

Date: 20 June 2014

To: Steve Rein, Chair, Academic Senate

From: Samuel Frame, Chair, Budget and Long Range Planning, Academic Senate

Subject: Budget and Long Range Planning Final Report

The Budget and Long Range Planning Committee (BLRP) had three meetings during the Spring 2014 quarter. The meetings were on Friday 18 April, Friday 09 May, and Friday 30 May. The Friday 18 April meeting was a working meeting for the faculty to discuss the Strategic Plan and no meeting minutes were taken. The Academic Senate Executive Committee (EC) gave BLRP the below charges for 2013-2014.

- Better understanding of the budget allocation – meet with Provost/VP AFD.
- Look at strategic plan and suggest criteria for evaluating targeted growth options.
- Have Executive Committee approve procedural guidelines. Fall 2013.

Below describes BLRP's efforts to address these charges.

- BLRP did not meet with the Provost/VP AFD to better understand the budget allocation process. After the Academic Affairs Budget Planning Committee finishes it's work, BLRP should meet with the Provost next year to learn more about the budget allocation process.
- BLRP has reviewed the strategic plan, and met on two occasions to discuss the charge. After reviewing the Strategic Plan, BLRP did not identify any metrics, methods, or reference to identifying targeted growth. BLRP would like the executive committee to clarify the charge, and have a reframed charge be a cornerstone activity for the 2014-2015 BLRP. Below are several questions the group has about the charge.
 - What metrics are used to identify target growth?
 - Where does growth show-up directly or indirectly in the strategic plan, e.g., vision statement, mission, key performance indicators, etc.?
 - How is targeted growth affected by our identity as a Comprehensive Polytechnic identity?
 - What criteria is important to examine targeted growth?
 - Does the strategic plan provide enough guidance to inform the criteria needed to evaluate targeted growth?
 - What changes to the strategic plan would be necessary to evaluate targeted growth options?
- The EC has approved BLRP's procedural guidelines, which are included in this report.

Below describes other BLRP activities.

- BLRP obtained input from the Academic Senate in response to the Cal Poly "Campus Conversations: Cal Poly's Budget Today and Moving Forward" through a DIALOGR survey, the results of the survey are included in this report.

- BLRP received a presentation from the the Master Planning team about the developing Master Plan. BLRP invited the Master Planning team to give the same presentation to the Academic Senate, obtained input from the Academic Senate about the Master Plan, and provided that input to the Master Planning team (through Joel Neel). The input is included in this report.

Procedural Guidelines for the Academic Senate Budget and Long Range Planning Committee

Responsibilities

The Constitution of the Faculty states, "joint decision making and consultation between the administration and the General Faculty have been recognized by the legislature of the State of California as the long accepted manner of governing institutions of higher learning and are essential to the educational missions of such institutions. [T]he Academic Senate is empowered to exercise all legislative and advisory powers on behalf of the General Faculty. Advisory powers shall include, but not be limited to consultation on budget policy, administrative appointments, determination of campus administrative policy, University organization, and facilities use and planning."

The Budget and Long Range Planning Committee (hereafter BLRP) shall review and make recommendations concerning policy for the allocation of budgeted resources and long range planning decisions. BLRP shall have representation on bodies formed to review the mechanisms by which campuswide resource allocations are made. BLRP shall work cooperatively and in consultation with administrative departments, units, representatives, and staff members. Budget and long range planning tasks assigned to specific, standing committees of the Academic Senate fall within the purview of BLRP. BLRP shall continuously develop and maintain definitions of budget transparency and faculty consultation on budget and long range planning issues.

Business items may be given to BLRP by the Academic Senate, Executive Committee, and/or the Senate Chair. BLRP may send to the Executive Committee a recommendation in the form of a draft resolution in order that it be placed on the Academic Senate's agenda. BLRP's recommendations shall not be considered policy statements until formally approved by the Senate and/or Executive Committee.

Membership

Shall include one voting General Faculty representatives from each college and PCS. Ex officio members shall be an ASI representative, Vice Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs or designee, and Vice President for Administration & Finance or designee.

