



PLANNING AND BUDGET STEERING COMMITTEE

Summary Meeting Notes March 16, 2016

APPROVED April 20, 2016

Members Present: Co-Chairs: Richard Storti, Carlos Ayon; **Management Reps:** Rich Hartmann; **Faculty Reps:** Sam Foster, Pete Snyder; **Classified Reps:** Alternate Summer Marquardt; **Student Reps:** Adam Ascencio, Niko Diehr; **Resource Members:** Terry Cox and Melisa Hunt; **Members Absent:** Cyndi Grein, Bev Pipkin, Tracy Thackrah, and A.S. Alternate Taylor Gaetje; **Guests Present:** None.

The meeting commenced at 2:05 p.m.

I. Approval of Summary Meeting Notes: The March 2, 2016 Summary Meeting Notes were unanimously approved.

II. Planning Update: Co-chair Ayon reported that at the recent IEPI webinar, it was determined that the seven indicators listed below are required to be used to set goals for the upcoming audit:

1. Successful course completion, including 1-year and 6-year goals.
2. Accreditation status
3. Fund Balance
4. Audit Findings (Audit Opinion Financial Statement)
5. Audit Findings (State Compliance)
6. Audit Findings (Federal Award/Compliance)
7. College choice

New data will be released on March 30, with goals to be set by June 2016. PAC approved the formation of a Standards Committee to set a base floor of our indicators. The college level indicators will be discussed at our next meeting.

III. Budget Update: Co-chair Storti thanked those who attended the NOCCCD Budget Allocation Model Forum and provided an update on the State budget.

IV. Total Cost of Ownership (TCO): Co-chair Storti reported that whenever a renovation takes place, planning needs to consider the total cost of that building, which includes security staff in place to patrol, maintenance of the building, cleaning, scheduled maintenance, etc. This cost is projected annually going out into the future. FC currently has a formal planning process that considers TCO for new buildings in order to project costs. Co-chair Storti invited all members to

review the current policy in place and reply to Melisa via email by April 4, 2016, if there are any questions or suggestions for improving the established practice. Any suggestions received will be discussed at the next scheduled PBSC meeting. The documented TCO procedures are located online at <http://vpas.fullcoll.edu/tco.htm>.

V. Proposed Procedure For Determining User Group Participants: Richard reported that the procedure for User Group Design went to PAC and received support. PAC members have been provided additional time in order for constituency groups to request feedback prior to final approval.

Some questions concerning how participants are selected were raised, including:

- 1) How are User Groups determined and established?
- 2) Will there be a “call-out” of interested parties to serve on a User Group?
- 3) Staff working in a “Service Area” should be included in the “users”.
- 4) Constituency Groups should be considered and represented.
- 5) The size of the “User Group” shall be dependent on the building design specifics, such as a small- or large-scale design.

Richard requested the members to provide any comments or suggestions to Melisa by April 4, 2016, regarding the above questions. Suggestions and ideas will be discussed at a future PBSC meeting to develop a formal procedure to be recommended to PAC for adoption.

VI. Non-instructional Equipment Funding Requests: Rich Hartmann reported that the faculty has requested for items that were not funded under instructional equipment to be considered for funding. Program review is a 3-year cycle and to wait for three more years to explore funding for these non-instructional program requests seems unrealistic. The Deans reviewed the requests and feel it’s important to fund the \$900,000 in requests over a 3-year cycle at \$300,000/year. The Deans that worked on Program Review worked hard and believe this is a legitimate pathway for funding. If another funding source is provided or available, certain items can be removed from the list. Some concerns raised by the members include:

- 1) Each Dean should develop a plan and a 1-page proposal for the requested funds.
- 2) Will there be an annual review?
- 3) Deans should review their budget and determine if they can fund within the parameters of their budget.
- 4) Deans should provide better data and a description for each request.
- 5) What is the timeline?
- 6) What data will be required?

VII. Other/General Discussion: Richard invited everyone to attend the upcoming President’s Open Forum. He also asked that the Dean’s be reminded of the April 15 purchasing deadline because the awarded instructional equipment funding will not be carried over to next year’s budget.

Richard reported that he attended a sustainability presentation where solar opportunities were discussed. Facilities Director Larry Lara is exploring solar options to supply energy to the charging stations. The District recently contracted with IWC (Innovative Workshop Consultants) to research and make recommendations on sustainability (electricity/solar) options at each of the three campuses. The consultants visited the FC campus and will hold a campus-wide workshop at a later date to gather input from all constituents in order to develop a plan to achieve our goals.

Richard reported that the draft Facilities Master Plan will be presented to Faculty Senate and Classified Senate at their next meetings. Richard is working with A.S. Student Representative Niko Diehr to be added to their next agenda.

A.S. Student Rep Niko reported that the Associated Student passed a resolution in support of Winter Intersession, with no preferred length noted. Chris Lim will present the item at the next Faculty Senate meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 3:27 p.m.

Meeting Notes were taken and typed by Melisa Hunt.

Next Meeting: April 6, 2016