

**No Child Left Behind Negotiated Rulemaking Committee
School Visit and Facility Management Information System (FMIS) Training
Albuquerque, NM**

Summary of Key Conversations & Next Steps

School Visits - Tuesday, March 9, 2010

Participants visited two Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) schools in the Albuquerque area: Isleta Elementary School and San Felipe Pueblo Elementary School. Isleta Elementary was a replacement school, and participants visited both the old and new schools. San Felipe Pueblo School was a renovation and repair project. Plans for both schools were approved before adoption of the 2005 Space Guidelines, and thus the schools were not subject to the 2005 Space Guidelines.

After seeing the schools, participants had the following reflections and questions about the school facilities and construction process:

- If/How do FMIS and the school replacement/renovation decision-making processes ensure consistency and fairness across schools and tribes?
- How does the system handle or allow for flexibility and tailoring by tribes (i.e. curriculum, cultural spaces, and community context)?
- How are the Design Guidelines incorporated into the process?
- How do curriculum requirements factor into the process?
- How do architectural complexities, such as different age buildings and needs, factor into the process?
- How does availability of additional, external funds (i.e. funds from gaming tribes) factor into the process?
- How are rural v. urban costs considered?
- How does the system deal with staff housing needs?
- Why was San Felipe allowed to add grades?
- How is student count determined?
- Can BIA help tribes to find external funding?
- How do land requirements and land acquisition needs factor into the process?
- How does the process address shifting funding contexts (do/should different factors weigh differently as funding diminishes?)
- How do energy efficiency and sustainability factor into the process?

FMIS Training – Wednesday, March 10 and Thursday, March 11, 2010

Margie Morin, Office of Facilities Construction and Management (OFMC), lead the FMIS training, which was designed to explain how data entered into FMIS is used in school replacement, renovation, and repair decisions.

Inventory: Margie discussed how the inventory in FMIS is the backbone of the process for Operations & Maintenance (O&M) funding, special program funding, and major construction funding. She explained that FMIS allows schools to enter very detailed information into the system and explained that FMIS relies heavily on the quality and accuracy of the data entered by schools. She noted that school staff, usually the facility manager or FMIS clerk, enter the data for a school and that OFMC recommends that data be entered on a weekly basis.

Participants commented that there are often challenges associated with entering data into FMIS, noting that: not all schools have access to FMIS, FMIS does not always work, and that some schools do not have staff resources to dedicate to entering data, especially at grant and contract schools. A participant recommended forming a Users Committee to assist grant and contract schools with FMIS.

In addition to the implementation challenges raised by participants, Margie added that the Committee might look at how to handle portable classrooms/un-housed students. Others suggested that the system should also incorporate curriculum requirements.

Backlog – Deferred Maintenance/Capital Improvement; Backlog Categories/Ranks; Safety Inspections/Abatements: Margie discussed the difference in deferred maintenance and capital improvement backlogs. She also discussed the differences in the backlogs and the importance of these categories, safety inspections, and how they all factor into projects/funding.

Margie explained that any school with O&M can access emergency programs for critical/emergency repairs. Margie explained that school facility managers enter their backlogs into FMIS and they are asked- usually in September-November timeframe- to prioritize their top backlog needs. Facility regional offices receive this information and with OFMC determine which priorities to fund.

Participants commented on number of backlogs (over 50,000) and questioned how they are prioritized. Some noted that there could be discrepancies between what a school sees as a priority and what BIA considers a priority. Others noted that the current system of prioritization is not transparent and that the system of dealing with backlogs does not address the root problems with schools (it is a temporary fix). One participant suggested that Navajo schools be considered as separate agencies to avoid self-competition among Navajo schools for these funds.

FI&R Ranking Process; Replacement Facility Construction Ranking; Replacement Schools: Margie explained how Facility Improvement and Repair and Replacement ranking is done. She explained that to establish a new ranking process, backlogs must be up to date. She also explained that FI&R does not incorporate academic program requirements, which will be a key task of the Committee.

She explained the process was updated to reflect criticisms in a 2005 Inspector General Report that schools were being over built and resulting in long term cost overages. She also noted that the scoring process is consistent with Department of Interior evaluation criteria. Both if these factors are important because BIA is facing diminishing funding for school construction and

repair and must be able to justify to Congress and the Department of Interior its spending decisions.

Margie discussed the school replacement list and noted that it was based on the evaluation of safety criteria. Each region was asked to pick its five worst schools. BIE was asked to do the same and FMIS did a similar evaluation. Schools that appeared on two or three of these lists were evaluated further by a Contractor who consolidated the list to 41 schools. The list of 41 schools was given to the Assistant Secretary-Indian Affairs who placed the top 14 schools on the replacement list. That list was frozen in March of 2004 by Congress.

Margie explained the ranking flow, which includes:

- Ranking Parameters (set based on previous funding categories determined by a human)
- Results (FMIS calculates)
- Ranking Category (FMIS calculates)
- Structure (FMIS calculates)
- Summary (FMIS calculates)
- Ranking (Human interpretation using FMIS and other budget data)

Participants commented that many believe that these decisions are political, and that there is a need to make the process more transparent. Participants also commented that flexibility is important because not all schools have the same needs and that there should be some room for tailoring, as appropriate. Participants also questioned how long a school should be ranked, noting that changing circumstances might move a school up or down the list. Participants also discussed O&M funding and its link to the Committee's work, noting that shortfalls in O&M lead to more backlogs.