Organization

BLRP shall organize the committee members into two working groups: Long-Range Planning and Budget. The Long-Range Planning working group will be responsible for completing the long-range planning charges given to BLRP by the Executive Committee and representing BLRP outside the committee as needed. The Budget working group will be responsible for completing the budget charges given to BLRP by the Executive Committee and representing BLRP outside the committee as needed. In general, the two units will meet and work as a team with the option to act as subcommittees on an as needed basis.

Responsibilities of the Chair

The BLRP Chair (hereafter the Chair) is responsible for scheduling meetings, setting an agenda, and conducting all meetings. After each meeting, the Chair will provide meeting minutes, including votes taken by BLRP on business items. At the end of each quarter, the Chair will submit a report to the Senate Office including a summary of the BLRP's work and accomplishments. At the end of each academic year, the Chair will conduct an annual review of BLRP's work and accomplishments, and provide an evaluation on how they fit within BLRP's responsibilities.

Meetings

BLRP shall meet at least one per quarter. Meetings shall be scheduled during normal work hours, during the third, sixth, and ninth Friday of each quarter. Notification of meetings shall be sent at least five working days before the meeting date. A quorum is required to conduct business. A simple majority of the voting members shall constitute a quorum for a meeting. A vote by the majority of the voting members attending a meeting constitutes the recommendation of BLRP. Voting shall take place by a show of hands unless one attending member requests a secret ballot. Electronic meetings may be conducted as described in AS-721-10.

Reporting

All BLRP deliverables must be voted on and approved by the BLRP voting members before dissemination. Minority opinions may be submitted to the Academic Senate for consideration. All meeting minutes, reports, and minority opinions will be made available to the General Faculty by way of the Academic Senate.

Dated: Fall 2013

Dialogr

MEANING OF TRANSPARENCY:

The Academic Senate Budget and Long-Range Planning Committee (BLRP) seeks your thoughts and suggestions on University budget issues. To start, BLRP would like to know how you define 'transparency' of the budget and the budget allocation process. Relative to budgeting issues, what does 'transparency' mean to you?

Add your thoughts and vote on (rate) the suggestions of others.

DIALOGR TOP 5																	
Rank	Idea (hide comments)	Profile	PostDate														
1	Transparency means a clear justification for how funds are allocated. Faculty and staff need to see the relationship between number of students (or scu's), professors, rooms, hours in class, modes of teaching, and the dollars. If we don't have this, we can't make informed curricular changes, especially those that are fiscally initiated.	Carmen T	11/18/13														
	<table><tr><td>Raters</td><td>Strongly Disagree</td><td>Disagree</td><td>Neutral</td><td>Agree</td><td>Strongly Agree</td></tr><tr><td>6</td><td>0%(0)</td><td>0%(0)</td><td>17%(1)</td><td>17%(1)</td><td>67%(4)</td></tr></table>	Raters	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	6	0%(0)	0%(0)	17%(1)	17%(1)	67%(4)				
Raters	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree												
6	0%(0)	0%(0)	17%(1)	17%(1)	67%(4)												
Mean Rating : 4.5 Standard Dev.: 0.76 Consensus: 78.62																	
Comments (1)																	
I agree 100% with the first sentence. However, the second sentence makes an assumption that all of those items/concepts listed are used as a part of the justification. I'm not sure that all of them currently do, nor am I of a mind that all of them should (at least, not in every case.) Regardless, the first and third sentences together (and alone) would succinctly state my thoughts on transparency relative to the budget allocation process.																	
<> Posted by Andy McMahan November, 25, 2013 12:16 AM Agree																	
2	Budget transparency means understanding both the distribution of funds and the mechanism that determined the distribution of funds. It means that the campus effectively identifies all revenue sources and where those revenue sources are spent. For me, budget transparency needs to occur for Cal Poly and all of its affiliated organizations (CPC, Cal Poly Housing, Foundation, etc.). For instance, right now out of state students are a growing revenue source for Cal Poly. But no-one communicates how those new revenue sources are being spent. At one time, the departments	Andrew Kean	11/19/13														

Rank	Idea (hide comments)	Profile	PostDate
------	--	---------	----------

that attract the most out of state students were promised additional funds from this revenue source, but this promise has not been fulfilled.

