Notes from the September Board of Regents Meeting (September 10, 2004; Lincoln).

All of the agenda items pertained to UNL or UNMC. However, there were a couple of items that may have ramifications for the UNK campus.

1. The wording of the UNMC campus policy on proceeds distribution applicable to royalties and proceeds resulting from the licensing and other technology transfer activities of UNMC was revised. The revision allows for the inventor to share in a larger than the general recommended one-third share of the royalties, under certain situations and with approval of the President upon recommendation of the Chancellor.

Some discussion followed focusing on the use of public facilities and resources being used by an employee paid with public dollars to do profit motivated research. President Milliken responded that the change allows for the recognition of “highly meritorious” situations where an inventor has earned a greater share of the proceeds. President Milliken concluded by saying that these situations will be the exception rather than the norm, that the Board of Regents will be kept informed, and this change provides incentive for research activities.

2. The policy limiting distribution of political material on UNL campus to two locations. David Kramer, Chairman of the Nebraskan Republican Party, addressed the BOR about UNL’s policy of limiting the distribution of political material on campus. Mr. Kramer emphasized that UNL’s policy has broad implications for what can and cannot be presented on campus and is a free speech issue. Another concern is the time frame in which the policy was implemented. Mr. Kramer reported that the policy had been in place since February, but was only enforced prior to the beginning of the first home football game. A representative for the Right to Life also expressed concerns about how their organization would be impacted by this policy.

Chancellor Perlman clarified about the recent implementation of the policy, and indicated that difficulties appeared to be resolved. Several Regents indicated that perhaps it is time to develop a University-wide conflict of interest/conflict of use policy, rather than trying to determine these policies on a campus by campus basis. President Milliken and Chancellor Perlman indicated that this was the goal and an investigation of how to develop this policy is underway.

The following a summary of the power point presentation Capital Planning Process by NU Facilities Planning and Management.

Prior to President Smith’s tenure, the capital planning process consisted of 100s of projects representing campus wish lists with no tie-in with strategic planning, no system for prioritization or discussion, and no effective mechanism for lobbying the legislature.

Currently the process begins at the campus level, with each campus identifying their physical master plan and putting forward a prioritized list of projects. At the system level (Central Administration), Capital Plans developed on a six year cycle and updated yearly, projects are prioritized regardless of funding source, and presented to the BOR on a biennial basis.

The planning/approval process also differs slightly depending on the source of funding, although all involve campus priorities identified in the Six-Year Capital Plan:

a) State Funded: On a Biennial basis projects are selected from the Six Year Plan, the BOR approve Capital Construction Budget Request (CCBR) in June. Funds requested for State supported projects encompass academic, research, and outreach activities. Projects represent University’s highest priority for state funds.

b) Donor/Grant Funded. Review of project with University Foundation or Granting Agency, fund raising or securing the grant, and approval by the BOR.
c) Bond Funded. Approval by the BOR, Revenue and F&A Projects require recommendation by CCPE and approval by the Legislature. Revenue and Facilities Corporation Bonds also need approval of the BOR, whether revenue or cash supported.

Some of the difficulties encountered with the current system of planning include:
- has not always contained auxiliary funded projects
- has not always included opportunity projects (donor or grant funded)
- does not include master plan projects completed after submission

In developing the Six Year Capital plan, the process questions to be addressed include:
- What information is needed for informed decisions?
- How do we gather and present that information?
- What informational needs to remain confidential?
- How does capital planning support the Strategic Plan?
- What are the costs of capital construction?
- What are the costs of not building?

The general purpose of the presentation was to inform the BOR of the process used in developing the Physical Master Plan. The Regents indicated appreciation for the information and indicated that it will be helpful in making better decisions, especially in terms of the BOR supporting specific capital projects.

ChancellorPerlman (UNL) provided preliminary information about the “School As Lender” program which will be formally presented at the October BOR meeting.

The School As Lender program has several benefits:
- allows a university to utilize a single firm to provide a single point of contact and access for loan funds
- provides better financial terms to borrowers
- allows a university to share in the income generated through the program and reinvest these proceeds in financial aid programs

Additional information will be provided at the October BOR meetings. Several Regents inquired if there was a possibility of extending this program to the other campuses. Chancellor Perlman responded by saying that there may be a possibility, but at the present time UNL is the only campus involved in Direct Lending and it requires a large loan volume to make School As Lender program feasible, thus it made the most sense for UNL to start the process.