

From: Miller, Monica <millemo@cod.edu>
Sent: Monday, June 23, 2014 4:24 PM
To: Millush, Mary Ann <millush@cod.edu>
Subject: FW: Trustee McGuire's Questions

From: Glaser, Thomas
Sent: Monday, June 23, 2014 4:23 PM
To: Breuder, Dr. Robert
Cc: Miller, Monica
Subject: Trustee McGuire's Questions
Importance: High

Dr. Breuder,

Below please find answers to questions raised by Trustee McGuire on the June 26, 2104 Board packet. If you need any other information, please let me know.

9.A.2 Pleased to see increased usage of the Consortium/Cooperative Agreement by the college. Do we have any idea of how much we might have saved by going through the cooperative for these purchases?

Response:

Savings or spend reduction estimates for Consortium/Cooperative purchases for June Board Report:

- UPS Battery Replacement - \$6,532
- Seville Stairing \$12,666 spend reduction from prior year
- B&H Photo \$13,055
- Advanced Disposal - \$29,047 per year

9.A.3 Back to the new IMET Convenience Fund...I see the rate of return was/is .35, and that we have other funds earning more...please refresh my memory: is this the rate we discussed when it was first introduced to the Board? Still at .35, I presume...Still considered a preferred investment?

Response:

Yes. At the April 2014 Board meeting under New Business, Item 10 B 7, we stated "The Convenience Fund has returned 1.84% since its inception, net of fees, while the rate of return for 2013 was 0.34%."

In 9.B.2, the IMET fund is listed as a "Cash Equivalent"...which is like a money market fund, right?

Response:

Yes, Correct

Will we have the fund balance figure for this fiscal year at the July meeting or later?

Response:

We will have a preliminary number, but for year-end. The College books are kept open longer as we make accruals and adjustments in accordance with GAAP. Very much appreciate the inclusion of the Operating Cash Available table, both with and without restrictions: thank you Trustee Hamilton for advocating for this additional information.

9.B.3 I would like to hear a little more about the various improvements (\$460,000 or so) to the Cosmetology Program physical layout. I was not impressed with the physical space/amenities as it was constructed at the Naperville Center...definitely saw the need for greater definition/privacy for spaces such as the facial room. So, please provide me with greater description of how this space will look when finished.

Response:

The Addison renovation converts slightly over 4,500-sq-ft of space consisting of a former classroom and a series of small poorly arranged rooms and corridors, into a larger teaching clinic providing all of the necessary plumbing and electrical to create individual full service cosmetology training stations as well as a dispensary, student lounge, offices, private facial room and a reception/waiting area for patrons. The renovation also provides enhanced HVAC needed to meet the requirements of cosmetology training.

9.C.1 Regarding the first two projects listed: are we planning to recoup the nearly \$14,000 it is costing COD to repair damage from the abandonment by NICOR of its gas line? Seems that should be considered...

Response:

Typical utility easements, such as the one with NICOR only obligate them to repair or remove the affected pipeline and grade the area smooth and install seed. They are not required to repair other improvements that the owner has installed within the easement such as irrigation, etc. NICOR did not damage the irrigation, but rather removed it from its installed location, which COD had to have reinstalled. Knowing that repairs of this nature would be required, we provided for this expense in the overall project budget.

PE Renovation - Power #237: Why are we converting an existing bathroom into an executive changing room? Who will be utilizing such a changing room?

Response:

This room conversion is planned in response to an operational request to provide facilities for special guests or those with unique needs. It is also anticipated that this facility might occasionally be utilized by Trustees and various members of the Senior Management Team.

10.B.2 As conservative as the college normally is, I am puzzled that we are asked to approve funding for a building that will be provided, in part "through an expected \$20 million in State appropriations." Need much more concrete evidence that this \$20 million is definitely on its way....Especially when you look at the funding request in the RAMP proposal and it is for \$33 million...

Response:

This item is only asking that the Board earmark \$30 million to help construct a new Teaching and Learning Center on the west end of the campus. It is not to begin construction! Based on information received from Academics, which the Board heard needs described from several Deans at the May meeting, there is not enough space during certain periods of the day to meet the educational demands of our students. The intent of this item is to (i) highlight the need to provide additional teaching and learning space on campus, and (ii) show the State, and support the RAMP submission, that the College is committed to constructing additional teaching and