1. Welcome & Introductions

1.1. Mindfulness for Students

The committee will center ourselves around students, a practice that helps keep students in mind.

Committee members were encouraged to support the upcoming *Young Frankenstein* production opening tomorrow in the PAC. Students were commended for their excellent work on the show.

2. Adoption of Agenda

2.1. Agenda Review and Adoption

The committee shall review and adopt today's proposed agenda.

The agenda was reviewed and adopted without opposition.
Motion: Adopt the agenda as presented.

3. Action Items

3.1. Phillip Briggs - Participatory Governance Handbook - SEIU Appointed Membership

Members identified in the 2026-2032 Participatory Governance Handbook:

Co-Chairs
Faculty Co-Chair appointed by Academic Senate (voting)
Classified Co-Chair appointed by Classified Senate (voting)
Administrative Co-Chair appointed by College President (non-voting, except in case of tiebreaker)
Members
6 faculty members appointed by Academic Senate (including Faculty Co-Chair)
4 classified professionals appointed by the Classified Senate (including Classified Co-Chair)
1 student appointed by ASVC
1 administrator appointed by College President

Phillip reported that during updates to the Participatory Governance Handbook, language regarding an AFT representative was inadvertently omitted. The AFT representative is currently reviewing and approving the proposed addition to restore this information to the handbook.
Phillip also shared that discussions continue with SEIU regarding the addition of an SEIU-appointed representative to the committee. The proposed position would be appointed directly by SEIU and would not replace any existing committee position or Classified Senate appointment.
The committee discussed the process for implementing these changes. Any updates to the Participatory Governance Handbook must be reviewed and approved by the Classified Senate, Academic Senate, and Presidents before new positions can be formally added.
Next Steps:

Finalize proposed handbook language for the AFT representative position.
Continue discussions with SEIU regarding an appointed representative.
Route any proposed handbook revisions through the established governance approval process.

4. Discussion / Information Updates

4.1. Identify connections to institutional priorities and work plan objectives

The committee discussed opportunities to refresh and strengthen alignment between committee work and the College's institutional priorities and work plan objectives. Members suggested engaging other division leaders and committee representatives, including IT and FM&O, in these discussions. Small-group discussion opportunities were identified as a potential approach for gathering input and fostering collaboration.
Next Steps:
Engage division leaders and committee representatives in discussions regarding work plan refresh efforts.
Explore small-group discussion formats to gather feedback and identify priorities.

4.2. Discuss opportunities to partner with other committees/teams

4.3. Discuss Committee Goals and proposed 26-27 Goals

Adopted Goals for 25-26

- Goal #1: Formalize budget communication plan including communication on topics such as timeline, methods for sharing information with the campus community, planned workshops, and feedback mechanisms for campus constituents.
- Goal #2: Expand BRC Members' understanding of all sources of funding, including categorical programs, grants, special funds, and capital projects.
- Goal #3: Establish procedures for reviewing Out-of-Cycle budget requests (non-personnel).
- Goal #4: Clarify relationship between FOG, TAG, and BRC.
- Goal #5: Establish Equipment Refresh Process.

Proposed goals for 26-27:

1. **Strengthen Budget Communication and Campus Budget Literacy:** Develop and implement effective methods for communicating budget information, timelines, terminology, decisions, resources, and opportunities for campus feedback.
2. **Expand Understanding of College Funding Sources and Processes:** Increase committee and campus understanding of funding sources, including

categorical programs, grants, special funds, and capital projects, as well as the appropriate processes and funding pathways for various types of requests.

3. **Establish Clear Procedures for Out-of-Cycle Budget Requests:** Develop and communicate procedures and consistent evaluation criteria for reviewing non-personnel Out-of-Cycle budget requests, coordinated with the Program Review redesign where appropriate.
4. **Clarify the Roles and Relationships of BRC, FOG, and TAG:** Define and communicate the roles of BRC, FOG, TAG, and related processes, including guidance regarding facilities requests, maintenance, refresh projects, and Program Review resource requests.
5. **Establish and Communicate an Equipment Refresh Process:** Develop a transparent process for identifying, prioritizing, reviewing, and funding equipment refresh needs.
6. **Strengthen Committee Participation and Constituent Engagem**ent: Establish expectations for member attendance, communication with constituent groups, and ongoing collection and consideration of campus feedback, including a goal of at least 75% member attendance.

