

## **Business and Facilities Planning Council**

**November 10, 2015 9:00am – 11:00am ST-107**

### **Meeting Minutes**

Present: Beth Gomez (Admin Tri-Chair), Dan Lambros (Staff Tri-Chair), Phu Tran (Faculty Tri-Chair), Mark DeAsis, Richard Henry, Shirley McGraw, Steve Monsanto, Jan Muto, Damon Nance, Erin Power, Jim Thomas, Koji Uesugi, Carol Farrar (Guest), Denise Terrazas (Recorder)

Absent: Diane Dieckmeyer, Monica Green, Gustavo Oceguera, Tanya Wilson

- I. Meeting called to order: 9:10am
- II. Approval of minutes tabled until we have a quorum.
  - a. Quorum established at 9:55am
  - b. Approval of October 13, 2015 Meeting Minutes MSC (Thomas/Koji) Approved.  
Abstentions (DeAsis, Muto)
- III. Information items
  - a. ACBO Update (Beth Gomez)
    - i. Tabled for future meeting.
  - b. Administrative Program Review Ranking Discussion

- Department Presentations

The committee discussed the need to streamline the ranking process. Last year, we extended an invitation to departments to come and present to the committee on the department needs and rationale in the program review. The committee agreed that it is helpful to have this information prior to ranking resource requests. Other concerns about the process such as how requests link the EMP and FMP will be addressed with the revised rubric. Denise will send out a college-wide email inviting departments to present for the first hour of the prioritization meeting on November 17<sup>th</sup>.

- Staffing Requests

Discussion on how student services position rankings could inform BFPC for their consideration. What BFPC has to rank comes from the administrative unit program reviews which includes student services positions. The committee needs clarification on the process for ranking student services staff positions. While some departments, i.e. Foster Youth, do not have a home for ranking, others are being ranked both by the Student Services Committee and BFPC. Is this similar to how faculty positions are ranked through APC? If so, we should not include those positions in the BFPC rankings. Beth informed the committee that faculty budget lines are distinct; everything else comes from the general fund. Because of this, all college positions (with the exception of faculty positions) should be considered to be ranked through BFPC. For ranking purposes we will move those positions that have already been funded to the end of the list.

- Operational vs. Strategic Planning

There was discussion about the lack of distinction between the operational and strategic planning. What is the role of this group in making determinations that have been grant funded that are requesting institutionalization. For example, STEM, center was funded by a big grant; but now there are requests that appear not to seek grant funds but seeking to institutionalize. Is this strategic or is it operational? Technology requests are operational, however they come to this committee after a grant ends for institutionalization and funding. In those cases we need a budget augmentation, but the issue becomes, is it our role to say, yes we should institutionalize or should it be another groups decision. Funding is a real critical issue, what we bring forth needs to be thoughtful, fit the plan, and fiscally responsible. Threshold for equipment - \$5K anything under that is not considered equipment.

- Budget Augmentation

Requests for budget augmentation should be considered separately. Should this section be added to the program review or the ranking rubric?

Meeting adjourned: 10:51am

Minutes submitted by: Denise Terrazas