



**Report and Recommendations
of the Workgroup on
Campus Condition Index
Implementation
FY 2011**

May 2011

**Division of Planning and Accountability
Finance and Resource Planning**

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board

Fred W. Heldenfels IV, CHAIR
Harold W. Hahn, VICE CHAIR
Joe B. Hinton, SECRETARY OF THE BOARD
Eric Rohne, STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE
Durga D. Agrawal
Dennis D. Golden
Lyn Bracewell Phillips
A.W. "Whit" Riter III

Austin
El Paso
Crawford
Corpus Christi
Houston
Carthage
Bastrop
Tyler

Raymund A. Paredes, COMMISSIONER OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Mission of the Coordinating Board

The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board's mission is to work with the Legislature, Governor, governing boards, higher education institutions and other entities to help Texas meet the goals of the state's higher education plan, *Closing the Gaps by 2015*, and thereby provide the people of Texas the widest access to higher education of the highest quality in the most efficient manner.

Philosophy of the Coordinating Board

The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board will promote access to quality higher education across the state with the conviction that access without quality is mediocrity and that quality without access is unacceptable. The Board will be open, ethical, responsive, and committed to public service. The Board will approach its work with a sense of purpose and responsibility to the people of Texas and is committed to the best use of public monies. The Coordinating Board will engage in actions that add value to Texas and to higher education. The agency will avoid efforts that do not add value or that are duplicated by other entities.

The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age, or disability in employment or the provision of services.

Table of Contents

Charges to the Workgroup.....	2
Authority	2
Workgroup Roster	3
Recommendations.....	4
DATA COLLECTION	4
DATA STRUCTURE.....	4
DATA SUBMISSION	4
Appendix A: Field Size, Order, and Report Structure Reference	6
Appendix B: Field Coding Structures - Board Required Fields.....	7
Appendix C: Data Collection System Reference - Institution Fields.....	9
Appendix D: Field Size, Order, and Report Structure Reference - Full Detail	10
Minutes	12

Charges to the Workgroup

The workgroup was charged to define a practical implementation for the recommendations in the FY 2010 Campus Condition Index (CCI) workgroup report within the parameters of the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) rules.

The Coordinating Board staff would like to express our sincere gratitude to the workgroup members. We extend a special note of appreciation to the leadership displayed by Brandon Hennington of Texas Tech University in chairing the workgroup.

Authority

Texas Education Code (TEC) 61.0572 (b)(4)

CONSTRUCTION FUNDS AND DEVELOPMENT OF PHYSICAL PLANTS – Require, and assist the public technical institutes, public senior colleges and universities, medical and dental units, and other agencies of higher education in developing long-range campus master plans for campus development.

Texas Education Code, 61.0582

CAMPUS MASTER PLAN; DEFERRED MAINTENANCE – Requires institutions to report deferred maintenance to the Board, allows the Board to set rules defining required data elements, and requires the Board to report the facilities' condition to the State.

Texas Administrative Code (TAC), Section 17.100 (3)

Deferred Maintenance and Replacement Value – Requires the Board to calculate a facilities value for comparison to reported deferred maintenance. Establishes the ratio to be used for announcing the facilities' condition and project evaluation.

TAC, Section 17.101 (2)(B)

Campus Deferred Maintenance Plan (MP2) – Sets the data elements and parameters of the deferred maintenance plans reported.

TAC, Section 17.101 (2)(C)

Campus Addressed Deferred Maintenance Report (MP4) – Sets the data elements and parameters of deferred maintenance expenditures reported.

Workgroup Roster

System	Name	Email	Phone
UT System	Charlie Brady Executive Director Of Facilities Design & Construction Services	cbrady@utsystem.edu	512-499-4329
UNT System	Lilia Gonzales Director of Planning and Development for the Office of Facilities Planning and Construction	lilia.gonzales@unt.edu	940-369-8810
TXST System	Rob Roy Parnell Architect, RAS, Associate Vice Chancellor for Facilities	robroy.parnell@tsus.edu	
TAMU System	Bob Brown Vice President for Business and Administration, Texas A&M University-Commerce	bob_brown@tamu- commerce.edu	903-468-6009
UH System	Mike Yancey Director of Planning for Facilities Planning and Construction	mdyancey@uh.edu	713-743-2449
TTU System	Brandon Hennington Assistant Director Operations Division, Planning & Administration	brandon.hennington@ttu.edu	806-742-2103
TSTC System	Selby Holder Physical Plant Director, TSTC Waco	selby.holder@tstc.edu	254-867-3704
Midwestern	Kyle Owen Associate Vice President of Facilities Services	kyle.owen@mwsu.edu	940-397-4648
SFA	Lee Brittain Director, Physical Plant	lbrittain@sfasu.edu	936-468-1400
TSU	Dilip Anketell Assistant VP Facilities & Construction	anketellm@tsu.edu	713-313-7948
TWU	Bill Beckham Assistant Director, Resource Planning and Assets	wbeckham@twu.edu	940-898-3134