BW hand out - shared proposed goals, reviewed the Educational Mssterplan Goals and Objectives, - discuss the proposed BRC 26-27 proposed goals and objectives and how we'll accomplish those objectives as a group.
Split into groups - discuss objectives.
Work plan objectives would include a plan, input from parties of who it will impact.
Outcome to students/campus staff if goals are accomplished.
(5 min small group work)

Brent/David, Goal #1: Supported All of the OBjectives in 2nd goal for EMP - bye in of being bale to know why bigger decisions are beig made. CReate a calendar that has budget updates as well as FLEX days where Fiscal Svcs has Budget Workshops. Coffee w/ VP of BS / Fiscal Svcs - time set aside w/ out agenda or presentation, open ended dept. budget questions, campus buegst questions - better understanding of overall campus decisions.

Steve/Dan Goal #2: MOstly communications, EMP Goal 2 - Focues in Objective 7 (Improving Communicationa corss campus) one of the last components of gOal #2 is expanding knowledge or various requests - goes hand in hand with Program Review committee work, how different requests are fielded out , the work or that commitee would be to work with and strgethen that work. Having a list of funding sources that support specific projects/requests, campus inititatives.

Gwen / Felicia: Unsure if this is even a BRC task - isnt this an Executive Team established Process? Did not feel comfortable making any initiatives.

BW: Academic Senate feels sometimes these decisions are made during the summer without campus bye-in, would it be approrpaite for a panel for a senate bye-in on the out of cycyle requests if you're request is being reviewed/approved. Would it be appropriate for a summer committee to discuss Faculty Out of cycle requests? End result - MORE transaprency on current process. We're notified of the decions but not consulted.
What procedure is left for BRC to even discuss or make a goal of?
Solely transparency - thats fine but clearer understanding and communication from Exec Team to the campus and full processees and cycles and how they interact with each other.
PB: Out of cycle originally designed for urgent/high-need quick turn-around requests, maybe worth documenting what goals and procedure identify Out of Cycle reuqest and what should be program review, is it just a timing caveat or something more for classified/faculty hiring reqyests. Clarification is definitly needed.
Dan : IS program review commitee up and running and meeting? PB: Yes, met last month and meet the 3rd Wed of each month.

Jimmy / Phil Goal #4 - funnnel up from TAG & FOG to BRC - the aount of requests - BRC may want to be the rubber stamp on TAG and FOG inititatives. BRC did move things around this year for Program Review, objectives: Student Engagement #1 & 7, BRC shoud be an advisory group best using our broad membership for reporting to other constituents, BRC can have a voice from Facilities, etc. to enforce refresh plans and other goals and objectives. Would be good for BRC to have nmore knowledge and bye in from specific division during meetings to help know what could and should be prioritized in fresh plans, refresh projects, etc.

Jesse / Katheryn #5 - proposed work plan - develop transparent and participated through various constiuents ; Equipment Fresh Process. Would Support EMP #2, goals 2, 3, 4. Next step: Develop a plan with input from FM&o and consituent senates. Sharing how to share purchasing processes acorss division offices with equipment funding, purachase requests, and cycles of equipment fresh. Sharring input and responbility from campus constituents.
FD: Equipment resfresh process previous conversations said 1st create an inventory of current items, and go from there.
SM: Is there a refresh building plan? JS: No, 4 years ago dier need or scheduled / refreash/ maintenance - millions of dollars have been spent over the past severasl years on roofs, flooring, etc. A development of scheduled maintenance projects should be created to share with campus just of where the projects, funding and priorites are directed for campus understandings. This process would help every one to know essential projects *roofs, carpeting, water heaters, etc.) dollars and bandwidth are necessay to fullfill this request. transparency of plans for campus project plans.

