

Minutes of the Budget Committee of the Academic Senate (DRAFT)

Meeting of December 3, 2012

Present: Mike McIntyre (Chair), Linda Beale, , Don DeGracia, Ewa Golebiowska, Rob Kohrman (Administration)*, Lawrence Lemke, Richard Needleman (AAUP-AFT)*, Charles Parrish, Lou Romano, Linea Rydstedt, William Slater, Richard Smith, Karen Tonso, James Woodyard.

Absent with Notice: Heather Sandlin, William Volz.

Absence without Notice: Patrick Bresnahan (Student Senate)*, Kenneth Jackson (Graduate Council)*.

Invited guest: Richard Nork, Vice President for Finance & Business Operations, Ronald Brown, Provost.

*Liaison

1. The meeting began at 11:15 AM.
2. *The minutes of October 1 were approved.*
3. *Discussion of major updates of the Campus Master Plan, 2020.*

The Chair reported that the December BOG documents indicated that Campus Master Plan 2020 had been revised in 2008 and in 2011. He requested a copy of these revisions and was told that there had not been a formal update in 2011 and that there was no steering committee involved in either update.

The following motion was made and seconded:

The Budget Committee requests that the Chair of the committee make a formal request to the administration to provide the 2008 and 2011 master plan updates.

The motion passed unanimously.

When VP Nork joined the meeting he indicated that he would send the committee both updates.

4. *Discussion of the proposed expansion and renovation of the Student Center Building.* The BOG materials included a request for \$1.3 million to complete the design activities for the renovation of the Student Center Building (SCB). The total cost of the project is estimated to be \$23 million. Mr. Woodyard indicated that the Student Affairs committee had been sent a copy of a consultant's report regarding the SCB that included a student, faculty, and staff survey and offered to forward this report to the Budget Committee. The Chair asked Mr. Nork what was the timeline for the SCB remodel. Mr. Nork said that bids for the design plans had been solicited and that Facilities was ready to hire a firm as soon as the Board approved the \$1.3 million request.

The Chair indicated that a major problem with all of these requests, including the SCB, is that they come at the end of the current administration. He thought that it would be better to wait for a new President to make decisions on the building priorities going forward. Although the faculty on the Budget Committee may not be experts on the need for and design of a remodeled SCB, these faculty were experts on budget matters and can have useful input on setting budget priorities. A member asked if there had been any Senate members on the committee that studied the need for a new SCB. Mr. Nork indicated that there had been faculty on the committee, but not from the Senate. Another member said that President Gilmour has a corporate perspective in which his staff does what he tells them to do. Applying this process to a university completely cuts out any academic consultation. Apparently he has convinced the Board to accept this view.

5. Discussion of the proposed Advanced Technology Education Center at Macomb. The Administration plans to renovate a Farmer Jack supermarket that was purchased by the university and is situated on 12 mile in Warren, across from the Macomb Community College campus. The Chair reported that apparently research faculty would be housed in this facility and that Macomb Community College faculty will participate in the research there. A number of committee members expressed doubts about this proposal.

6. Discussion of the 5-Year Capital Outlay Plan. The Chair reported that the BOG materials included a revised 5-year Capital Outlay Plan. The administration did not provide this plan to the Academic Senate as required in the BOG statutes and as VP Nork promised at the Dec. 2011 meeting of the Budget Committee.

The following motion was made and seconded:

The Budget Committee requests that the Chair of the Budget Committee contact the administration early in the Fall semester and ask that it provide the Budget Committee with the 5-year Capital Outlay Plan in time to allow proper Faculty consultation.

The motion passed unanimously.

A member asked why the State Hall renovation had been dropped from the highest priority to the lowest priority. Mr. Nork said that ½ of the proposed work in State Hall had already been completed. The technology in all of the classrooms had already been upgraded and the fourth floor had been completely remodeled. The Chair said that the money for these upgrades was provided by a give back from the State on funds taken from the FY2009 budget. This \$4 million did not come close to the estimated \$40 million cost for a complete upgrade of this important facility.

Mr. Nork reiterated that the fourth floor was completely renovated and that the bulk of the remainder of the \$40 was for HVAC and infrastructure upgrades. A member indicated that this did not seem reasonable. The Chair stated that State Hall resembled a high school building circa 1950 and that bringing this building up to the standards of the universities we compete with for students should be a very high priority. A member indicated that having attractive and technologically advanced classrooms influences both students and parents when the decisions are made regarding which college to attend and could also affect retention.

7. Discussion of the Report of the Development Budget Review Committee. The Chair asked for a summary of the meeting of the Board Executive Committee in which the Academic Senate Development Budget Review Committee made a presentation. Mr. Romano gave a brief summary of the presentation. He said that the analysis by the committee and by the Marts and Lundy consultants had concluded that Development had been underperforming for many years. The committee criticized the plan that Development had submitted going forward. The review Committee proposed a revised budget model that did not use general funds to increase the Development budget. Governor Driker responded to the report by questioning the expertise of the committee and the character of the committee members. He also attacked the committee because it reviewed the entire Development effort rather than just the budget aspects. He never responded to the substance of the report.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:45

Lou Romano