Raters	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
7	0%(0)	14%(1)	14%(1)	0%(0)	71%(5)

Mean Rating : 4.29 Standard Dev.: 1.16 Consensus: 64.79

Comments (0)

3	"Transparency," in part, means that we should see a clear accounting of which campus entities make money, and which cost money. There should, perhaps, be incentives for departments that are money-makers. Transparency also should include clear numbers that allow us to compare dollars spent on administration with dollars spent on actual instruction. This might be a way to stop the ever-increasing shifting of dollars away from teaching and toward administration.	CW	11/26/13
---	---	----	----------

Raters	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
4	0%(0)	0%(0)	25%(1)	25%(1)	50%(2)

Mean Rating : 4.25 Standard Dev.: 0.83 Consensus: 76.51

Comments (0)

4	Transparency is not only creating access, making available or allowing full disclosure. Transparency should be a balance between transcribing data and visualizing data (which helps making sense of it).	Cesar Torres	11/15/13
---	---	--------------	----------

Raters	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
9	11%(1)	0%(0)	22%(2)	11%(1)	56%(5)

Mean Rating : 4 Standard Dev.: 1.33 Consensus: 57.74

Comments (0)

5	I agree with nearly everything others have said previously, and would just like to re-iterate that one of the most important parts of transparency is making available to appropriate stakeholders the rationale for why a budget decision was made.	Paul Rinzler	11/20/13
---	--	--------------	----------

Raters	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
--------	-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

Rank	Idea (hide comments)	Profile	PostDate
------	--	---------	----------

8	<p>25%(2) 0%(0) 13%(1) 13%(1) 50%(4)</p> <p>Mean Rating : 3.63 Standard Dev.: 1.65 Consensus: 41.62</p> <p>Comments (0)</p>		
---	---	--	--

6	<p>All stakeholders should have full access to the decision criteria used in allocating funds.</p> <p>Raters</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Strongly Disagree</th> <th>Disagree</th> <th>Neutral</th> <th>Agree</th> <th>Strongly Agree</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>10</td> <td>0%(0)</td> <td>10%(1)</td> <td>40%(4)</td> <td>30%(3)</td> <td>20%(2)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Mean Rating : 3.6 Standard Dev.: 0.92 Consensus: 73.6</p> <p>Comments (1)</p> <p>These decision criteria should be linked to the specific components of the University's strategic plan. Please note that a strategic framework does not have enough depth and specificity to make meaningful links.</p> <p><> Posted by SPH November, 16, 2013 4:19 PM</p> <p>I agree that all stakeholders should have full access to all information; however, I'm not entirely sure I am in full agreement with regard to how a 'stakeholder' is defined. Clearly, it would include faculty, given that our system is built on the concept of shared governance. However, I'm not entirely convinced (yet) that the general public should be given unfettered (or equivalent) access simply because the CSU is partially funded by tax dollars. I may be convinced otherwise; however, my gut feeling is that faculty (and especially faculty governing bodies) should be given complete and unfettered access to all budget items and all details. However, the general public would receive an easy-to-read/understand synopsis.</p> <p>Raters</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Strongly Disagree</th> <th>Disagree</th> <th>Neutral</th> <th>Agree</th> <th>Strongly Agree</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>9</td> <td>0%(0)</td> <td>22%(2)</td> <td>33%(3)</td> <td>11%(1)</td> <td>33%(3)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Mean Rating : 3.56 Standard Dev.: 1.17 Consensus: 64.6</p> <p>Comments (2)</p> <p>To clarify, by "synopsis", I'm speaking of the type of information available at http://afd.calpoly.edu/budget/inforeports.asp. By "complete and unfettered access to all budget items and details", I'm speaking of details within the categories provided on that link, as well as documentation on how (and why) the decisions were made with regard to the amounts allocated to each area in the budget.</p> <p><> Posted by Andy McMahan November, 13, 2013 5:11 PM</p>	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	10	0%(0)	10%(1)	40%(4)	30%(3)	20%(2)	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	9	0%(0)	22%(2)	33%(3)	11%(1)	33%(3)	JED	11/12/13
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree																					
10	0%(0)	10%(1)	40%(4)	30%(3)	20%(2)																				
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree																					
9	0%(0)	22%(2)	33%(3)	11%(1)	33%(3)																				

Agree

[Andy McMahan](#)

