

Draft Minutes
Budget Resource and Development Subcommittee
October 3, 2014 10:30am to 12:08pm Room L-108

Meeting called to order at 10:33 a.m.

In attendance: Brett Bell (Co-Chair); Joyce Allen; Roanna Bennie; Dan Gutowski proxy for Denise Kapitzke; David Navarro; Sadayoshi Okumoto; Steve Volin; Marty Walsh; David Wilhelm.

Absent: David Buser (Co-Chair); Buran Haidar; Kurt Hill; Gerald Ramsey;

Guests: Daniel Miramontez

Approval of Agenda and past meeting's Minutes

- The agenda was approved after moving the IELM Allocation Report From Library to #1 and the IELM Allocation Report From Technology to #2.
- Minutes for the 9/19/14 meeting were presented alongside revisions suggested by B. Haidar. The committee discussed concern for verbatim minutes since the meeting is not publicly recorded. Minor clarifications to the minutes from B. Haidar were accepted. The verbatim transcription was determined not to provide material benefit. (Allen, Navarro with opposition from Walsh).

Old Business

- #2 IELM Allocation Report From Library – D. Miramontez indicated that there was confusion amongst Librarians and Supervisors on the current budget. The confusion stemmed from the multiple funding sources available to the LLRC in support of library materials. D. Miramontez will go back to staff to clarify all funding sources available to the LLRC and will report back to the committee the outcome of the discussion. Our goal is to determine how much of the allocated \$80K can be spent on Library Books. S. Volin reminded the committee that if the LLRC cannot spend the entire \$80K then the committee would consider adding the balance not needed by the LLRC to the RFF process. B. Bell indicated that the role of BRDS was to allocate resources and not to function as a purchasing agent.
- #1 IELM Allocation Report From Technology – D. Miramontez, co-chair of the Technology Committee, reported that the Technology Committee would be able to spend the allocated \$320K. D. Miramontez reported that the technology committee is pursuing two options:
 - 1. Hybrid approach - % of allocation to Thin Client Pilot and % to Technology Refresh.
 - 2. If Thin Client Pilot is not a viable approach for the campus, 100% of the allocation would be used for technology refresh.

It is the charge of the Technology Committee, working with constituent groups, to communicate widely and determine which option will best serve Instructional

Computing. D. Navarro inquired if either of the two options would be affected by the upcoming ERP implementation. B. Bell indicated that the ERP is web based and that it can be accessed via District standard platforms. S. Volin asked that the Technology Committee follow existing process and solicit input from Instruction on what are the exact technology needs. D. Gutowski asked if there was an aged inventory of all Instructional computers on campus and if this inventory would be used in determining the refresh. Miramontez indicated that aging and warranty are available and will be used a criteria.

- Faculty Membership Report From Academic Senate – No report
- Classified Membership Report From Classified Senate – J. Allen indicated that the following is current:

Joyce Allen
Kurt Hill
Denise Kapitzke
Steve Volin

New Business

- College Discretionary Budget Allocation – The College has received an additional \$100K of discretionary budget. B. Bell proposed using a modified process/form to collect budget needs from the three divisions that complete program review. This form documents 14-15 budget, justification, Program Priority, Division Priority, BRDS Priority and also requests signature from Department Chair/Supervisor and confirmation from Dean and VP that all requests are included in Program Review and linked to a College Strategic Goal. B. Bell indicated that this form was scaled from an existing form and is integrated and simple. J. Allen noted concern for control of integrated planning, but this was a great start. R. Bennie highlighted that our recent history is with cutting budget and not adding budget and that using an existing process would be of benefit due to consistency. There was consensus that the form was appropriate and that we would evaluate effectiveness next year. The form/process was recommended by the Committee (Navarro, Gutowski). Bell will present form/process to PIEC and then CEC.
- Miramar College 2014/2015 Adopted Budget Report – B. Bell presented the Miramar College total budget for 2014-2015. The report listed General Fund Unrestricted, Restricted, Categorical, Grants and Contracts, Special Revenue, Capital Projects (FF&E), Fiduciary Trust, Total Budget by major object and budget planning assumptions. By consensus, the committee accepted the report. B. Bell will present the report to PIEC and CEC.

Meeting was adjourned at 12:05 p.m.