



MOORPARK COLLEGE

Facilities – Committee on Accreditation and Planning

Plans, monitors, and evaluates facilities and project-specific issues, the Facilities Master Plan, the Accreditation Self-Study, and Monitors the implementation of agenda 3B of the Self-Study relative to Facilities.

MEETING NOTES

Wednesday, November 16, 2011 | 1-2:30 p.m., A-138

POSITION/DEPARTMENT	NAME	ATTEND	DIVISION	DEPARTMENT CHAIR OR DESIGNEE	ATTEND
Co-Chair: Vice President, Business Services	Iris Ingram		Applied & Social Sciences (2)	Howard Davis Vance Manakas*	X X
Co-Chair: Academic Senate Appointee	Phil Abramoff	X	Art, Media, Education, & Enrollment Services (2)	Gerry Zucca Erika Lizée*	X X
Associated Students' Representative (1)	Krysten Jones Jon Foote	X	Language & Learning Resources (2)	Hart Schulz* Jeff Baker	X X
Deans' Council Representatives (2)	Kim Hoffmans* Julius Sokenu	X X	Mathematics & Physical Sciences (2)	Marcos Enriquez* Michael Walegur Kahroline di Passero (alt.)	X X X
Director, Facilities, M&O	John Sinutko*	X	Life & Natural Sciences (2)	Norm Marten Lupe Aldana	X
Student Services Council Representative (1)			Performing Arts and Student Life (2)	Robert Salas*/ Traci Allen	X
ACCESS Representative (1)	Sherry D'Attile		GUESTS – College Business Services	Darlene Melby	X
Information Technology Representative (1)	Todd Hampton	X			

Note: * = FRAWG Member

TOPIC	ACTION
1. WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS Co-Chair Philip Abramoff welcomed everyone attendance. He noted that he would Chair the meeting in Co-Chair Iris Ingram's absence. Introductions were made around the room.	The Meeting was called to order at 1:04 pm.
2. REVIEW & APPROVE MEETING NOTES <ul style="list-style-type: none"> October 19, 2011 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting Notes were approved as distributed. 	Jon Foote requested that the minutes be sent to

TOPIC	ACTION
	his personal email address (sawjrf@gmail.com) and not to the general AS mailbox. Co-Chair Abramoff said he would inform Kim Watters of this request
<p>3. INFORMATION/REPORTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PROJECTS – Mr. John Sinutko <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Academic Center Building NO DISCUSSION ○ Health Sciences NO DISCUSSION ○ EATM The building is open and staff will be moving in on December 1 & 2. Classes will be scheduled in building for Spring semester. ○ Fountain Hall Entrance Planning design for the project will be started soon. Need to incorporate the ‘First Stop’ design into the project. ○ Parking Structure Plans are expected from DSA later this month with work scheduled to begin near the end of the Spring Semester or during summer. There are also plans to repair the overflow parking lot to ensure it is in good shape before the construction on the parking structure betins. ○ Roof/Gas Lines Moving forward with Gas Lines Project (\$50,000 for that project). Roofing is done and we should be good for another 20 years. M&O will continue to do its best given the current budget situation to perform scheduled maintenance on all buildings. ○ Locally Funded Projects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Environmental Science Program Plan (photovoltaic course lab location) NO DISCUSSION <p>Some discussion followed regarding award process. Mr. Sinutko explained that we are bound by</p>	