Recommendations

The workgroup met for three sessions and concluded with the following recommendations:

Data Collection

- Institutions should evaluate the scope of the work to collect the data required by Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (Board or THECB) rule when determining the use of internal staff or contracted services to complete evaluations of their existing facilities. An external review is not required to collect the information nor is a full facilities condition assessment.
- Institutions should prioritize the evaluation of buildings based on age, occupancy loads, condition of systems, and renovation expenditures to date in that order.
- The audit criteria should be prioritized based on mechanical, electrical, and plumbing (including fire and life safety, voice video, and data) systems; building structure, building envelope; and interiors in that order.
- The workgroup recommends the use of the Facilities Condition Audit templates on Texas Southern University's website <ftp://67.66.218.222> (User Name: facilities, Password: facilities123) to assist in determining the scope of the work required.
- Institutions may use their existing data collection systems, the workgroup's recommended data collection protocols, or any other collection system that most efficiently collects the data required by Board rule as referenced in the authority section of this document.

Data Structure

- Institutions should evaluate their existing data structures to determine their capability of reporting the data required by the Board. The workgroup provided an alternative data structure available on the above-mentioned site.
 - The purpose of the data structure is to communicate the base structure required to generate the tab-delimited flat file to be reported to the Board.
 - Appendix A serves as a reference in determining field sizes, order, and report structure for the THECB tab delimited flat file.
 - Appendix B explains the coding structure for each field.
 - Appendix C and D are references to develop a data collection system that aligns with the Board rule as referenced in the authority section of this document Campus Condition Index (CCI) reporting requirements.
- Institutions may use their existing data structures, the workgroup recommended data structure, or any other structure that most efficiently provides for the compiling of the data required by Board rule as referenced in the authority section of this document.

Data Submission

- Institutions should submit the Board required data by emailing tab delimited text files to a designated Board staff member. The files should include the building and project level sections of the report, and the email body should include the comments section of the report.
- The Board should continue to collect this report on the same date the Deferred Maintenance (MP2) report was scheduled, October 15, annually.
- The workgroup recommended the following reporting schedule for the next 18 months:
 - June 1, 2011 – Each institution would report one building.

- Mid-June 2011 – THECB would provide training.
- September 1, 2011 – Each institution would report an additional three buildings or 3 percent of their building inventory (the higher of the two), along with at least one infrastructure project.
- October 15, 2011 – Each institution would report deferred maintenance under the same format as reported on October 15, 2010.
- June 1, 2012 – Each institution would report 60 percent of their building inventories under the new format.
- Mid-June 2012 – THECB would provide training.
- September 15, 2012 – Each institution would report 100 percent of their building inventories and infrastructure projects under the new format as a preliminary run.
- October 15, 2012 – Each institution would report 100 percent of their building inventories and infrastructure projects under the new format as a final submission.

Appendix A: Field Size, Order, and Report Structure Reference

THECB Report 1 (Replaces Section 1/2/3)

Report submitted to THECB that replaces Institution Maintenance Report (Excel Format)

Tab Delimited Flat File

INTEGER VARCHAR(6) VARCHAR(3) VARCHAR(6) VARCHAR(3) VARCHAR(3) NUMERIC(18, 4) VARCHAR(3) INTEGER VARCHAR(60)

