



## 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, February 15, 2012 | 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	X	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
Associated Students' Representative (1)	Krysten Jones Jon Foote		Language & Learning Resources (2)	Hart Schulz* Jeff Baker	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
Director, Facilities , M&O	John Sinutko*		Life & Natural Sciences (2)	Norm Marten Lupe Aldana	
Student Services Council Representative (1)			Performing Arts and Student Life (2)	Robert Salas*/ Traci Allen	X
ACCESS Representative (1)	Sherry D'Attile		GUESTS	Darlene Melby	X
Information Technology Representative (1)	Todd Hampton	X			

**Note:** \* = FRAWG Member

TOPIC	ACTION
<b>1. WELCOME &amp; INTRODUCTIONS</b> Co-Chairs Iris Ingram and Philip Abramoff welcomed everyone in attendance.	<b>The meeting was called to order at 1:07 pm</b>
<b>2. STATEMENT BY FACULTY CO-CHAIR</b> Entering into a bad budget year with mostly zero dollars. Programs must put in requests knowing there are very few dollars available; therefore departments must identify their critical needs.	

TOPIC	ACTION
<b>3. REVIEW &amp; APPROVE MEETING NOTES</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>November 16, 2011 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The meeting notes were approved as written</li> </ul> </li> <li>January 18, 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There was a question regarding the comments made by J. Sinutko at the January meeting regarding the gym that are missing from these minutes. It was requested that the Gym Renovation be added to the minutes under <b>Locally Funded Projects</b>. Tabled, pending revision.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Co-Chairs P. Abramoff and I. Ingram will review their notes and add the information regarding the Gym Renovation to <b>Locally Funded Projects</b> .
<b>4. INFORMATION/REPORTS</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>PROJECTS – Mr. John Sinutko – NO DISCUSSION</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Academic Center Building</li> <li>Health Sciences</li> <li>EATM</li> <li>Fountain Hall Entrance</li> <li>Parking Structure</li> <li>Roof/Gas Lines</li> <li>Locally Funded Projects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environmental Science Program Plan (photovoltaic course lab location)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Howard Davis gave a brief update on repairs that took place in the gym at the beginning of the month when drains became plugged and water began pouring into faculty offices and the lobby. He wanted to recognize John and his staff for dropping everything and coming immediately to the gym to make the repairs and clean up the mess. M&amp;O took care of everything so that the gym was available for the basketball game later that evening. Questions were asked about how repairs were paid for and Ms. Ingram stated that the College does have a budget for repairs. We did not use our insurance because the deductible is \$25,000. Had the gym floor been damaged we would have used our insurance.</p> </li> <li><b>FRAWG – Dean Kim Hoffmans/ Mr. Gerry Zucca</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gerry Zucca reported that he and Kim Hoffmans went through all the facility requests. When they were done, Ms. Hoffmans entered everything onto an excel spreadsheet.</li> <li>Ms. Ingram reported that Kim Watters took all the information from the spread sheet and put it in the form of a ranking sheet for everyone to review. The document is available on the shared drive. The committee was instructed to review the information before the March meeting and to be ready to vote at the March meeting. Send all questions regarding requests to Iris before the March meeting.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Manakas asked to have ongoing projects placed on an ‘In Process’ list so that no one forgets that these projects exist. Ms. Ingram stated that this list could be created but that</p> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>It was agreed to carry this item over to next month when Mr. Sinutko would be present and could give his report</p> <p>The committee is to review all the requests before the March 2012 meeting. All questions are to be forwarded to Ms. Ingram before the March 2012 meeting.</p>

