

Budget Allocation and Recommendation Committee

3:30

MEMBERS

Lorenze Legaspi		Nicole Roesler
Isabel O'Connor (A)	Brian Mackus (A)	Laurie Strong
Cassandra Storey (A)	Kevin Branson (A)	
Jennifer Carmichael (A)	Virginia Enriquez (A)	
Todd Curan (A)	Alex Berry (A)	

<p>Call to Order 2:36</p> <p>BARC Minutes 2.26.26 are pending approval for next meeting</p>	<p>Lorenze Legaspi</p>
<p>Next Year BARC Process Questions and Improvements - Discussion</p> <p>The 2026–2027 BARC Change Recommendations were introduced for discussion; however, the finalization of these recommendations will be postponed until the next meeting to ensure a broader representation of committee members.</p> <p>A reminder was issued to all committee members regarding the importance of consistent attendance.</p> <p>The committee expressed that the recommended BARC 2026-27 Change Recommendations.xlsx accurately reflects the general goals for the 2026–2027 BARC cycle.</p> <p>Laurie noted a current disconnect regarding whether BARC funding is intended for basic operational needs or for innovation. It is essential to clarify that if applicants are seeking replacements or basic needs, they are directed to the appropriate alternative resources.</p> <p>Nicole added that for applicants who were not awarded funding this year, the committee must provide clear guidance on next steps. This includes recommending alternative avenues for support, such as their respective Dean or specific departments.</p> <p>Lorenze reviewed the BARC FAQ with the committee, highlighting the importance of the training sessions. These sessions are intended to expand upon the FAQ in a more personal setting, allowing for a deeper understanding of the material. It was noted that the list of items that should not be requested will remain unchanged on the FAQ.</p>	<p>Lorenze Legaspi</p> <p>Barc Agenda 3.12.26.docx</p> <p>BARC 2026-27 Change Recommendations.xlsx</p> <p>BARC FAQ</p>

The committee discussed adding specific instructions to the FAQ to redirect requests that do not qualify for BARC funding—such as certain equipment or instruments—to the appropriate Deans or Managers.

Laurie raised a concern regarding the process for replacement items: if a request has already been denied or filtered through the Dean/Manager channel and is then brought to BARC, how should it be handled?

Lorenze clarified that Deans must prioritize their own allocated resources first.

The committee proposed building a formal step into the process that allows for replacement requests to be considered by BARC only *after* it has been confirmed that Deans or Managers are unable to fulfill them. Furthermore, it was suggested that training be provided for managers on the FAQ to ensure they are better informed about where specific types of requests should be directed.

The committee noted that the availability of COVID-19 relief funds may have temporarily reduced the volume of BARC requests. As these one-time funds are depleted, the committee anticipates that the campus may rely on BARC for resource allocation.

It was proposed that Facilities could rank facilities-related requests, while the Technology Committee could potentially rank technology-specific requests.

The committee discussed the possibility of establishing a minimum and/or maximum dollar amount per request. It was noted that a minimum threshold might inadvertently restrict certain smaller but innovative needs. Conversely, a maximum limit could be applied at the department level; in such cases, any approved funding would be directed toward that department's highest priority item.

The committee reached a consensus that ongoing costs (such as maintenance or subscriptions) must be addressed more explicitly within the rubric.

Additionally, the committee agreed that a follow-up report is a reasonable requirement for large-scale awards. These reports would address the impact of the funding, asking questions such as:

- How did this request affect your department?
- In what specific ways did it benefit students?
- Which student populations were most impacted?

<p>Rubric Discussion</p> <p>During the Rubric Discussion, the committee suggested adding a specific metric to evaluate the reach of each proposal: "How many students will this request affect?" Members agreed it is essential to understand the scale of student impact or how the broader campus community is affected by a potential award.</p> <p>The committee proposed adding Background Categories to the request form. These categories—such as Equipment, Software, Technology, or Furniture—would provide necessary and quick context for each item. Finally, the committee reached a consensus that the question regarding the quantification of student impact should be integrated as a formal addition to the "Need" section of the rubric. The first bullet in the Need section of the BARC rubric should be removed.</p> <p>The committee acknowledged the need for more members and diverse representation in the membership to ensure robust scoring. To improve accuracy and reduce the impact of outliers, it was suggested that the highest and lowest scores be removed before calculating the final averages for rankings.</p> <p>Members noted that the Sustainability criteria currently feels disconnected from the committee’s core mission. Two primary adjustments were proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option A: Remove "Sustainability" and reallocate its weight to Innovation, a key pillar of the BARC mission. • Option B: Remove "Sustainability" and distribute weights equally across all remaining sections. 	<p>Lorenze Legaspi</p>
<p>Quotes</p> <p>The committee reached a consensus that rough quotes should be a mandatory requirement for all submissions. To accommodate unique circumstances, an initial question will be added to the form: if an applicant is unable to provide a quote, they must provide a detailed explanation as a caveat.</p> <p>A new dropdown menu is suggested to be integrated into the Nuventive system. This feature is designed to "weed out" and redirect Safety and Facilities requests to their appropriate channels before an applicant can officially submit a BARC request</p>	<p>Lorenze Legaspi</p>
<p>Next steps</p> <p>The committee discussed strategies for increasing participation, including the potential for offering an online or hybrid meeting format.</p> <p>Other Committee and Goal Review has been moved to next meeting.</p> <p>Meeting Adjourned 3:21pm</p>	

