Administrative Affairs Council Meeting
July 22-23, 2008 Retreat, Dickinson

Alice Brekke, UND    Brenda Wigness, WSC
Trudy Collins, VCSU    Tamara Barber, BSC
Broc Leitz and John Adams, NDSU    Corry Kenner, LRSC
Steve Benson, MaSU    Ron Dorn, MiSU
Jim Borkowski, MiSU-BC    Mike Renk, Keith Johnson, NDSCS
Alvind Binstock/Mark Lowe, DSU
Darci Trenda, Cathy McDonald, Laura Glatt-NDUS

Deferred Maintenance
Rick Tonder, UND, reviewed the earlier draft deferred maintenance calculator model recommended by NDAPPA. Council members raised the following questions and suggestions:

- Another category should be added for older buildings (i.e. over 50 years old) with an increasing age of facility actor, instead of applying the same factor for all buildings over 35 years of age.
- Need to clarify how building age is determined when a facility is renovated for consistency purposes in applying the model.
- Questioned how the varying increments—both the years and percentage factors—were arrived at for the age of facility factor. Rick indicated it was based on a sampling of recent UND projects. It was suggested that perhaps more standard increments may be more understandable and acceptable.
- Suggested that a thorough review of the recent NDSU evaluation be done to determine where there are major differences and what can be learned from that process and applied to the NDUS model. (MaSU and VCSU also said they engaged an outside firm in the development of their campus master plan, with VCSU’s consultant also identifying deferred maintenance.)

It was suggested that each campus undertake a similar external review, similar to what was done at NDSU, to identify and quantify outstanding deferred maintenance since a common baseline has not been established for each campus. Once this baseline is established, a formula approach to maintaining the valuation for a period of years would make sense. Rick supported this and asked that someone from NDSU participate in the work of the committee. John Adams said that Bruce Frantz from NDSU would participate.

One option for funding such an external review would be to ask the legislature for the authority to spend a small portion of any special deferred maintenance appropriations for engaging a consultant. If this is done, it would be important to either use the same consultant across all campuses, or if more than one consultant is used, it would be important to have a clearly defined scope, clear guidelines and definitions in place to guide the consultants’ work.
Some campuses indicated this would also serve as a good internal campus planning tool for the use of scarce capital resources. Others believed they already know what their most immediate campus capital needs are and the information would be most helpful if we got enough new funding to address things other than the most critical needs.

The Committee asked the physical plant directors, through Rick Tonder, to review the proposed model taking into account the feedback from the Council. It was suggested that other campuses may volunteer to participate in the work of the NDAPPA subcommittee. They asked that the committee and Council meet jointly to present a revised model at a later date.

**Capital Project Priority Process**

Laura reported on recent SBHE discussion at their retreat on the capital project process, including a suggestion that the SBHE possibly engage an external consultant in the review process. Laura asked for feedback from the Council on specific ways in which the process could be improved in the future. One suggestion was to consider the possibility of creating two separate priority lists—one for crisis management projects (life, safety, etc.) and the other would be investment projects. Some believed this would add more confusion and competition and some projects fall into both categories. Council members questioned the need to submit more than one major capital project priority since a lot of work goes into developing the projects, with very little chance of funding for these. One alternative would be to allow campuses to ask for more than one project, as is currently done, but not necessarily require the same level of detail for projects beyond the first priority.

Laura asked for suggestions on how we can assure more timely and comprehensive completion of the major capital project requests in the future, consistent with the SBHE policy. It was suggested that perhaps a specific form/format could be developed that all campuses complete for each project request.

**Collaborative Student Process**

Laura provided an update on the work of the NDUS multi-functional committee who has developed new collaborative student procedures. She said it is her understanding that this new procedure is intended to apply to declared collaborative students. The existing NDUS procedure 805.3.1 is intended to apply to programs delivered at a distance either through face-to-face or IVN delivery. However, she recognized this is not clear to all campuses and as a result, we have inconsistent application. It was also pointed out that there are students/programs that come under both at the same time. Pat Seaworth has indicated that the two need to be reconciled and moved into NDUS procedure. It was agreed that a subcommittee of the Admin. Affairs needs to review these procedures, reconcile any differences and fill in any gaps, considering the larger fiscal policy implications. The subcommittee members are as follows: Alice Brekke-UND, chair, Tamara Barber-BSC, Alvin Binstock/Mark Lowe-DSU. They will bring a recommendation back to the Council.
Laura also mentioned that Randall intends to pull together a user group to look at the issue of access to collaborative student records between partner institutions, since it appears that access to collaborative student information is not a legal issue under FERPA, but it a technology issue since there is no way currently to limit access to collaborative student records only.

**Code of Ethics**
The Admin. Affairs reviewed the Code of Ethics adopted last year by the Council. It was suggested that the Code of Ethics be added to the Admin. Affairs Council web site for ease of reference. It was also suggested that Council minutes for the past two years be added to the web site.

**Funding Models**
Laura summarized new possible budget components outlined by Dennis Jones at the last interim Legislative HE Committee meeting including investment and performance components. She said she does not have knowledge of what Mr. Jones intends to specifically recommend to the committee next week in terms of changes to the financing model. She will keep the Council informed as the work of the committee progresses.

**LTF Plan Review**
Laura pointed out that the Long-Term Finance Plan calls for a review of the peers not less than every four years. According to this schedule, a review would need to be completed prior to the next biennial budget cycle. She asked for feedback on this process. It was suggested that we contact MGT of America to get a price estimate to have them re-run their model to identify the set of “valid” peers for each campus.

**Cell Phone Policy**
Bonnie Neas and Jean Ostrom-Blonigen-NDSU joined the meeting via conference call. Darci Trenda summarized the state and federal laws related to cell phone usage. Bonnie and Jean summarized the work and discussion which has been ongoing at NDSU. They said federal changes are still under consideration in Congress and that the ND legislature is likely to consider some statutory changes next session as they look at legislative use of blackberries. Trudy Collins-VCSU was asked to review VCSU’s newly implemented cell phone policy.

Following discussion, it was agreed that the Council will return to developing a policy when further clarity is provided at the state and federal level, including consideration of a broader technology policy, to include cell phones, internet connectivity, etc.. In the meantime, campuses will remind employees about the limitations of personal use of business cell phones.

Mick and Randall pointed out the need to limit the number and type of payroll codes related to cell phone allowances. It was suggested that campuses, who are considering a policy and allowance, review this with CND, before implementation, to ensure coordination and to be sure the proper codes are in place.
Ohio Tuition Proposal
Laura distributed a news story that described a recent initiative in Ohio wherein veterans would be given in-state tuition rates—making all veterans honorary Ohioans. This is done consistent with the expansion of GI benefits which essentially guarantees a full scholarship at their in-state public colleges and universities.

The Council members said they agreed with the idea in concept, but questioned the impact on tuition revenues, most especially as it relates to spouse and dependent of veterans.
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