notes from Co-Pilot: BW distributed a handout outlining proposed BRC goals and facilitated a review of the Educational Master Plan (EMP) goals and objectives. The committee discussed proposed 2026-27 BRC goals, related work plan objectives, and strategies for accomplishing those objectives. Members emphasized that work plan objectives should include

implementation plans, input from impacted stakeholders, and clear identification of the intended outcomes for students and campus constituents.
Committee members participated in small-group discussions and reported the following feedback:

Goal 1 - Budget Awareness and Transparency

Brent and David supported the objectives associated with EMP Goal 2, emphasizing the importance of helping the campus community understand how and why major institutional decisions are made. Suggestions included developing an annual budget communication calendar, incorporating Fiscal Services budget workshops during FLEX activities, and offering informal opportunities such as "Coffee with the VP of Business Services" or Fiscal Services staff to provide open forums for budget-related questions. The objective would be to increase understanding of campus budgeting processes and decision-making.

Goal 2 - Communication and Resource Awareness

Steve and Dan focused on EMP Goal 2, particularly Objective 7 related to improving communication across campus. The discussion highlighted opportunities to strengthen connections between BRC and the Program Review Committee by increasing awareness of how requests are evaluated and prioritized. Members suggested developing campus resources that identify funding sources available for projects, requests, and institutional initiatives.

Role of BRC and Shared Governance

Gwen and Felicia questioned whether some of the proposed initiatives were within BRC's scope, noting that certain processes may be established and managed through the Executive Team. They expressed hesitation regarding BRC taking ownership of initiatives that may not fall within the committee's charge.
BW shared feedback from the Academic Senate indicating that some campus decisions, particularly out-of-cycle requests, are perceived as occurring without sufficient campus input. Discussion centered on whether additional opportunities for consultation or review could improve campus understanding of those decisions. Members emphasized that greater transparency regarding existing processes would be beneficial.
PB noted that out-of-cycle requests were originally intended for urgent, high-priority needs requiring expedited review. The committee discussed the value of documenting the purpose, criteria, and process for out-of-cycle requests, including how they differ from requests that move through the regular Program Review process. Clarification of these processes was identified as a need.
Dan inquired about the status of the Program Review Committee. PB confirmed that the committee is active, met the previous month, and continues to meet on the third Wednesday of each month.

Goal 4 - Integration with TAG and FOG Processes

Jimmy and Phil discussed ways BRC could strengthen communication and coordination with TAG and FOG. Members noted that BRC serves as an advisory body with broad campus

representation and can provide valuable feedback on facilities, refresh plans, and institutional priorities. The group emphasized the importance of providing members with sufficient information from various divisions to support informed discussions regarding campus priorities and resource allocation.

Goal 5 - Equipment Refresh and Facilities Planning Transparency

Jesse and Kathryn discussed developing a more transparent and participatory equipment refresh process involving FM&O and constituent groups. Members noted that this work would support several EMP objectives by improving communication, planning, and stakeholder involvement. The proposed approach would include sharing information regarding equipment funding sources, purchasing processes, replacement cycles, and campus responsibilities.

FD referenced previous discussions regarding the need to first establish an inventory of existing equipment before developing a refresh plan.

SM asked whether a campus-wide facilities refresh plan currently exists. Jesse explained that while significant investments have been made in recent years for roofs, flooring, and other infrastructure needs, there is no comprehensive campus refresh plan currently shared with the campus. Members discussed the value of developing and communicating scheduled maintenance and facilities improvement plans so campus constituents better understand project priorities, funding allocations, and resource constraints.

Discussion Summary

Throughout the discussion, members consistently identified transparency, communication, and campus understanding of institutional planning, budgeting, facilities improvements, and resource allocation processes as key themes for future BRC goals and work plan development.

Sandra / Kelley #6 : EMP #2, objectives #1

Brent distributed a handout outlining proposed BRC goals and facilitated a review of the Educational Master Plan (EMP) goals and objectives. The committee discussed proposed 2026-27 BRC goals, related work plan objectives, and strategies for accomplishing those objectives. Members emphasized that work plan objectives should include implementation plans, input from impacted stakeholders, and clear identification of the intended outcomes for students and campus constituents.