11/13/13

Strongly Agree

Rank	Idea (<u>hide comments</u>)	Profile	PostDate
	<p>Sorry -- I'm new to this system. This was supposed to be a comment on another, already present idea. And, it won't let me edit/delete it! So -- my apologies!</p> <p>◊ Posted by <u>Andy McMahan</u> November, 13, 2013 5:03 PM</p> <p>Strongly Agree</p>		
<u>8</u>	<p>Budget transparency means all stakeholders have full access to all information. In the case of the CSU, a public tax-supported institution, the stakeholders include the public at large. Therefore, Cal Poly should develop and maintain a public Web page that fully discloses all details of our institutional budget. The Web page should be organized for easy understandability by anyone. It should be hierarchical, showing income and expenditure at high levels but allowing anyone to drill down into as much detail as desired. See http://opengov.com/ for software and ideas how to accomplish budget transparency for a public institution.</p> <p> Raters Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree 9 0%(0) 22%(2) 44%(4) 11%(1) 22%(2) </p> <p>Mean Rating : 3.33 Standard Dev.: 1.05 Consensus: 68.77</p> <p>Comments (2)</p> <p>William, excellent ideas, thanks for expressing your thoughts, it is very important to increase the awareness of these ideas, I was not aware of them otherwise. Many budget related ideas are "buried" and it is good to bring them to our attention and to be able to debate their merits.</p> <p>◊ Posted by <u>JED</u> November, 12, 2013 10:41 AM</p> <p>Neutral</p> <p>A lot of the information you suggest is already available here: http://afd.calpoly.edu/budget/inforeports.asp</p> <p>◊ Posted by <u>Samuel</u> November, 11, 2013 1:21 PM</p> <p>Neutral</p>	<u>William Ahlgren</u>	11/08/13
<u>9</u>	<p>Financial statements use "plain English" reporting. It should not take a degree in accounting or finance to understand a report.</p> <p> Raters Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree 12 17%(2) 25%(3) 17%(2) 8%(1) 33%(4) </p> <p>Mean Rating : 3.17 Standard Dev.: 1.52 Consensus: 49.07</p> <p>Comments (1)</p> <p>I very much agree with this sentiment. There should be a "plain English" version as well as the full "detailed version" for reference.</p> <p>◊ Posted by <u>Andy McMahan</u> November, 13, 2013 5:02 PM</p> <p>Not Rated</p>	<u>Eric O</u>	11/13/13
<u>10</u>	<p>There should be some way to normalize the reporting such as "per</p>	<u>Eric O</u>	11/13/13

Rank	Idea (hide comments)	Profile	PostDate
------	--	---------	----------

student" or "per 4 year graduate."

Raters	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
8	13%(1)	25%(2)	50%(4)	0%(0)	13%(1)

Mean Rating : 2.75 Standard Dev.: 1.09 Consensus: 67.46

Comments (1)

Normalization is important, the parameters need to be carefully chosen to be able to determine the proper allocation for each department.

◁ Posted by [Cole McDaniel](#) November, 16, 2013 7:10 PM

Not Rated

11

The definition of transparency is not the biggest issue we face and almost seems like a red herring. It is more important that we identify the most important issues that we would like to see transparent, e.g., who gets the next new hire and why that entity received the next hire. The problem with wanting transparency with everything all in "plain English" is that you will need an army of individuals to provide this. Given resource constraints of the university we need to settle on the most important areas that we would like to see transparency so that there is a level of trust between the administration and the faculty. We should focus on the most important issues in the budget and its process that we would like to see transparent.

[SPH](#)

11/17/13

Raters	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
7	14%(1)	29%(2)	43%(3)	0%(0)	14%(1)

Mean Rating : 2.71 Standard Dev.: 1.16 Consensus: 64.79

Comments (2)

I would agree with Andrew that the level of transparency that we need as a University would not need an army of individuals. The point I was trying to make was in regards to others who have posted that they would like to see transparency in everything in understandable and plain English. When you add the word everything into the qualifier of what you want to see, I would argue that you are going to need a large group of people to assimilate and then provide the information everyone would like to see. I agree that a predictable budgeting model would be helpful.

◁ Posted by [SPH](#) November, 19, 2013 9:15 PM

Strongly Agree

I disagree somewhat that it will take an army to provide transparency. Having a thoughtful funding model to determine distribution of funds is neither complicated, nor difficult to communicate. Our campus is odd that it does not have any sort of deterministic or predictable funding model for disbursement of money.