TOPIC	ACTION
<p>it could not include Measure S projects, only Program Plans. Mr. Abramoff asked if the intent of creating this new list was to find out what projects are underway at this time. Mr. Manakas responded that his intent is to ensure that projects that are not completed, but are in process, do not disappear. Ms. Ingram assured him that the projects will not be forgotten, but if the project is not a part of a Program Plan it cannot go into the FRAWG report.</p> <p>Ms. Ingram assured the committee that an update of all projects will be made at the March meeting. Ms. Ingram then went on to say that the list that Kim Watters put together represents all requests for facilities related to the Program Plans. The list went to FRAWG for prioritization and FRAWG's assessment of each request is included. Ms. Hoffman stated that she sent everything to Kim W. (work orders, in process, etc...) will it all be posted online for review? Ms. Ingram will ask Kim W. about these items and what is posted online. Otherwise, only appropriate items are placed in the FRAWG document as the committee is only making decisions on new Program Plans – not old Program Plans.</p> <p>Mr. Zucca pointed out that in some cases he and/or Ms. Hoffmans did ask questions about submitted requests. For instance, there were questions regarding the photography request so he went and spoke to the department. As a result of that discussion, they realized that the photography department wants something other than what was requested, so now what? Mr. Abramoff and Ms. Ingram stated that if the representatives present know of any requests on the list that are no longer valid they need to let the committee know now so that those items can be removed. Mr. Salas asked if there was a procedure to ensure that the department making the request still wanted the request to move forward. Ms. Hoffman's replied that the role of the department representative is to make sure all requests are correct and necessary. Ms. Ingram then stated that the finalist goes to the Deans, the VP and then to FCap for review. It is assumed that when it comes from the Department that the Dean has reviewed and approved the request.</p> <p>Mr. Zucca asked who will make the changes to the ranking sheets. Ms. Ingram stated that she will give the information to Kim W. She reminded the committee that the amounts listed are estimates and will most likely change once the request gets closer to drawing up plans.</p> <p>The committee was then reminded that if someone cannot be at the March meeting they cannot send in their vote by proxy. The vote will take place in March unless there is not quorum (50%+1)</p>	<p><b>Category – Intermediate Page 8 Item 4 - withdrawn per KH &amp; GZ</b></p> <p><b>Category – Major Page 3 Item 4 – only need \$500,000 per DM</b></p>
5. ACTION	
6. REVIEW/DISCUSSION <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Methodology for “catching” requests that could be either Technology, Equipment, or both</li> </ul>	Phil Abramoff will

TOPIC	ACTION
Ms. Ingram explained that in some cases there is confusion as to whether or not a request is technology or facilities. Some requests fit both categories. Therefore, TCap thought it would be good to create a subcommittee with members from both FCap and TCap reviewing the questionable requests. The subcommittee currently consists of Todd Hampton (member of both committees), John Sinutko (member of both committees) and Martin Chetlen (co chair of TCap). It was suggested that Mr. Abramoff be the fourth member of the committee since he is the co chair of FCap. Mr. Abramoff agreed to be the fourth member of the subcommittee that will meet to review problem requests.	<b>serve as the FCap representative on the subcommittee reviewing program plan requests that could be facilities or technology.</b>
<b>7. ADJOURNMENT</b>	<b>The meeting was adjourned at 1:57 PM</b>

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

## Moorpark College FACILITIES - CAP

RECOMMENDING STRUCTURE	CHARGE AND SOURCE OF AUTHORITY	MEMBERSHIP
FACILITIES – Committee on Accreditation and Planning (CAP)  <i>Committee of Academic Senate</i>	Plans, monitors, evaluates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>› facilities and project-specific issues</li> <li>› The Facilities Master Plan</li> <li>› <i>The Accreditation Self-Study</i></li> <li>› Monitors the implementation of Agenda 3B of the self-study relative to facilities</li> </ul> Ed Code 53200(c): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>› processes for institutional planning and budget development</li> </ul>	Co-Chairs: Vice President, Business Services Faculty appointed by ASEC  Members: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>› Two faculty from each Division appointed by Academic Senate</li> <li>› Director of F, M&amp;O</li> <li>› Two Deans appointed by EVP</li> <li>› One IT representative</li> <li>› One Student Services Council rep</li> <li>› One student appointed by ASG</li> </ul>