TO: Members of the Board of Trustees
FROM: Adriana D. Barrera, Interim Chancellor
DATE: October 16, 2013
SUBJECT: BOARD LETTER FOR OCTOBER 23, 2013 MEETING

Board Meeting Location
Next week’s Board meeting will be held at the Educational Services Center. The meeting times and locations are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meetings</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Master Planning and Oversight Committee</td>
<td>12:30 p.m. to 2:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Board Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convene for Board Meeting and Recess to Closed Session</td>
<td>2:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Board Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convene for Public Session</td>
<td>5:45 p.m.</td>
<td>Board Room</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Facilities Master Planning and Oversight Committee (Veres Chair, Svonkin Vice Chair, Moreno Member)
The committee will meet from 12:30 p.m. to 2:30 p.m. in the Board Room. For the committee’s agenda refer to Attachment A.

Confidential Matters
The attached correspondence is confidential and should not be shared with other persons.
- Office of General Counsel
  - Enclosed for your review is the District-related Litigation Report. (Refer to Attachment B)
  - Enclosed for your review is the Bond-related Litigation Report. (Refer to Attachment C)

Other Matters
Enclosed for your information is an article on Information Technology Services at Community Colleges. Since the topic of the agenda for next week’s meeting of the Committee of the Whole is on the District and Colleges’ Information Technology Departments, I thought this article would provide a viable framework for your discussion. (Refer to Attachment D)

Please let me know should you have any questions regarding the meeting.
I. ROLL CALL

II. PUBLIC SPEAKERS*

III. REPORTS/RECOMMENDATIONS/ACTIONS

A. LEED™ and Parking Structure Projects – Presentation and Approval
   - Los Angeles Valley College – Community Workforce Development Center/Administration (part 2), design-build ($35.7 million)

B. Presentations/Initiative Reviews
   - West Los Angeles College Facilities Master Plan Review
   - Student Housing Study
   - Food Program Study
   - Community Economic Development Resolution

IV. NEW BUSINESS

V. SUMMARY – NEXT MEETING..............................................................................................................................................Steve Veres

VI. ADJOURNMENT

*Members of the public are allotted five minutes time to address the agenda issues.

If requested, the agenda shall be made available in appropriate alternate formats to persons with a disability, as required by Section 202 of the American with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. Section 12132), and the rules and regulations adopted in implementation thereof. The agenda shall include information regarding how, for whom, and when a request for disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services may be made by a person with a disability who requires a modification or accommodation in order to participate in the public meeting.

To make such a request, please contact the Executive Secretary to the Board of Trustees at 213/891-2044 no later than 12 p.m. (noon) on the Tuesday prior to the Board meeting.
MEMO

Date: October 14, 2013

To: Members, Facilities Master Planning and Oversight Committee:
   Steve Veres, chair; Scott Svonkin, vice chair; Ernie Moreno, member

From: James O'Reilly
       Chief Facilities Executive

RE: October 23, 2013 Facilities Master Planning and Oversight Committee

Please find attached background materials for the Facilities Master Planning and Oversight meeting to be held on October 23, 2013.

There will be one project review and approval for Valley College’s Community Workforce Development Center – part 2. This item was held over from the August agenda. Please note that the project documents refer to the Capital Construction Committee because they were submitted and in process before the committee structure and name were changed. Forms for project approvals initiated after the change in committee structure will reflect the current committee name.

In addition, there will be a presentation from West L.A. College on its draft facilities master plan and presentations on campus housing and college food services. There also is a draft resolution reaffirming and enhancing the board’s commitment to the community economic development program.

Finally, the annual business outreach s/l/e/dvbe utilization report is attached for your reference.

I will be joined by staff at the meeting to discuss the items on the agenda. Please feel free to call me at (213) 891-2048 if you have any questions.

C: Adriana Barrera, interim chancellor
   Nabil Abu-Ghazaleh, president, West Los Angeles College
   Alma Johnson-Hawkins, interim president, Valley College
   Thomas Hall, director, facilities planning and development
   Terri Mestas, director, LACCD bond program management office
   Steve Sharr, CPM director, West Los Angeles College
**CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION COMMITTEE (CCC) MEETING SUBMITTAL FORM**  
(Design - Build Project)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LACCD Project Number:</th>
<th>38V.5836.02</th>
<th>Submittal Date:</th>
<th>07/31/2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| LACCD Project Name: | Community Workforce Development Center (Valley Glen Gateway Building-Administration Center and Omega Data Center) - Part 2 | Scheduled CCC Meeting Date: | 08/21/2013 |

| Project Construction Budget: | $43,187,992.00 | DB Construction Contract Amount | $35,700,000.00 |

| Project Status: | ☑ LEED™ Project (Valley Glen Gateway Building - Administration Center) | ☐ Non-LEED™ | ☐ Infrastructure Project Building |

