

SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE

Budget Allocation and Recommendation Committee May 14th, 2026 2:30-3:30 (Zoom)

MEMBERS

Jacqueline Collins	Brian Mackus	Laurie Strong
Isabel O'Connor (A)	Kevin Branson (A)	Nicole Roesler (Consultant)
Cassandra Storey	Virginia Enriquez	Mary Gwin (Guest)
Jennifer Carmichael	Alex Berry	
Todd Curan		

Call to Order Meeting was called to order at 2:33 The committee reviewed minutes and there were no corrections or additions.	Jacqueline Collins
Review BARC Application Questions The committee began the meeting by discussing potential changes to the current BARC application questions to provide clarity around the BARC process and ensure that applicants are submitting BARC-eligible requests. J. Collins raised a discussion point from the last meeting, noting that future BARC requests must include quotes so that the committee can better understand the fiscal impact and cost of the request. This could be a formal quote from a vendor or an informal quote, such as a screenshot of an online shopping cart. B. Mackus suggested filtering out safety and accreditation requests from the request pool before the committee ranks them, as these requests may influence the final ranking. J. Collins proposed having BARC review every incoming request to identify which items are safety issues or technology requests. These items could then be pulled and routed to the Facilities and Safety Committee and the MIT Committee to be evaluated, scored, and ranked. These ranked requests would then come back to BARC for final approval and ranking. J. Carmichael noted the need for transparency and documentation regarding items pulled from BARC for safety or technology reasons, ensuring that requestors know where their requests ended up.	<u>Change Recommendations Spreadsheet</u>

The committee discussed how the process would work if safety or technology requests were categorized before the final list arrives at BARC. L. Strong clarified that having pre-categorized requests would allow the committee to make quicker, more informed decisions for requests that may need additional expertise. C. Storey suggested adding checkboxes to the BARC application—similar to program review—for applicants to mark if their request is IT, safety, or accreditation-related. J. Collins added that while checkboxes will be helpful, there will still need to be a manual review of requests with checked boxes to ensure they are correctly marked. Regarding accreditation requests, the committee agreed that requests required for accreditation are pulled and automatically forwarded to the President.	
BARC Goals and Objectives The committee engaged in a broader discussion regarding the role of BARC. J. Carmichael noted that while BARC is intended for innovative requests, the campus is missing an established process for departments to request equipment "needs." J. Collins explained that BARC could serve as a space for innovative requests, but there should also be a process by which BARC informs how the campus communicates its critical needs. These critical needs could be directed from BARC to the executive chain for funding. N. Roesler reiterated the opportunity for BARC to be the space to create those missing processes for non-innovative requests, encompassing both capital assets and smaller requests. The committee will continue this discussion in depth during their summer retreat on June 11th from 8:30 to 11:00 a.m. M. Fay will send out a calendar invite to the committee. The tentative agenda for the retreat will be to discuss the mission and identity of BARC and to start developing BARC processes. J. Collins acknowledged the committee's role in defining and developing the process by which the budget is built and funding is requested. The committee will develop those recommended processes, which will then go through the approval process, be voted on, and be implemented. M. Gwin asked if BARC will be creating an operating budget for both the GFU and the GFR. J. Collins explained that this is the conversation that will happen at the summer retreat to better understand the goals and objectives of BARC. Collins agreed that GFR is included. She also noted that there should be a process to utilize the institutional budget as a whole.	

Collins and Gwin briefly discussed NANCE funding. Collins noted that NANCE funding is tracked and reports are sent to budget managers to ensure spending is accurate.

Currently, the committee has no active action items for review.