

**University of Central Missouri  
Board of Governors  
Work Session  
March 26, 2026**

The University of Central Missouri (UCM) Board of Governors convened in a Work Session on March 26, 2026, at 9:20 a.m. in Union 237A on UCM's main campus in Warrensburg, Missouri. Presiding over the meeting was Board President John Collier. Others participating in the meeting were Governors Mary Dandurand, Stu Rogers, Gus Wetzel II, and Ken Weymuth; University President Roger Best; General Counsel Lindsay Chapman; and Assistant Board Secretary Kristen Plummer. Governor Stephen Abney participated in the meeting via Zoom. Presenters included Mr. Bill Hawley, Vice President for Finance and Operations; Mr. Jackson Kane, Partner at Lord Aech Sargent; and the following representatives from Hollis + Miller: Ms. Kristine Dorn, Partner; Mr. Cam Hinton, Client Leader; and Mr. Chris Koch, Project Leader.

**Call to Order - Agenda Item No. 1**

Mr. Collier called the meeting to order and determined a quorum was present to conduct business.

**Construction Manager at Risk Project Delivery - Agenda Item No. 2**

Mr. Bill Hawley, Vice President for Finance and Operations, welcomed the representatives from Hollis + Miller and Lord Aech Sargent, who introduced themselves to the Board and shared their experience working within the education sector. Mr. Kane provided an overview of the Construction Manager at Risk (CM-R) process, a collaborative delivery method in which the construction manager (CM) is brought in during the design process and provides input on cost, schedule, constructability, and phasing as the design evolves. The CM ultimately becomes the General Contractor, and having the CM involved in the design process allows them to understand the design's intent, provide more accurate and timely cost estimates, and get better answers sooner. They are also able to help capture market shifts and the lead times needed for purchasing items. Mr. Jackson explained that CM-R is not a design-bid-build based on the low bid, though subcontractors are still competitively bid. It incentivizes the CM to be as accurate as possible with their bid. The CM holds the risk for delivering within the guaranteed maximum price (GMP), not the university.

Mr. Hinton provided an overview of the CM-R advantages. He reiterated that the design team is the university's advocate throughout the process, regardless of the project's delivery method. Having worked with all the major CMs in the region, they will help ensure that the best CM is selected for the project. He shared that the CM should be selected as soon as possible, in accordance with the protocol the university must follow to make that selection. Hollis + Miller can assist in facilitating the selection, including attending the interviews with the CMs to provide input. Mr. Hinton also shared that the design team has a third-party cost estimator who provides a second opinion on the CM cost estimates to help ensure the CM provides realistic estimates that reflect market conditions.

Mr. Koch provided an overview of a conceptual schedule for a project like the Yeater Hall replacement under the CM-R project delivery method. Mr. Hinton stated that this process provides the university and the Board with a series of opportunities to weigh in and approve

funding as required by the governance structure. Within the example provided, he explained the four opportunities.

In response to a question from Mr. Rogers, Mr. Kane said the GMP will include all hard costs from the CM broken out, plus the contractor's fees, general conditions, builders' risk insurance, and contingency. When interviewing for the GM, typically, you receive their fees as a percentage, so you can compare fees. Mr. Kane recommended interviewing the project manager and the superintendent. Looking at the conceptual schedule, Ms. Dorn explained that you see the estimated number throughout the project, noting that the estimates become clearer and more refined as they are locked in. All fees are included in the early estimates.

Ms. Dorn explained the abbreviations listed in the conceptual project schedule:

- Demo CDs: Demolition Construction Documents
- Mobilization: Coming onto the site
- Abatement and Demolition: Time period for the abatement of hazardous materials and taking the building down
- NTP: Notice to Proceed
- Site DD: Site Design Development
- DWG: Drawing Package
- Early Package CD: Early Package Construction Documents
- Early Package GMP: Locking in GMP for anything related to the site package
- Early Package Construction: When they actually start
- Float: Space that is available if something changes or is delayed with the project
- Building SD: Building Schematic Design
- Building DD: Building Design Documents
- Building CD: Building Construction Documents
- Building GMP: Total Guaranteed Maximum Price

Mr. Weymuth commented that it seemed it is pretty far down the line when the GMP is locked in, and Ms. Dorn confirmed that was correct. She explained, however, that the estimate is available as early as the first Building SD/Site DD. Related to float, Mr. Hinton recommended that one of the very early things to ask the CM is to evaluate the design schedule and request their feedback on any areas for refinement. President Best asked if Hollis + Miller could provide a matrix to clearly show potential CMs what we expect their costs to include, so we can better compare estimates or bids between CMs, and Mr. Hinton confirmed they could. President Best also asked whether project change orders would be largely nonexistent under the CM-R process, except related to a change in scope. Mr. Kane confirmed that was correct, as the CM is bound by everything in the construction documents and the specs. In response to a question from Mr. Weymuth, Mr. Hinton noted that the industry norm for change orders in the CM-R process is around 3%, and Hollis + Miller is closer to 1%.

Ms. Dorn thanked the Board for their time and expressed that Hollis + Miller is happy to serve as a resource for the university as part of their partnership, reaffirming their willingness to help answer any questions.

**Other - Agenda Item No. 3**

There was no other business to discuss. The meeting adjourned at 9:57 a.m.