◁ Posted by [Andrew Kean](#) November, 19, 2013 10:14 AM

Disagree

Rank	Idea (hide comments)	Profile	PostDate
<u>12</u>	All stakeholders have full access to all information.	<u>JED</u>	11/12/13

Raters	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
6	33% (2)	50% (3)	17% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)

Mean Rating : 1.83 Standard Dev.: 0.69 Consensus: 81.02

Comments (1)

I agree that all stakeholders should have full access to all information; however, I'm not entirely sure I am in full agreement with regard to how a 'stakeholder' is defined. Clearly, it would include faculty, given that our system is built on the concept of shared governance. However, I'm not entirely convinced (yet) that the general public should be given unfettered (or equivalent) access simply because the CSU is partially funded by tax dollars. I may be convinced otherwise; however, my gut feeling is that faculty (and especially faculty governing bodies) should be given complete and unfettered access to all budget items and all details. However, the general public would receive an easy-to-read/understand synopsis. Posted by Andy McMahan November 13, 2013, 5:00 PM

◇ Posted by JED November, 14, 2013 6:11 AM

Disagree

Feedback - Master Plan Presentation given at the Academic Senate meeting on Tuesday, April 29 2014

***What are current non-instructional space needs?**

~~An important aspect of business education is community and relationships. The present structures in and near the OCOB do not facilitate this. There are no gathering points in the area of the OCOB. Some kind of cafe or mini restaurant or community room is very much needed.

Professional education is a niche that should be developed at Cal Poly. Having a professional education building located near the OCOB would be excellent.

~~Students need additional space to work on group projects together. Students also need additional space to work on projects outside of classroom assignments, such as contests.

~~These needs are minor because this *is* Cal Poly, where instruction is most important. We could, in general, use a bit more research space, ideally adjacent to instructional laboratories and the like, because the purpose of research at CSU should be to support learning. A few facilities for *club* sports would be nice. Not revenue sports, which are a money sink that undermines Cal Poly's academic status, but club sports in which the focus is bringing benefits to the students who participate (rather than revenue sports, which exploit "students"). Parking space is an important issue as well. Although it is good to use alternatives to driving as much as possible, it is wrong to "encourage" people to find such alternatives by making driving (and parking) unnecessarily inconvenient, frustrating, and wasteful of time. I commute by carpool and bicycle 4 days a week and drive alone just one, but this is *not* because parking is bad; with convenient parking I would do the same thing.

***What additional space requirements are needed to support additional growth?**

~~More parking, more classrooms, more distant learning/collaboration rooms...

~~Additional space is needed for the library as more students need more studying spaces, group collaboration spaces, and spaces to work on campus computers.

~~We need office space for faculty and staff of course, but most importantly, we need more classroom space which is suited to instruction in the Cal Poly style. Cal Poly style instruction involves face time between instructors and students in relatively small classrooms. (Please note that modern techniques such as "flipped" courses still need small classrooms.) There is an unfortunate, politically motivated, trend to push for larger classes, accompanied by disingenuous claims that large classes do not harm instructional quality. Political motivations should not drive the design of our facilities; educational motivations should. We need more classrooms which have some basic multimedia gear ("smart rooms") and whose capacity is about 40-45 students.

***Where should new facilities be located?**

~~We should build in the area near the OCOB. First, just north of California Blvd. near the OCOB, a parking structure should be built there with a walkover that goes over the railroad. This parking structure should be similar in nature to the one near the PAC. The parking lot near the OCOB should be

removed and any new buildings located there. Putting that massive new building in the center of campus really changed the feel of the campus (not for the better actually). The new student dorms should also be placed in this area (this would also solve the problem of creating a community space in this part of the campus if it were designed well).

~~Instructional space should be located as reasonably close to the campus core as possible. This includes laboratories and student project centers of course.

***Which existing buildings should be renovated or replaced?**

~~Building 2 could be converted to a cafe and a professional development/education center. The top floor of the new Baker building could be built and house the education faculty or a new building created near the OCOB.

~~There are several older buildings which could use some sprucing up, but since safety is the greatest concern and I'm not qualified to identify the hazards (fire, seismic, etc.) I leave it to the experts to decide where the work is most needed. I believe that making old classrooms multimedia compatible and generally clean, safe, and functional should be a highest priority.