Report Year	FICE	CBPeriod	BuildingID	CB Category	CBMaint Type	Amount	CBBasis	Priority	Project Name
2010	003644	E	XXX1	PM	H	\$1,000	ACT		
2010	003644	B	XXX1	FA	A	\$32,000	APP		
2010	003644	B	XXX1	PM	L	\$74,500	APP		
2010	003644	E	XXX2	PM	S	\$20,000	ACT		
2010	003644	B	XXX2	DM	A	\$87,500	APP		
2010	003644	E	000000	PM	L	\$100,000	APP		
2010	003644	E		PM	H	\$1,000	APP	1	TEST 1
2010	003644	B		FA	A	\$32,000	APP	2	TEST 2
2010	003644	B		PM	L	\$74,500	APP	3	TEST 3
2010	003644	E		PM	S	\$20,000	APP	4	TEST 4
2010	003644	B		DM	A	\$87,500	APP	5	TEST 5

Institution Code

NULL for
Top 5
Projects

Only
Populated
by Top 5

Only
Populated by
Top 5

THECB Report 3 (Replaces Section 4)

Institutional Impact of Deferred Maintenance

--

Appendix B: Field Coding Structures - Board Required Fields

Table Type THECB
Table CCI Period
 Source CCI System
 Table Data (Control File)
 VARCHAR(3) VARCHAR(60) VARCHAR(3)

Period ID	CCI Period	CBPeriod
1	Previous Expenditures	E
2	Budgeted - Current Year	B
3	Unbudgeted - Current Year	U
4	Projected - Years 2 Through 5	P
0	Not Assigned (Internal Inst. Use)	

Table Type THECB
Table CCI Category
 Source CCI System
 Table Data (Control File)
 VARCHAR(3) VARCHAR(60) VARCHAR(3)

Category ID	CCI Category	CBCategory
1	Planned Maintenance	PM
2	Deferred Maintenance	DM
3	Critical Deferred Maintenance	CM
4	Facility Adaptation	FA

Table Type THECB
Table Building
 Source Facilities Inventory
 Comments Must match all Facilities Inventory Building Numbers
 Table Data
 VARCHAR(6) VARCHAR(50)

Building Number	Building Name
XXX1	Biology
XXX2	Library

Table Type THECB
Table CCI Section
 Source CCI System
 Table Data (Control File)
 VARCHAR(3) VARCHAR(60)

Section ID	CCI Section
1	Building
2	Campus Infrastructure

Table Type THECB
Table Maintenance Type
 Source CCI System
 Table Data (Control File)

VARCHAR(3) VARCHAR(60) VARCHAR(3)

Maintenance Type ID	Maintenance Type	CBMaintType
1	Architectural	A
2	HVAC	H
3	Plumbing and Electrical	P
4	Safety	S
5	Legal and Mandatory	L
6	Other	O

Table Type THECB
Table CCI Basis
 Source CCI System
 Table Data

VARCHAR(6) VARCHAR(50) VARCHAR(6)

Basis ID	Basis	CBBasis
1	Approximated	APP
2	Inspected	INS
3	Actual (Reserved for Previous Expenditures)	ACT

Appendix C: Data Collection System Reference - Institution Fields

Table Type

Table

Source

Comments

Institution

Organization

Institution Organizations

Institution Organization Codes (Reporting Organization) and will only be required at the institution level.

Table Data

VARCHAR(25)

VARCHAR(60)

Organization Code	Organization
A0001	Physical Plant
V0072	Athletics
Z0004	Aux

Appendix D: Field Size, Order, and Report Structure Reference - Full Detail

Table **CCI Maintenance**
Source Multiple
Comments Centralized repository of data for the entire institution.
Table Data

Project Number should be unique to each project

VARCHAR(20)	VARCHAR(25)	VARCHAR(3)	VARCHAR(60)	VARCHAR(25)	Date/Time	VARCHAR(3)
Project Number	Organization Code	Maintenance Type ID	Project Name	Request Organization Code	Request Date	Period ID
1	A0001	2		A0001		1
2	A0001	4		A0001		1
3	A0001	3		A0001		1
4	A0001	1		A0001		2
5	A0001	1		A0001		2
6	A0001	5		A0001		2

INTEGER VARCHAR(3) VARCHAR(6) VARCHAR(3) VARCHAR(500) NUMERIC(18, 4) VARCHAR(3) INT VARCHAR(500)

