

**State-Wide Capital Master Plan Sub-Committee
Ohio Board of Regents
Minutes of the Meeting of June 19, 2006**

The State-Wide Capital Master Plan Sub-Committee met at the office of the Ohio Board of Regents in Columbus, Ohio. In attendance were the following:

Jim Haley
Kate Carey
James Nargang
Alex Cofield
Ron James
Evelyn Frey
Ann James
Chuck Mann
Kate Harkin
John Kotowski
Katie Hensel

The meeting started with a meet and greet of all the members of the sub-committee. As part of this team building activity, nicknames were shared and we discussed the toys we brought to the meeting.

Alex Cofield led the first discussion with the development of the committee charter. She talked about why we need to do this and why the charter was an important first step. The following are the responses to the structured subcommittee chartering document that was facilitated by Alex Cofield of the Ohio State Universtiy.

Step 1: Define the team.

1. Sponsor: the 9 member Board of Regents
 2. Leader/Project Manager: Jim Nargang
 3. Members and organizational linkages
 - Jim Haley, Miami University
 - Kate Carey, Ohio Learning Network
 - James Nargang, Ohio Board of Regents
 - Alex Cofield, Ohio State University
 - Ron James, Ohio Board of Regents
 - Evelyn Frey, Cleveland State University
 - Ann James, Cincinnati State Technical and Community College
 - Chuck Mann, Owens State Community College
 - Kate Harkin, Columbus State Community College
 - John Kotowski, Ohio University
 - Katie Hensel, Ohio Board of Regents
- To whom does the team report?
 - i. the 9 member Board of Regents
 - ii. institutions/peers
 - iii. stakeholders

1. taxpayers, bond holders, students (current and future), general assembly, Governor (current and future), employers, IUC, OACC, Higher ed staff, customers, host communities

Step 2: Define the Purpose

Team Purpose

1. Why does this team exist? To assist the Board to create an ongoing capital planning process.
2. Why was it formed? To create a plan/statement of current and future needs. To develop policy recommendations and alternatives for BOR Board and legislature. To identify tangible outcomes. To educate the General Assembly about the needs and outcomes.

Mission

1. What is the team expected to do? To provide expertise and to clearly present and communicate complex message in layman's terms. To develop a 10 year capital plan and process.

Goals/Measures

1. Have plan and process in 18 months. (December 31, 2007)
2. Understand the higher ed need (mid to end august)
 - a. Capacity, renovation, future needs, academic plans, state policy, CHEE report
3. Understand audience
4. Involve 3rd party expert
5. labor market index

Boundaries

1. correcting academic programs
2. not debating 18 month deadline
3. not dictate how each campus uses funding
4. funding formula & capital allocation
5. don't burden campuses with new reports

Critical Success Factors

1. Communicate connection of relationship between higher ed and economic well being of Ohio.
2. December 31. 2007 deadline
3. product is credible
4. increase credibility of higher ed to legislators with interaction and dialogue.
5. document a coherent program
6. acceptance of higher ed institutions

Step 3: Define the Responsibilities

Team

1. provide meeting minutes
2. communicate to other Ohio higher ed institutions
3. start meetings on time and end on time
4. work towards acceptance
5. follow Ohio ethics laws

Individual

1. Keep your own institution up to date

2. keep comments, what you agree to do
3. if you can't make a meeting, let Jim Nargang know
4. respect each other
5. open, honest communication
6. play devil's advocate
7. do not introduce biased institution agenda
8. keep on task
9. own final product

Step 4: Develop Operating Guidelines

Decision making

1. depends on how we relate to BOR Board
2. If issue, escalate to BOR Board and to larger higher ed group (depending on issue)
3. acceptance by committee members

Communications

1. email team members
2. minutes on web with feedback option
3. quarterly meetings with larger higher ed team
4. inform IUC and OACC with formal communication

Step 5: Set Behavior Guidelines

Core Values

1. respect
2. honest
3. integrity/ethics
4. listening
5. discussion

Guiding principals

1. agree to disagree
2. talk with person
3. forgiveness
4. tolerance
5. talk with Jim
6. Jim move the issue forward

The chartering exercise was well received by the members of the subcommittee and commended Alex Cofield for doing an exceptional job in coordinating this effort.

The next item on the agenda was the Discussion of the \$150 million Supplemental Capital Request.

The subcommittee reviewed a draft spreadsheet with a detailed list of proposed projects by campus. Jim Nargang asked for feedback from the subcommittee members regarding the format and amount of detail relative to project descriptions.

The consensus of the subcommittee members was to provide a synopsis of campus requests and not the project list in detail. The concern was the list of

projects would imply that funding these projects would address the deferred maintenance backlog. Several subcommittee members emphasized the need to create a narrative that explains why Ohio's public higher education facilities have a renewal backlog.

The major elements of the narrative proposed by the subcommittee included:

- Developing a common thread or theme throughout the supplemental request narrative and ultimately the master plan.
- A description of why we are here from a total building and historical perspective.
- Providing a list of major renewal problems and the boundaries applied to projects funded in the supplemental request.
- Comparison of actual needs vs. available resources.
- Growth of non-state resources.
- Educate legislators and OBM regarding infrastructure needs.
- Addressing multi-prime bidding and prevailing wage requirements.
- Reducing or breaking down a complex renewal problem into a simple structure that is easily understood.
- The steps campuses are taking now to address the facility renewal problem and recommendations for a long term solution.
- Demonstrate a strong link between campus technology needs and facility renewal.

The subcommittee agreed to defer the first compression planning session that would identify 5-7 guiding principles for state-wide capital planning. The subcommittee then began discussing potential key qualifications for bidders interested in assisting the Board with the master planning effort.

During the compression planning session, it became apparent the subcommittee did not have sufficient background to identify the key qualifications for a vendor at this meeting. It was recommended that subcommittee members wait until after completed an initial draft of the state-wide master plan was completed.

The discussion then moved on to proposed major phases of the capital plan. The subcommittee recommended a three-phase approach:

- Phase 1 – development of a draft master plan narrative.
- Phase 2 – assessment of facilities and validation of need.
- Phase 3 – combine amended narrative and facility profiles from assessment into a final master plan.

The subcommittee decided to meet on July 25th, the proposed date for the next capital master plan committee meeting. The meeting was planned as an update on the work of the subcommittee. The subcommittee agreed we would not have sufficient material for the larger group to review by July 25th. The larger committee meeting will most likely be scheduled in late summer.