Committee members participated in small-group discussions and reported the following feedback:

Goal 1 - Budget Awareness and Transparency

Brent and David supported the objectives associated with EMP Goal 2, emphasizing the importance of helping the campus community understand how and why major institutional decisions are made. Suggestions included developing an annual budget communication calendar, incorporating Fiscal Services budget workshops during FLEX activities, and offering

informal opportunities such as "Coffee with the VP of Business Services" or "Fiscal Services staff" to provide open forums for budget-related questions. The objective would be to increase understanding of campus budgeting processes and decision-making.

Goal 2 - Communication and Resource Awareness

Steve and Dan focused on EMP Goal 2, particularly Objective 7 related to improving communication across campus. The discussion highlighted opportunities to strengthen connections between BRC and the Program Review Committee by increasing awareness of how requests are evaluated and prioritized. Members suggested developing campus resources that identify funding sources available for projects, requests, and institutional initiatives.

Role of BRC and Shared Governance

Gwen and Felicia questioned whether some of the proposed initiatives were within BRC's scope, noting that certain processes may be established and managed through the Executive Team. They expressed hesitation regarding BRC taking ownership of initiatives that may not fall within the committee's charge.

Brent shared feedback from the Academic Senate indicating that some campus decisions, particularly out-of-cycle requests, are perceived as occurring without sufficient campus input. Discussion centered on whether additional opportunities for consultation or review could improve campus understanding of those decisions. Members emphasized that greater transparency regarding existing processes would be beneficial.

PB noted that out-of-cycle requests were originally intended for urgent, high-priority needs requiring expedited review. The committee discussed the value of documenting the purpose, criteria, and process for out-of-cycle requests, including how they differ from requests that move through the regular Program Review process. Clarification of these processes was identified as a need.

Dan inquired about the status of the Program Review Committee. PB confirmed that the committee is active, met the previous month, and continues to meet on the third Wednesday of each month.

Goal 4 - Integration with TAG and FOG Processes

Jimmy and Phil discussed ways BRC could strengthen communication and coordination with TAG and FOG. Members noted that BRC serves as an advisory body with broad campus representation and can provide valuable feedback on facilities, refresh plans, and institutional priorities. The group emphasized the importance of providing members with sufficient information from various divisions to support informed discussions regarding campus priorities and resource allocation.

Goal 5 - Equipment Refresh and Facilities Planning Transparency

Jesse and Kathryn discussed developing a more transparent and participatory equipment refresh process involving FM&O and constituent groups. Members noted that this work would support several EMP objectives by improving communication, planning, and stakeholder involvement. The proposed approach would include sharing information regarding equipment funding sources, purchasing processes, replacement cycles, and campus responsibilities.

FD referenced previous discussions regarding the need to first establish an inventory of existing equipment before developing a refresh plan.

SM asked whether a campus-wide facilities refresh plan currently exists. Jesse explained that

while significant investments have been made in recent years for roofs, flooring, and other infrastructure needs, there is no comprehensive campus refresh plan currently shared with the campus. Members discussed the value of developing and communicating scheduled maintenance and facilities improvement plans so campus constituents better understand project priorities, funding allocations, and resource constraints.

Discussion Summary

Throughout the discussion, members consistently identified transparency, communication, and campus understanding of institutional planning, budgeting, facilities improvements, and resource allocation processes as key themes for future BRC goals and work plan development.

4.4. Out of Cycle Requests

N/A

4.5. Program Review Updates

5. Budget Reports

5.1. FY27 Budget Discussion

6. Reports

6.1. DCAS - TBD

6.2. Board of Trustees

6.3. Technology Advisory Group - Grant

6.4. Facilities Oversight Group - Jesse

Campus Maintenance and Facility Refresh Plans

Brent initiated the discussion by asking about a building refresh plan for items like carpeting, noting that current carpets are "disgusting" and 16 years old.

Jesse explained that the campus has spent millions over the last four years on roof replacements and roughly $100,000 on flooring, but the Facilities Maintenance and Operations (FMO) team is currently managing a deep backlog.

