FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE
March 27, 2012
Meeting Summary

Members Present: Don Flowers, Laura McCarty, Robert Thompson, Maridel Barr, Erik Dunmire, Nanda Schorske, Sara McKinnon, Raemond Bergstrom-Wood, Scott Blood

Members Absent: John Rodriguez, Fernando Agudelo-Silva, Al Harrison

Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>CATEGORY: (Information/Discussion/Action)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Intro, agenda</td>
<td>Approve agenda &amp; previous minutes</td>
<td>5 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Facilities Master Plan</td>
<td>1) Discuss ideas for a “rubric” we can use to rank and prioritize projects in the master facilities plan.</td>
<td>50 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Closing</td>
<td>Confirm next meeting date(s) if indicated by group</td>
<td>5 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Agenda Items for Next Meeting

Meeting Summary

Agenda Review
- The Committee reviewed and approved agenda

Approve Minutes
- Approval of minutes deferred until next meeting

Discussion of “Rubric”
- We discussed some ideas on how to rank and prioritize the facilities projects in the Master Facilities Plan. The group discussed we could rank them by safety, ADA, or college systems including student outcomes, access (scheduling, classroom), community responsiveness. Don
mentioned that the FPC group created a rubric for facilities in program review from 2008 that was helpful. The group looked at the old rubric and discussed it:

- How the facility will be used?
- What data supports the requirements?
- How will instruction be improved for Student Learning and success?
- How will access be improved for Student Learning and success?
- What Student learning or other outcomes can be expected?
- How will the outcomes be measured for future planning?

The group liked this rubric and decided to move forward using it. (See attached).

Additional discussion centered on how to recommend projects when multiple projects get the same score on the rubric. How do you prioritize those projects? Suggestions included looking at multiple factors: the percent of useful life left to a building, its relevancy to the EMP/college systems etc. When you decide to work on one area it makes sense to “cluster” other work in that same facility. Need to look at surveys for student input.

**Review Responsibility Matrix**

- We need clarification about what it means when both CoM and vbn are listed as doing a component of the work. Are we writing or just giving data input? Laura will get clarification about what CoM is to have done by the next meeting with the consultant.

- Nanda will write a summary overview of the Educational Master Plan for our review on or about April 10.

**Meeting Wrap Up**

- The next meeting will be held on April 3 in Student Services A.

**Agenda Items for Next Meeting**

- Rob Barthelman the consultant will attend the next meeting.