



PLANNING AND BUDGET STEERING COMMITTEE

Summary Meeting Notes

March 4, 2020

APPROVED October 7, 2020

Members Present: **Co-Chairs:** Rod Garcia, Joseph Ramirez; **Management Reps:** Cyndi Grein, Rich Hartmann; **Faculty Reps:** Joshua Ashenmiller, Kim Orlijan; **Classified Reps:** Nichole Crockrom; Monica Hagmaier; **Student Reps:** Robert Salcido, Wendy Hernandez Torres; **Resource Members:** Gil Contreras, Vivian Gaytan, Melisa McLellan, and Catalina Olmedo.

The meeting commenced at 2:05p.m.

I. Associated Student Representation: The two newly appointed student reps Wendy Hernandez Torres and Robert Salcido introduced themselves to the committee and members in turn introduced themselves and stated their title and governance group they represent.

II. Approval of Meeting Notes: The February 5, 2020 Summary Meeting Notes were unanimously approved by a motion from Kim Orlijan and seconded by Nichole Crockrom; all were in favor.

III. Planning Update: Co-chair Ramirez reported on the following items: The EFMP (Educational and Facilities Master Plan) is part of our College and District's effort to provide a vision on how to develop educational opportunities and facilities to match our educational future. Throughout the year, the campus conducted focus groups, surveys and provided engagement opportunities, and a consulting group is currently in the process of writing a draft to incorporate this information. A draft is anticipated in the spring with the hope that the campus will continue to be highly engaged in this effort. The transfer of the generated ideas to the consultant team shows the direction our College wants to go and will be an important document to guide us for the next 10 years as its importance relates to construction on campus.

Other important information is that Dr. Schulz provided an update on the state of the College at the last Board of Trustee meeting while highlighting the annual report and Institutional Effectiveness. The College performs against a number of indicators, and these reports are developed, published, and approved by a committee. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness publishes the Institutional Effectiveness Report that is available on our website.

The Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC) is currently meeting and work is underway to write a midterm report. It is going very well with lots of excitement and enthusiasm involved in this effort. Related to campus planning efforts, institutional outcomes need to be redesigned to be

consistent with how the college thinks about and assesses key outcomes students will receive in respective programs and will continue across campus with implications in accreditation.

Key for this committee to be aware of is campus researchers worked with the Program Review Committee (PRC) to support it with data and information, and the PRC has questions for this committee. They want to understand what happens to the items endorsed by their committee. Also, what are the recommendations for funding items using Instructional Equipment (IE) funds versus other funding sources. There is a desire to know what happens once they make an endorsement that is forwarded to the PBSC. The PRC asked how useful is the Program Review instrument as they hope it is not being used as a wish list for student services. How can the tool best reflect the needs of student services. The group is receptive to ideas, so please contact Kelly Robertson. The committee is currently developing templates now that the cycles have changed from a 3 to 4-year cycle. We are currently in year 1 of the two years of planning in the new 4-year Cycle Process, which consists of an Instructional Year, Non-Instructional Year, and followed by two years of planning. We will still use the Annual Update Form with plans to update the form to be more robust. Joe stated the new Program Review Process should be added to the Integrated Planning Manual. With regard to Accreditation Standard 4, how do we distinguish between ongoing General Fund requests and one-time funding requests? The accreditation Standard states that we are not only required to have a process, but it must be meaningful. For the most part, outside of personnel and building requests, we do fund most requests.

At the last PAC meeting and Monday's SEAC meeting, they discussed the idea of transitioning categorical funding and how will that take place at our College. With several SSSP and Student Equity pots of money now becoming one pot of money, how will that transition work? These questions need to be discussed in its early stages. We need to identify where we have been, where we are going, and maybe create a group to discuss that. VPSS Gil Contreras asked if a survey should be developed and how that would fit into our planning. He also asked how can we include those outcomes and lessons into our planning and resource allocation.