Fiscal Year	Section ID	Building Number	Category ID	Project Description	Expenditure Amount	Basis ID	Priority	Comments
2009	1	XXX1	1	Replaced HVAC	\$1,000	3	0	
2009	1	XXX2	1	Fire Alarm System	\$20,000	3	0	
2009	2		1	West Campus Tunnel	\$100,000	3	0	
2010	1	XXX1	4	Renovate 2nd Floor Suite	\$32,000	1	1	
2010	1	XXX2	2	Replace Roof	\$87,500	1	2	
2010	2	XXX1	1	ADA Upgrades/ Elevators	\$74,500	1	3	

Only required for Period ID Previous Expenditures

Basis for Expenditure Amount
Priority by Period ID

**Meeting of the Campus Condition Index Implementation Workgroup
Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board
Boardroom, Second Floor
1200 East Anderson Lane, Austin
Friday, January 28, 2011**

Minutes

Attendees: Gary Barnard (for Charlie Brady), Lilia Gonzales, Rob Roy Parnell, Bob Brown, Mike Yancey, Brandon Hennington, Selby Holder, Kyle Owen, Jeff Ghiringhelli (for Lee Brittain), Dilip Anketell, and Bill Beckham.

Staff: Paul Turcotte, Thomas Keaton, Jennifer Gonzales, and Roland Gilmore.

1. The meeting convened at 8:55 a.m.
2. Thomas Keaton commented on the history of the process. Thomas Keaton nominated Brandon Hennington, Assistant Director of Operations, Texas Tech University, as workgroup chair. The workgroup unanimously voted him in.
3. Brandon Hennington presented Texas Tech University's data structure schema they intend to use to collect the data for the new report. He agreed to distribute that structure to all workgroup members before the next meeting.
 - a. Mr. Parnell suggested adding an additional field for the level of accuracy of cost estimates.
 - b. The group asked the THECB staff to build, distribute, and maintain an application for data collection and reporting. The staff does not see the development of an application for this reporting necessary as the data will still need to be converted from the individual institutions' project management systems into the application. It is more efficient for the staff to define a flat file convention for all institutions to export their data for transmission to the staff.
 - c. Mandating the institutions to conduct Facility Condition Audits was considered, but it is not in line with this implementation, and the group saw a value in leaving the collection of the data as flexible as possible for each institution.
 - d. The group requested the staff provide webinar-like training before the implementation.
 - e. The group requested a standardized Excel or Access template be created to collect, manage, and distribute the information for the report.
 - f. The chair divided the efforts to complete the workgroup's agenda into three sub-workgroups: Data Collection, Data Structure, and Data Submission.
 - g. Data Collection is chaired by Dilip Anketell with Kyle Owen, and Mike Yancey.
 - h. Data Structure is chaired by Brandon Hennington with Lilia Gonzales, Rob Roy Parnell, Lee Brittain, and Charlie Brady.
 - i. Data Submission is chaired by Bob Brown with Selby Holder and Bill Beckham.
 - j. The chair will issue charges to the sub-workgroup chairs before the next meeting.
 - k. It is the expectation that the sub-workgroups will meet between meetings and present the results of their efforts to the main meeting.

- I. The chair reserved the right to add additional sub-workgroups during future meetings if the main group saw the need.
4. The workgroup adjourned at 11:51 a.m. to reconvene at 9:00 a.m. on February 23, 2011.

**Meeting of the Campus Condition Index Implementation Workgroup
Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board
Lonestar Room, Second Floor
1200 East Anderson Lane, Austin
Wednesday, February 23, 2011**

Minutes

Attendees: Charlie Brady, Lilia Gonzales, Rob Roy Parnell, Bob Brown, Mike Yancey, Brandon Hennington, Kyle Owen, Jeff Ghiringhelli (for Lee Brittain), Dilip Anketell, and Bill Beckham.

Staff: Paul Turcotte, Thomas Keaton, and Roland Gilmore.

