Administrative Review Facilities Charter

Purpose

To establish the roles and responsibilities of the Administrative Review of Facilities. The charge is pursuant to the Goals and Directives of the Board of Trustees as adopted in January 2012 and in keeping with the subsequent administrative review of university functional areas which recommended in January 2013 as a top priority that a full administrative review be conducted in the facilities functional area.

Charge

The Administrative Review of Facilities has responsibility for successful completion of the facilities component of the general Administrative Review project. The team reports through the Vice Chancellor and Chancellor to the Administrative Review Steering Committee and to the Presidents’ Council. It is to begin its work in September 2013 and make an interim report by December 31, 2013, outlining how the review is to be carried out and proposing a timeline for doing so.

Responsibility and Authority

The review teams are to seek out and plan for interim, actionable reports and milestones prior to making final reports. There will be two teams working under a common chairmanship. The common chairmanship will ensure coordination and collaboration between the respective efforts. The functional team’s draft report is due December 31, 2014 and it is authorized to include in its review the facilities functional areas such as construction, project management, trades, grounds, custodial, other daily operations, fleet management, risk management, safety and environmental management and any other reasonably related functions as it determines necessary or constructive. It is anticipated that any final reports from the planning team would be submitted in the period January 1 to June 30, 2015. The planning team is primarily charged with long-term planning and the associated issues.

Overview of facilities, primarily as summarized in the report of January 2013

- The facilities function manages 583 facilities, encompassing approximately 9.4 million square feet, on 3,831 developed acres, with an asset value of approximately $1.825 billion.
- The facilities function is staffed with approximately 500 FTEs, with over 59% of the workforce being custodians, building and grounds workers. An additional 25% of FTEs are in the trades.
- The annual budget for all facilities is in excess of $64 million, with over 38% of that going to compensation (pay and benefits). Approximately 15% of the annual budget is contracted to parties outside of UMS with some campuses as low as 5% and one as high as 35%.
- More than 36% of UMS facilities have a renovation age of 50 years old or greater.
- Deferred maintenance is approximately $400 million. The estimated total asset reinvestment backlog is approximately $720 million and growing.
**Key deliverables**

Because of the size and scope of the reviews, the work and deliverables are divided between the two groups as follows. Deliverables include:

1. **Functional Team**: Review the operational administration and management of all UMS facilities assets and services systemwide, including campuses, outreach centers, auxiliary spaces, leased space, owned space, construction services, project management services and fleet services. How is this work done? How to achieve administrative efficiencies and/or service enhancements?

2. **Planning Team**: Develop a strategic, system-wide plan to manage UMS facilities including a multi-year plan for managing, developing, and rightsizing the facilities plant. The teams should take into account relevant data (e.g., financial realities and contingencies; student numbers and profiles; differentiations in campus’ missions; academic programs, focused research and service needs) as well as a process for its no-less-than annual updating of such a plan.

**Assumptions for the team to incorporate and/or test as part of its work**

1. Functionally up to date facilities are required for UMS to meet its tripartite mission in: a) education; b) research and economic development; and, c) public service.
2. The teams should ensure that long term plans are consistent with campus missions and in recognition of their respective competitive advantages.
3. The existing facilities portfolio is likely too large, functionally sub-optimal, or badly sited to be fiscally sustainable in the existing and forecasted operating environment. (This assumption needs to be quantified and tested.)
4. Some functional efficiencies may be implemented best at the systemwide University Services level, although these opportunities will need to be identified and quantified.
5. How do the relevant data sets (e.g., demographics, campus missions, revenue streams) inform and affect facilities planning, and vice-versa?
6. The structure of servicing students via 7 primary institutions (USM, UMA, UMF, UMM, UM, UMPI and UMFK) and 10 primary physical campuses (Gorham, Portland, Lewiston, Augusta, Bangor, Orono, Machias, Presque Isle, Fort Kent and Farmington) is beyond the scope of this review.
7. Additional items for consideration are reflected throughout the January 2013 administrative review report on facilities management.
**Composition**

The Facilities Administrative Review for Functional Operations Team is:

- Ryan Low
- Chip Gavin
- Norm Fournier, UMS Trustee
- Cynthia Huggins, UMM President
- Robert Bertram, E.D. Facilities Management, USM
- John Murphy, CFO, UMFK

The Facilities Administrative Review Team for Strategic Planning is:

- Ryan Low
- Chip Gavin
- Karl Turner, UMS Trustee
- Cynthia Huggins, UMM President
- Janet Waldron, UMaine
- TBD (Academic Stakeholder Seat)

**Resources**

- TBD