Cost Works Estimating and other relevant FMIS tools: Margie and other OFMC staff discussed relevant tools and process including cost estimating, the construction program, Space Guidelines, "Sum of Least" Squares Methodology, Asset Management Plans, Facility Condition Index, Asset Priority Index, Department of Interior- Major Project Requirements, Program of Requirements (POR) and works.

Summary of Issues for Further Consideration by the Committee

Participants agreed that the FMIS training provided very useful information for the Committee to consider. They also discussed key issues for further consideration including:

How to incorporate educational needs into FMIS: Participants recommended establishing an Education subcommittee to evaluate how NCLB, federal, state, AYP, Space Guidelines, and other educational requirements should factor into school facilities decision-making processes (as a parallel system, incorporated into FMIS, or another way)

Support from BIE: Participants discussed the technical support they would need from BIE, including participation in the Education subcommittee and technical assistance to help the Committee understand how different options might impact schools.

How to manage the prioritization system in FI&R: Participants emphasized that they need a methodology that is based on need, that is transparent, and that is predictable.

If/how O&M funding fits into the Committee's Scope: Participants noted that FMIS determines O&M so it is an important piece to the Committee's work. They discussed options including issuing a statement on O&M or making a detailed recommendation.

If/how implementation issues fit into the Committee's Scope: Participants emphasized that implementation of FMIS is very important to the success of their work. Initial options for addressing implementation include developing a guidance document and/or issuing a statement that implementation is important and resources are needed.

Budget Analysis: Participants requested further discussion on BIE, BIA, and OMB budgets, including administrative line items, so that they better understand the context in which they are working. Others suggested that the Committee should focus on the system as it should be, and not be limited by the funding that currently exists.

Sustainability: Participants requested further discussion on sustainable buildings and how they factor into the system.

Partnerships: Participants requested further discussion on partnerships and how they factor into the system.

Meeting Timing/Schedule: Several participants commented that they would like the facilitation team to better manage the schedule, including ending times and lunch breaks. They noted the need for consistent and predictable schedules for travel planning, meals, and personal time.

Handouts

The following documents were handed out during the presentation and will be made available on the NCLB workspace.

- Powerpoint presentation
- 2005 Space Guidelines
- IG 2005 report
- Budget estimates 2001-2011 (Education construction):
- 5 year plan in budget:
- ARRA budget
- Evaluation flow after ranking (under guidance of DOI requirements)
- AIP, flowchart
- BIE FY 2011 Budget Request

Requested:

- Moratorium on grade expansion document
- BIE education budget projections
- OMB budget projections

Attachment A: List of Participants

<i>L_Name</i>	<i>F_Name</i>	<i>Representing</i>	<i>Alt/PriM</i>	<i>Attended</i>
Anderson	Gregory	Muscogee (Creek) Nation of Oklahoma	Primary	March 9, 10, 11
Azure	Janice	Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa	Primary	March 9, 10, 11
Begay	Jimmy	Navajo Nation	Primary	March 10, 11
Brown	Jerry	Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribe	Primary	March 10, 11
Cheek	Jackie	Bureau of Indian Education	Alternate	March 9, 10, 11
Colhoff	Fred	Oglala Sioux Tribe	Primary	March 9, 10, 11
Culbreath	Joy	Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	Primary	March 10, 11
DeHose	Judy	White Mountain Apache Tribe	Primary	March 10, 11
Eskeets	Emerson	Office of Facilities Management and Construction	Alternate	March 10, 11
Gross	Shirley	15 Tribes of ND, SD and NE	Primary	March 10, 11
Hogan	James	Rosebud Sioux Tribe	Primary	March 9, 10, 11
House	Jerald Scott	Navajo Nation	Alternate	March 9, 10, 11
Lester	Hudson	Navajo Nation	Primary	March 10, 11
Gilbert	Regina	Division of Indian Affairs	Alternate	March 9, 10, 11
Leader Charge	Fred	Rosebud Sioux Tribe	Alternate	March 9, 10, 11
Maxwell Taylor	Arthur	Nez Perce Tribe	Primary	March 9, 10, 11
Ojaye	Betty	Navajo Nation	Primary	March 9, 10, 11
Porter	Jim	Office of the Solicitor	Primary	March 9, 10, 11
Rever	Jack	Office of Facilities Management and Construction	Primary	March 10
Roessel	Monty	Navajo Nation	Primary	March 9, 10, 11
Singer	Michele	DFO/ Division of Indian Affairs	Primary	March 9, 10, 11
Witt	Jerome Wayne	Oglala Sioux Tribe	Primary	March 9, 10, 11
Wright	Catherine	Hopi Tribe	Primary	March 9, 10, 11
Yazzie	Albert	Navajo Nation	Primary	March 9, 10, 11
York	Kennith	Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians	Primary	March 9, 10, 11
Zah Bahe	Lorena	Navajo Nation	Primary	March 10, 11

Other Participants

<i>L_Name</i>	<i>F_Name</i>	<i>Representing</i>	<i>Alt/PriM</i>	<i>Attended</i>
Harvey	Kate	Consensus Building Institute	Facilitator	Jan 5, 6, 7
Morin	Margie	Office of Facilities Management and Construction		Jan 5, 6, 7
Smith	Stacie	Consensus Building Institute	Facilitator	Jan 5, 6, 7
Tubby	Julia	Choctaw Agency	Public	Jan 5, 6