TOPIC	ACTION
<p>State regulations and must use the lowest 'responsible bidder' when awarding construction bids. He explained that he and the DAC work to ensure that those bidding on construction jobs are qualified to perform the work.</p> <p>Mr. Sinutko also stated that the Gym redesign is scheduled to begin soon also.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FRAWG – Dean Kim Hoffmans/ Ms. Erika Lizée <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Update The discussion began with deciding who would sit in for Erika Lizée when she is on maternity leave. It was decided that Cara Dallamara would join the committee while Erika is out. <p>Erika Lizée then informed the Committee that FRAWG met yesterday and reviewed items but did not take any real action. FRAWG will meet again in two weeks. Kim Hoffmans clarified that each representative is supposed to review all requests, and follow up if more information is needed, before the request is forwarded to FRAWG. This will help streamline the approval process.</p>	
<p>4. ACTION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FRAWG Criteria The criteria was distributed with Kim Hoffmans pointing out, that while in general, the criteria is based on last year, membership criteria has been revised. It was decided that it would be best to have a member from each department rather than just the Dean. This decision was made in that there appeared to be a “conflict of interest” when one Dean was required to argue for and/or against requests made from various departments in the Dean’s division. 	<p>It was M/S/P to accept the revised criteria as written.</p>
<p>5. REVIEW/DISCUSSION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Methodology for “catching” requests that could be either Technology, Equipment, or both Erika Lizée stated that there still seems to be some confusion as to where to send a request. For instance, for the set up for a smart classroom who decides where equipment is placed? Is it M&O or IT who makes this decision? Both John Sinutko and Todd Hampton were in agreement as to where specific requests were to be sent. John Sinutko stated that equipment needs must go through M&O at some point so that they are aware of the voltage requirements, size of the equipment and the weight of the equipment to ensure the rooms are set up to meet these issues. <p>Phil Abramoff further clarified that requests for structural or room changes go to M&O and requests for portable equipment goes to IT.</p> <p>The discussion then went to who decides on what equipment is put in each classroom. John Sinutko stated that the DAC has already determined the specific equipment that is to be purchased for each room so individual departments/instructors cannot put in requests for something different.</p>	

TOPIC	ACTION
<p>Jeff Baker questioned if this was the correct place to have the discussion regarding programs, space and the prioritization of where/how money is spent. Phil Abramoff suggested that there be a meeting between F-CAP and T-CAP to discuss this issue. There was still disagreement as to who makes the decision. Jeff Baker stated that given our limited resources it was important to look at each request from an academic point of view and how it will help the current programs. Everyone agreed with this statement, but did not answer which committee is responsible for making the decision.</p> <p>There was a suggestion to add a column to the request form that would require the requestor to include at the beginning stages the various departments that will be affected/involved should the request be approved (M&O, IT, Business Services).</p> <p>Phil Abramoff stated that the committee seems to be torn between having a formal request process versus an informal request process. John Sinutko commented that including M&O at the beginning of the process rather than at the end (which is our current process) could improve the time needed to complete the project.</p> <p>Both Erika Lizee and Kim Hoffmans agreed that if the request process is corrected/clarified, requests could be sent to both T-CAP and TRAC in one day. Currently, due to the confusion associated with who should be looking at the requests and the lack of information included in requests, it can take more than a month for one request to be seen by both committees.</p> <p>The discussion ended with no formal resolution to this issue.</p>	
6. ADJOURNMENT	Meeting was adjourned at 2:10 p.m.

HANDOUTS	Meeting Calendar 11-12 3 rd Wednesday, 1 p.m., A-138	
AGENDA 11/16/11 – MCShare, Webpage	2011	09/24, 10/19, 11/16
MEETING NOTES 10/19/11 – MCShare, Webpage	2012	01/18, 02/15, 03/21, 04/18
FCAP 2011-12 GOALS – MCShare, Webpage		

Moorpark College FACILITIES - CAP

RECOMMENDING STRUCTURE	CHARGE AND SOURCE OF AUTHORITY	MEMBERSHIP
<p>FACILITIES – Committee on Accreditation and Planning (CAP)</p> <p><i>Committee of Academic Senate</i></p>	<p>Plans, monitors, evaluates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▸ facilities and project-specific issues ▸ The Facilities Master Plan ▸ <i>The Accreditation Self-Study</i> ▸ Monitors the implementation of Agenda 3B of the self-study relative to 	<p>Co-Chairs: Vice President, Business Services Faculty appointed by ASEC</p> <p>Members:</p>

	facilities Ed Code 53200(c): › processes for institutional planning and budget development	› Two faculty from each Division appointed by Academic Senate › Director of F, M&O › Two Deans appointed by EVP › One IT representative › One Student Services Council rep › One student appointed by ASG
--	--	--