-- renovate 22

--improve Dexter SMART rooms; they're awful.

***Other comments?**

~~In the Accounting Area, we are running out of space for the Low income Tax Clinic (LITC). This is becoming a more self-support learn-by-doing class with our IRS grants but needs additional space.

I would think an additional 1,000 square foot space would meet our short-term needs. In the long run we would like to have additional facility for a student lab experience and on-site parking availability for clients. This would serve our Volunteer Income Tax Assistance (VITA) program and LITC. We served over 640 clients this tax season. It is our objective to make these learn by programs more earn by doing and we are striving for additional grants and private foundation funds.

It would be nice to have a continuing education facility similar to Kellogg West at Cal Poly – Pomona.

With our geographical location we could develop income streams from the public.

A nice hotel facility with a conference area would be a great addition.

~~This email is an example of a very foolish survey. The rank-and-file faculty--even experts who know about economics or urban planning--would not be able to answer these questions perspicaciously. In fact, the right answers to these questions come in the form of contingent plans: if X, then Y.

First, you would have to tell us how much enrollment is expected to increase in the next decade.

Second. You would have to tell us how many large lecture courses are going to be added to the schedule so that we would know how badly we need that kind of space

Third, you would have to tell us what the land-use restrictions are to answer your third bullet point.

It is possible to get some sense of the worst buildings that are currently extant, but you should know that already. Most people will say, "Fix my building." Of course this response is almost worthless. Does it have to do with planning, or the euphemism "deferred maintenance?"

~~The campus needs new tennis facilities with adequate stadium-style seating to support Cal Poly's nationally recognized Division 1 teams. The size and location of these facilities should be addressed with the Athletics Department, the tennis coaches and local community members, such as those involved with Tennis Connect SLO.

~~There is often a tendency of those in administrative circles to promote grand new visions for institutions such as Cal Poly. This can lead to neglect of the "old" mission, which for us is teaching our students in a learn-by-doing environment. Using great alterations of facilities to force modes of instruction to change (for example, installing large classrooms while neglecting small ones) will cause great harm to our students and our state. Supporting the instruction that works for Cal Poly and making changes only after the current mode has been properly enabled will help us move successfully, at a measured pace, toward better performance in the future.

~~Faculty do not have space to meet and interact informally. There is no faculty club, dining commons or even a lounge where we can meet for coffee. Such space is more than a perk: several studies have shown that informal interactions can lead to collaborative and interdisciplinary work. I know anecdote is not data, but I have several publications in dairy science journals due to meeting an assistance professor of dairy science in a bar frequented by graduate students in College Station, TX. As an economist, I don't think our paths would have crossed on campus.

I attached an article from the Chronicle of Higher Education that covers the issue better than I can. And I know architects at Stanford have published on the benefits of common spaces when planning research facilities, but I don't have them available. What I do know is that Cal Poly faculty are encouraged to get out of our silos, to collaborate across disciplines and to figure out how to make the contacts on our own.

As new buildings are being planned and built, I would like to see areas set aside for faculty lounges, lunch rooms and other common areas where faculty are encouraged to congregate. I think the marginal cost would be relatively low and the payoff high.

~~The university should consider other ways to get students to campus beyond cars. There should be no parking permits issued for any students who live within two miles of campus. This would free up some existing space to new building construction. Thus, no additional space would be needed. If absolutely necessary, I would hope the university does not expand north and retains some of the rural aspects of the campus e.g., ag fields off of highland, dairy unit, fields next to the tech park, equine facilities etc.

~~Upgrades/renovations to building 22, which is sorely in need of repairs and upgrades.
Dedicated conference room(s) for our senior seminars and graduate classes (15-20 students in a circle).
Dedicated computer lab space designed and optimized for digital humanities work.
A faculty lounge/dining room.

-- keep VHS and DVD in rooms

--more multimedia rooms

--more seminar rooms and conference rooms

--more PARKING near office buildings

--a dining facility for faculty as used to exist. We don't need fancy tablecloths, table service, and the accompanying high prices. We want a QUIET space, to which students come only invitation of a faculty member.

--a place to deposit private mail on campus