Review

**Expert Workgroup**

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES

Department of General Services  
Public School Design & Construction Process Program Review  
Program Review Expert Workgroup – **Design** Sub-group Charter

Top 10 Problems/Issues (in priority order)	Proposed Solutions
	[note proposals as legislative (L), regulatory (R), policy (P), procedural (PR), education/training (ED), communication (Com), collaboration(C)]
1. Budget constraints vs. program needs	<b>1a.</b> Assess funding mechanisms by other states (PR) <b>1b.</b> Set benchmarks/Federal, State, and local expectations (identify: PR, establish: L) <b>1c.</b> Assess past projects (need accurate data, Financial Hardship districts, Statewide software/establish a unified database) (P, L) <b>1d.</b> Establish best practices (delivery methods, set indices, pre-approved plans) (P, PR, L) <b>1e.</b> Encourage equity (Financial Hardship districts, establish a baseline for equity) (L)
2. Duration and timing of agencies' reviews/changes & revisions to design documents	<b>2a.</b> Assessment of potential barriers and obstacles (PR) <b>2b.</b> Develop an internal process audit (refer to DSA metrics) (L) <b>2c.</b> Implementation plan (review schedules and durations) (P, R)
3. Lack of collaboration/communication between all parties	<b>3a.</b> Agencies conduct outreach and training, develop a facilities task force (P, PR) <b>3b.</b> Establish a unified collaborative process (program-wide) (P, PR) <b>3c.</b> Require agency and district participation in the unified collaborative process (L, R)
4. Customer service/staff unfamiliar with process	<b>4a.</b> Establish a response and solution method (response within 2 working days; solution within 5 working days) (PR) <b>4b.</b> Develop effective communication venues (websites, email, phone; effective; information updated regularly; communication roadmap; establish best practices) (PR)
5. Lack of single point of contact	<b>5a.</b> Ombudsman (appointee) (L) <b>5b.</b> Create single, unified agency for school construction (L) <b>5c.</b> Single application number for all agencies (PR, L) <b>5d.</b> Establish uniform accounting method at local level (L)
6. Conflicts between local and State agencies	
7. Lack of pre-approved school design plans	
8. Complexity of total process	
9. Community College process/perceived scope changes	
10. Conflicting nomenclature/expansion of definitions	
11. Architects, documents, and fee structure	

Note: Due to time constraints, proposed solutions were only discussed for the top five problems/issues.



DSA/OPSC Program Review

**Expert Workgroup**

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES

Department of General Services  
Public School Design & Construction Process Program Review  
Program Review Expert Workgroup – **Design** Sub-group Charter

**SOLUTIONS TIMELINE**

Short Term (3-12 mos.)	Intermediate (12-36 mos.)	Long Term (36-60 mos.)
<b>1a.</b> Assess funding mechanisms by other states (may become intermediate)	<b>1c.</b> Assess past projects <b>1d.</b> Establish best practices	<b>1b.</b> Set benchmarks/Federal, State, and local expectations <b>1e.</b> Encourage equity
<b>2a.</b> Assessment of potential barriers and obstacles	<b>2c.</b> Implementation plan	<b>2b.</b> Develop an internal process audit
<b>3a.</b> Agencies conduct outreach and training, develop a facilities task force <b>3b.</b> Establish a unified collaborative process		<b>3c.</b> Require agency and district participation in the unified collaborative process
<b>4a.</b> Establish a response and solution method <b>4b.</b> Develop effective communication venues (may become intermediate)		
<b>5c.</b> Single application number (may become intermediate)	<b>5a.</b> Ombudsman	<b>5b.</b> Create a single, unified agency for school construction <b>5d.</b> Establish uniform accounting method at local level

**RECOMMENDED PERFORMANCE MEASURES:**

	Proposed Solution	Recommended Performance Measure
<b>1a.</b>	Assess funding mechanisms by other states	Assessment of all applicable states, and matrix product
<b>1b.</b>	Set benchmarks/State and local expectations	Benchmarks for all school projects (Federal, State, local)
<b>1c.</b>	Assess past projects	Unified database created
<b>1d.</b>	Establish best practices	Adoption of best practices, implementation of a new funding mechanism for school facilities
<b>1e.</b>	Encourage equity	Establishment of baseline for equity
<b>2a.</b>	Assessment of barriers and obstacles	Assessment
<b>2b.</b>	Develop an internal process audit	Internal process audit
<b>2c.</b>	Implementation plan	Implemented plan
<b>3a.</b>	Agencies conduct outreach and training, develop facilities task force	Outreach and training (2 per agency), establishment of a facilities task force
<b>3b.</b>	Establish a unified collaborative process	Established process
<b>3c.</b>	Require participation in unified collaborative process	Full participation by agencies and districts
<b>4a.</b>	Establish a response and solution method	Method established
<b>4b.</b>	Develop effective communication venues	Information is regularly and consistently updated
<b>5a.</b>	Ombudsman	Position has been created, there is an appointee
<b>5b.</b>	Create single, unified agency for school construction	Existence of single, unified agency
<b>5c.</b>	Single application number	Existence of single application number
<b>5d.</b>	Establish uniform accounting method at local level	Existence of uniform accounting method

**NOTED DISAGREEMENTS OVER TOP 10 PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED OR SOLUTIONS RECOMMENDED:**

No items; no member requests for disagreements to be noted.