1. The chair called the meeting to order at 9:07 a.m.
2. The minutes from the January 28, 2011, meeting were reviewed and approved.
3. The chair reviewed the subgroup charges distributed before the meeting.
4. The Data Collection subgroup chair presented the group's progress.
 - a. The group does not recommend prescribing how the data are collected.
 - b. Facilities Condition Assessments should be left to management's discretion.
 - c. The group chair requested institutions place the data they currently have in the format recommended by the data structure subgroup by March 2.
 - d. Charlie Brady, Executive Director of Facilities Design & Construction Services, The University of Texas System, requested the degree of accuracy expected with the elimination of the \$10K threshold. Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board staff recommend institutions apply the 80/20 rule in devoting resources to collect data on structures not currently analyzed, with the understanding the data collection could take some time.
5. The Data Structure subgroup chair presented the group's progress.
 - a. The subgroup updated the data structure removing the project name field and added the estimate field to indicate the degree of accuracy of the costs presented.
 - b. A "non-assigned" option was added to the time period list of options to account for items beyond 5 years and unknowns.
 - c. The group has developed an MS Access database for distribution to the institutions that do not currently have an application to contain the data to be collected. The group would consider including a data collection form.
 - d. The group requested the estimate field be renamed.
6. The Data Submission subgroup chair presented the group's determination that a tab delimited submission format would be acceptable to all institutions.
7. The goal for the next meeting is to have the subgroups present their draft final reports to the main group. Updated final reports will be due to the chair March 18. Preliminary data from all institutions are due by July 18, 2011, with a formal reporting in July 2012.

8. Adjourn until 9:00 a.m., March 25, 2011.

**Meeting of the Campus Condition Index Implementation Workgroup
Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board
Lonestar Room, Second Floor
1200 East Anderson Lane, Austin
Friday, March 25, 2011**

Minutes

Attendees: Charlie Brady, Lilia Gonzales, Rob Roy Parnell, Bob Brown, Mike Yancey, Brandon Hennington, Selby Holder, Kyle Owen, Jeff Ghiringhelli (for Lee Brittain), Dilip Anketell, and Bill Beckham.

Staff: Paul Turcotte, Thomas Keaton, Jennifer Gonzales, and Roland Gilmore.

1. The meeting convened at 9:00 a.m.
2. Discussed and approved minutes from the February 23, 2011, meeting.
 - a. Staff confirmed that the 80/20 rule applies to all categories of the report and not just to the deferred maintenance category. The projects defined and summarized should represent 80 percent of the work to be done, with the understanding the remaining 20 percent would take an unreasonable amount of effort to collect and not return a material value to the reporting.
3. The Data Collection subgroup chair reported recommendations for data collection. Institutions may use existing data collection systems or the recommendations of the data collection committee for compiling the required data.
 - a. Prioritize buildings on the basis of age, occupancy loads, condition of systems, and renovation expenditures to date in that order.
 - b. Prioritize audit based on mechanical, electrical, and plumbing (includes fire and life safety, voice video, and data) systems; building structure, building envelope; and interiors in that order.
 - c. Use the Facilities Condition Audit templates on Texas Southern University's website <ftp://67.218.222> (User Name: facilities, Password: facilities123).
4. The Data Structure subgroup chair reported a recommended structure for data collection provided in an Access database found on the website listed in the Data Collection subgroup's recommendations. Institutions may use their existing data collection and structure or the recommendations of the Data Structure subgroup for compiling the required data provided.
5. The Data Submission subgroup reported tab-delimited files would be the preferred submission format.
 - a. Institutions are to email flat files to a designated THECB staff member to include the building and project level sections of the report.
 - b. Institutions would include the comments section of the report in the email body.

- c. A survey of the component institutions indicated that all institutions with the exception of one would like to maintain the October 15th annual report date.
 - d. In the following 18 months, the following reporting schedule was recommended by the workgroup:
 - i. June 1, 2011 – Each institution would report one building.
 - ii. Mid-June 2011 – THECB would provide training.
 - iii. September 1, 2011 – Each institution would report an additional three buildings or 3 percent of their building inventory (the higher of the two), along with at least one infrastructure project.
 - iv. October 15, 2011 – Each institution would report deferred maintenance under the same format as reported on October 15, 2010.
 - v. June 1, 2012 – Each institution would report 60 percent of their building inventories under the new format.
 - vi. Mid-June 2012 – THECB would provide training.
 - vii. October 15, 2012 – Each institution would report 100 percent of their building inventories under the new format.
6. Adjourned until August 2011.

This document is available on the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board
Website: <http://www.thecb.state.tx.us>

For more information, contact:

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board
P.O. Box 12788
Austin, TX 78711
512/427-6130

Paul Turcotte
Program Director
Planning and Accountability, Finance and Resource Planning

Thomas E. Keaton
Director
Planning and Accountability, Finance and Resource Planning