Jesse mentioned he has a color-coded flooring assessment report from Genesis Flooring (red for immediate, amber for 2 years, green for 5+ years) that he will share digitally with the group.

The group discussed the difficulty of carpet replacement, which requires displacing staff, moving IT equipment, and demo work, making it a major logistical challenge.

suggested the Public Information Office should send out press releases about these improvements to show residents how their tax dollars and bond money are being used for maintenance.

Strategic Goals and Budget Transparency

discussed aligning the committee's work plan with the Educational Master Plan (EMP), specifically Goal #2 regarding communication improvements.

The committee aims to achieve 75% attendance and is considering establishing a budget

forum every semester after September 15th to explain funding and ongoing projects.
There was a suggestion to hold "Coffee with the VP" every few months to address budgetary questions and maintenance schedules.
Brent highlighted an existing but underutilized anonymous web form on the BRC website created with James and David for campus members to submit budget-related questions.
The team agreed to spend the next month "wordsmithing" their goals, particularly refining the language around "out-of-cycle budget requests" to clarify the executive team's current view.
Impact of New Student Housing
The new student housing project is expected to transform campus vibrancy, potentially increasing participation in performing arts and athletics due to a "captive audience" of 300 residents.
Grant suggested partnering with housing to use vacant rooms in the summer for the Schwab Festival, possibly adding acoustic paneling and pianos for practice spaces.
Jesse and Speaker 7 noted operational challenges, including the fact that rooms house three students, meaning cleaning and repairs must be strategically timed around occupancy.
Concerns were raised regarding FMO staffing, as the new facility will require significant upkeep, yet the total FMO staff for the entire campus is only 34 people.
The group discussed how 24/7 residents will require extended access to resources like the library (LRC), which currently has limited Friday hours.
Detailed Facilities Project Updates
AEC Elevator: The project has been ongoing for over a year; it is currently waiting for a communication system installation and state fire alarm certification, with completion expected in two weeks.
EV Charging Stations: There are 80 new spaces in the east lot, though the campus lacks 80 electric vehicles. The team is waiting for a formal parking policy to determine if internal combustion engines can use those spots.
SCE Transformer: A $2 million replacement project is pending final engagement from Southern California Edison, who are moving at their own pace.
Greenhouse Project: The project was pulled from the October board meeting because bids came in significantly over budget; Jesse suggested potentially separating the utility infrastructure from the building erection to lower costs.
LRC and Roofs: Recent rain caused major leaks in the LRC, requiring 12 to 16 hours of cleanup by FMO. The AEP roof replacement is looking at a "fluid applied system" that takes only three days to apply and offers a 40-year guarantee.
Modulars (TR 12-15): Exterior shells are being sealed with new siding, paint, and doors; a job walk for the roofs is scheduled for Friday.
East Campus Expansion: The project is pending a letter from the City of Santa Paula for 24 additional parking spaces; construction could start as early as January if approved.
Suggested Action Items
Jesse to provide the Genesis Flooring assessment report to the committee in a digital format.
Jesse to begin sending out a monthly FMO project report similar to the one Grant distributes.
Brent to refine the language for committee Goal #2 and clarify the purpose of out-of-cycle budget requests for the next meeting.

Brent to bring the EMP-alignment activity to the Senate to see if other faculty co-chairs want to adopt the practice.
The equipment refresh workgroup (including Jesse and others) to meet and develop a plan by November 4th.
Jesse to follow up with Vortex Doors to obtain a cost proposal for nine doors.

7. Items to report to CPC

Discuss new monthly reporting process.

8. Future Meetings

8.1. BRC Equipment Workgroup

- Update on Workgroup created to Develop Equipment Refresh plan.
- Working Group Volunteers include Grant Jones, Jesse Sluder, Mike Lazarus, Steve Palladino, Katheryn Solorio, Felicia Duenas, Kelley Bruns

8.2. Future Meeting Dates

November 4th, 2026

December 2nd, 2026

January 6th, 2027 (Faculty Off contract) Jennifer Garner request to unschedule this Jan meeting - no objections from the group to cancel this meeting

February 3rd, 2027

March 3rd, 2027

April 7th, 2027

May 5th, 2027