### Agenda

**Members Present:** Erik Dunmire, Don Flowers, John Rodriguez, Robert Thompson

**Absent:** Fernando Aguelo-Silva, Laura McCarty, Maridel Barr, Raemond Bergstrom-Wood, Rob Barthelman

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>CATEGORY: (Information/Discussion/Action)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Intro, agenda</td>
<td>Approve agenda</td>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Review of WASC “standard”</td>
<td>Are we on track for meeting this?</td>
<td>30 min</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Review VBN’s proposal</td>
<td>Confirm scope and meetings are on track for meeting deadlines</td>
<td>20 min</td>
<td>Discussion, Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Closing</td>
<td>Review meeting schedule bi-weekly; discuss if weekly</td>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Approve Minutes –
2. Insert Additional Agenda Item(s) - none
3. Meeting Wrap Up
4. Agenda Items for Next Meeting

### Meeting Summary

**Agenda Review**
- Approved agenda

**Review WASC Standard**
- Most of the meeting was spent discussing this item. The group discussed the exact intent of the accreditation language in each row of Laura’s standards matrix, and tried to
identify the differences between each (aided by Laura’s underlining). A summary of the conclusions is as follows:

- B1 seems to speak to implementation while B2 speaks to planning.
- B1a stresses whether the facilities are necessary and sufficient to support the programs and services, while B1b stresses more person-related aspects of the learning/working environment (“access, safety, security, health”).
- B2a stresses how long-range planning supports goals and considers costs (i.e., whether the plan is data driven), while B2b seems to stress process aspects (i.e., integration with institutional planning and assessment/evaluation feedback loop).
  - Under the “How we achieve it” column, the group identified some missing elements.
  - Since B1a and B1b include the word “maintain”, some analysis/presentation of maintenance data should be included to support these.
  - Under B2a, an additional step or two beyond those listed is probably required—actual estimates of the total cost of ownership for the 2 bldgs, and perhaps an actual plan as to how this will be addressed. In some sense, B2a may actually be the heart of the document—creating a long-term plan for future facilities that (a) “supports institutional goals” but (b) “reflects total costs”.

There was also some discussion at the meeting regarding how in recent history the college has often made facilities-related decisions (e.g., programming new buildings, retaining buildings slated for demolition, etc.), in many cases based upon proposed general ideas about changes to academic or operational practices (e.g., modifying times/days/locations of course offerings, addition of new programs or services, changing availability of classrooms from discipline-specific to general-use, etc.). But the institution then failed to follow this up with a more detailed plan or any action to implement these changes (leading to “crises of inaction”). While this seems to be related to facilities planning, it’s not clear if this shortcoming is due to a gap in the facilities planning process, in the educational planning process (or their integration), or in the implementation of plans.

**Review vbn’s Proposal**

- The members present felt that there was insufficient attendance to make a recommendation on Amendment to the consultant contract during the meeting. It was decided that a response to the Amendment document would be solicited via email from all members of the group, with a deadline of Thursday, March 1.
Closing

- The group recommended that at each definitely scheduled bi-weekly meeting (i.e., those at which the consultant is present), a decision would be made based upon need as to whether a meeting should take place in the following (intervening) week.