IV. Budget Update: Co-chair Garcia distributed a handout listing Fullerton College's 2019-20 One-time Fund Request (including 10 projects) in the total amount of \$7.9M that is supported by Classified Senate, Faculty Senate, Associated Students, PAC, CBF, and DCC. However, that same list was reduced to just over \$5M by the DCC when it was presented at an earlier CBF meeting. The CBF requested to have the Chancellor reconsider the original amount of \$7.9M and FC President Schulz informed VP Garcia that the Chancellor will increase to \$7M and will request funding be posted to 11100 fund for one-time use.

Rod reported that capital outlay funds are posted to what is referred to as Fund 4, where new construction supported by bond funds are tracked under codes beginning with 49 and smaller construction projects are tracked under codes beginning with 41 and 45. Sources of Fund 4 monies are set aside from General Fund, Scheduled Maintenance funds, or from Measure J Bond funds.

With regard to Measure J Bond funds, work is still in progress and detailed updates are created by the District's Bond Management firm MAAS and reported quarterly at the Citizens' Oversight Committee meetings. There is a meeting today, and it's open to the public. Reports are posted at the District's website.

The Measure J bond was passed 5 years ago for \$574M Districtwide and \$311 for Fullerton College to help fund renovations and new construction projects. First will be the new Instructional Building (housing Humanities). Today we started the second project to renovate the 300/500 bldgs. We have completed the design phase for the next scheduled projects including a new parking structure and M&O Building. If Proposition 13 passes, then state money will be available with restrictions and timelines, and with the hope to plan for the new Performing Arts Building, which may jump over some projects. Prop 13 is a state funded bond for educational facilities and is currently supported by 44.1% and may need 50% plus 1 to pass. We submitted our Performing Arts Project to the state in hopes that if Prop 13 passes, it will fund this construction project. Rod stated we will have a clear answer by Friday.

Other projects for students include the Welcome Center, a one-stop center for students rather than the need to obtain student services from offices located throughout the campus. The Performing Arts Building is planned to be built across Chapman (on south side) and then Buildings 1100 and 1300 will be vacated and demolished to make room for the Welcome Center.

Since existing buildings including the 100, 300, 600, and 840 are truly historic due to architectural design, they cannot be demolished to make room for other structures. The Fullerton Heritage Group protects the existence of these EPA Buildings built in the 1930s.

Each year, the College receives \$2M in carryover from the District to spend on scheduled maintenance projects. The College has allocated \$311M of Measure J Bond funds to specific projects or infrastructure. The list will get shorter and shorter as prices increase and money is used to fund current projects. When the Board approves a project and we confirm the amount for GMP (Guaranteed Max Price), we can potentially be several million under budget and monies can be used for other projects and be redistributed.

The College completed the Facilities Master Plan in 2016 so we will not see a dramatic change in our plans. The \$311M is not enough for us that we identified, but we will cross that bridge when we get there and leverage our bond monies. Our Performing Arts Project was planned as a 50/50 state and bond and now at a 80/20 split, and if it is approved, this will free up bond funds to be used elsewhere. You can only submit one project per year per campus. The Natural Sciences 400 Building was an 80/20 project so we only had to pay for 20% so it's better to leverage bond monies when possible.

Projects remain on the list until funded. The 300/500 building plans are black and white and were programmed several years ago, and if technology changes or structurally they require modification, the State is rigid about changing. Cypress' SEM Building was on the list as a renovation for 50/50 and they opted not to wait for the state, and they pulled it off the list and decided to build a new building. Since that decision changed their priorities, it resulted in

Cypress receiving less money, which will only allow them to fund one project. The FC Welcome Building on Chapman is currently not on the list, but the State currently has the FC Performing Arts project on the list as a replacement project for Buildings 1100 and 1300, with the same square footage and not an expansion. The Wilshire Auditorium will remain as it's a historical building.

V. Other/General Discussion: Student Rep Hernandez Torres asked what services would be included in the new Resource Building. Rod stated the Welcome Center is planned to include the following services: Financial Aid, Counseling, A&R, Bursar's, Bookstore, and Outreach. The Veteran Office and Health Services will be located in a student resource building on the south side of Chapman Avenue.

Meeting adjourned at 2:42 pm
Meeting Notes taken by Melisa McLellan
Next Meeting: March 18, 2020