Meeting Notes May 5, 2010  
(Accepted via e-mail 5/26/10)

**Members Present:** Adam O’Connor, Dan Willoughby, Cyndi Grein, Sharon Kelly, Ken Collins, Tyler Speer, Marcus Wilson

**Absent:** Chrystal Van Beynen, Jesse Garcia

**Guests:** Andrea Hanstein, Sean Chamberlin

Meeting commenced at 2:05 p.m.

**Meeting Notes from 4/21/10 were accepted.**

**Follow-up:**

**Categorical Programs:** Adam informed the committee that the amount of difference at this point in time is still $870,000. This amount has been presented to Fred Williams. We have $550,000 in vacancies to use towards the shortfall. There is really nothing else we can do until the May Revise to see what the district might be able to contribute. A member then stated that the sales tax revenues are not as strong as earlier anticipated.

Adam will be attending the ACBO conference to discuss the May Revise which is being held at the same time as our last scheduled meeting—so this will be our last meeting of the year. Adam will send out an e-mail to members to convey the outcome from the ACBO conference.

**Accreditation Planning Agenda:** On-going scheduled maintenance—what is this exactly? Are we using the state definition or just including major things on campus? Adam stated that the state comes up with some or no money for scheduled maintenance and the district then needs to match the amount. Even if the state does not come up with funds we still need to put money aside for these types of needs.

Building maintenance—add total cost of ownership for that specific item. The big ticket items the state addresses—other items like the cost of heating the new pool, painting of buildings, etc. we need to cover. There was some confusion between Scheduled Maintenance and scheduled maintenance—possibly use the phrase “total cost of ownership”—Sean and Adam will talk more about this particular item.

**State and District budget Update:** No update at this time.
Foundation Fundraising (blue handout): This was discussed at PAC and determined that the BDC needs to revisit this issue. Adam then stated that Andrea Hanstein agreed to come to the meeting today to help with the discussion based on the fact that she is the new foundation liaison. Adam added that Carol Mattson was previously the liaison but since she is now on the board and the potential conflict of interest, the president appointed Andrea to fill this role.

Much discussion ensued:

After reviewing the handout, Ken Collins thinks that it is dangerous to send this to the foundation vaguely listing our priorities. Instead of Science Building—what do we want them to raise funds for? What programs in Fine Arts need funding? Basic Skills needs to be removed since we can’t spend the money we have.

Andrea suggested an annual campaign like the Science Building. Some group would meet with the science faculty to see what they actually need. The division will need to buy into it because they will need to help with the fundraising effort. Ken added that this was an improvement to what we have. The science building is something we need help with because of “X”. Give more specificity up front. Possibly say Science Building equipment—what is the specific equipment that we see a need for?

This document was put together quickly so that the foundation could get started in July. They don’t have a plan but there is some interest and they are excited about it. Next year it would be more descriptive. Possibly get rid of the bullets. Show some forethought instead of having such broad categories—what is important for the coming year.

Tyler asked if this list was in priority order—No.

Dan doesn’t think that this is the way to go. Listing things that haven’t been thought through is not the way to go. No particular discussion as to what went on the list. Add some examples into the bullet points. Whenever you disseminate something the first time you need to do it right. You might get a new set of priorities every year. We haven’t agreed to priorities and the campus has not agreed to them either.

One member added that the Science building equipment and technology equipment is ripe for our need. We need to tell the foundation board what we really want—not “such as”. If we come up with one or two things in each category it might be more effective. We need to come up with some reasonable things so that they will become successful.

Sean feels that we need to narrow the selection for a campaign. While the priorities might change, can we sell a campaign to account for these?

Might want to focus on campus wide items—not necessarily a specification. State of the art equipment for the new state of the art building. Could be more generic so that we could include the Technology building equipment. Science building equipment, instructional equipment and technology? Possibly focus on items that will be going into the rooms of the new buildings.

Maybe we give them just one priority for next year—we need to give them something to go on. We need to think about what they can market and pitch to the community.

Dan added that it is not good policy to approve priorities such as these when we haven’t had an opportunity to obtain input from our constituent groups. If there was more time, Dan could take this back.
to the deans for input. He likes the part about innovative programs and possibly something about jobs—consultants to work with students. He stated that he does not feel comfortable with this the way it is currently.

These are not FC priorities because we didn’t go out to the constituents to see what their actual priorities are.

The Foundation is asking for guidance—they don’t even know what our college goals are.

Possibly add University Tours, Vocational Programs and Innovative Instructional and Student Support Programs. We want to keep it simple but easily understood. Instructional technology is something non controversial—wants to get them excited about the process.

What if we just focused on one? Need to have choices. Different donors will have different things that they will be excited about.

Will BDC be the group responsible to make the priorities and take them to PAC? What will the process be? Will different groups have an opportunity to come to BDC and pitch their proposals? Adam indicated that BDC members will go to their constituent groups and come back with their specific suggestions.

Andrea then briefly reviewed the three ways to approach the foundation for assistance.

Some things might not fit the guidelines but has a great need. If someone has a project that is not a college goal or priority, can they go to the foundation and ask for money? Adam indicated that he would need to get clarification from the president.

Adam then added that the maximum amount to request on the Fullerton College Foundation Funding Request Form was increased to $1,500 from $1,000.

There was much discussion about the amount and the wording. Everyone has to do it at the same time, not trickle in throughout the year. The requests would go to president’s staff and then to the foundation.

If funds were raised for University Tours, we could then use some of the savings originally funded by the college to put aside for emergency requests—the President’s Circle that goes specifically to the college.

Adam will make changes to the Foundation Fundraising document reflecting the discussion and will be sending it out. Changing the title to: 2010-2011 Fundraising Priorities for FC; changing the sentence under Facilities & Equipment to end with “to include Instructional Equipment & Technology”; under Programmatic Support, adding “to include University Tours and Innovative Instructional and Student Support Programs; and deleting the Student Financial Support section all together.

**Allocation for “On-going” DF:** Adam reviewed 5 “on-going” items that we already agreed would be funded through Dynamic Funds last year. If we get $8,000 fundraised for University Tours, we could put the money back in the carryover funds to use elsewhere.

Sharon added that we might want to consider changing the wording on the use of funds for the Workforce Center. It is currently being used to increase the coordinator from 10 to 11 months—there are no other
areas that get to use Dynamic Funds for this purpose. Adam will talk to Toni to determine if she is on board to keep the money for the Workforce Center for salary increases.

One Book One College—why is this not on the list? Adam stated that it was on the list for one year and then the Dynamic Fund was discontinued. The items on the list are those that had been funded from year to year and the BDC determined that there was an ongoing need for funding.

It was suggested that we add One Book One College on the list for foundation fundraising as well.

It was confirmed that BDC expects to continue funding the Distance Learning Special Projects Manager until such time as it is institutionalized. The committee supported funding for this list again for 10/11.

Meeting adjourned at 3:17 p.m.