Documents submitted via email: (Part 2)
- DES-011 CCC Meeting Submittal Form
- DES-015-A LEED™ Project Executive Summary (if applicable) (in MS Word) or DES-015-A Non-LEED™ Building or Infrastructure Project Executive Summary (if applicable) (in MS Word)
- Campus Site Map with Project Location (in Adobe Acrobat)
- LEED™ Version 2.2/3.0 Checklist / LEED EBOM Checklist (if applicable) (scanned)
- DES-012 Project Team Sign-Off Sheet (scanned)
- DES-013 Project Design Features Sign-Off Sheet (scanned)
- Draft of PowerPoint Presentation in PowerPoint format.
- Draft of Fly Through in electronic format.

CPM Director Initial: __________

For LEED™ and parking garage projects provided at CCC meeting on CD-Rom:
1. Final Fly Through Animation in Electronic format.
2. Final CCC Presentation in PowerPoint format.

Requested by: Eloy Retamal, Project Director, Yang Management, Inc.
Print Name / Title: CPM Firm

Signature __________________________ Date 8.7.13

CPM to scan and email CCC Submittal Documents:

Program Management Office
Attn: Magdalen Hron, AIA, LEED AP
Email: magdalen.hron@build-laccd.org
College Name: Los Angeles Valley College
LACCD Project Name: Community Workforce Development Center (Valley Glen Gateway Building-Administration Center and Omega Data Center) – Part 2
LACCD Project Number: 38V.5836.02
College Project Manager: Eloy Retamal, Yang Management, Inc.
Design Build Team: Pankow / Quatro Design Group

Project Description:

This 35.7 Million Dollars Design Build project funded by Measure J, consists of three distinct, but inter-related parts:

**Valley Glen Gateway (VGG):** A new 70,310 gross square feet, two-story structure will house college administration, community and workforce development programs as well as instructional and conference facilities. Most of these departments are operating in an outdated 1960’s era structure on the same site that will be razed to make way for this new building. In addition to providing facilities that better serve the current and future needs of the campus community, this building will provide an identifiable and welcoming gateway to the college along Fulton Avenue. **Part 2 to be approved by CCC on 08/21/2013.**

**Omega Data Center (ODC):** The current administration building houses a data center essential to the operation of the campus IT network. So, as part of this project a new free-standing Omega Data Center will be built on a separate site and will be fully operational prior to initiating demolition of the administration building. In addition to serving LAVC needs, this new data center will also house some LACCD IT infrastructure. **Part 1 was approved by CCC on 5/15/2013.**

**Swing Space:** During the course of construction, interim facilities will be needed to house the departments that will be displaced. As part of this project, a combination of existing permanent and relocatable buildings throughout campus will be utilized with a minimum of alteration. **Part 1 was approved by CCC on 5/15/2013.**

**Part 2 Scope of Work:**

The new, 70,310 gross square feet, Valley Glen Gateway Building will include offices and spaces for instruction and meeting facilities for the College and its community. The scope of work also includes demolition of the existing Administration building; and construction of the Valley Glen Gateway Building and all associated signage, site preparation, and improvements.

The new building will be constructed as a steel brace frame structure with curtain wall at the exterior building envelope utilizing glazing, plaster, and metal panels as finish materials. The office and educational program functions are arranged on either side of the main circulation spine or “Avenue” that provides efficient access to the various office suites as well as bringing ample natural light into the heart of the building. The building entrances are located at each end of this “Avenue” and are accentuated with double height glass entrance volumes. At the center of the building is a central stair and seating court with a large skylight above that serves as a gathering space. Also within the gallery is an “Art Wall” that celebrates the history of Los Angeles Valley College.
The Valley Glen Gateway Building consists of three functional zones:

- Instructional Zone is comprised of lecture rooms and a computer lab
- Conference Zone is comprised of meeting rooms and a catering kitchen
- Office Zone is comprised of 14 departments, with varying hours of operation

Relevant Statistics:

The existing Los Angeles Valley College Administration Building, which was originally constructed around 1960’s has become outdated in its ability to facilitate the functioning of the College Departments that it holds. The existing facility will be demolished and replaced by the new Valley Glen Gateway Building. The goal is to bring many community and workforce development programs together under one roof, along with the College Administrative Center.

The awarded Design Build contract for the entire project is $35.7M, funded by Measure J. The Part 2 contract is $25.6 million.

Schedule:

Works related to Part 2:

Expected Design Phase Completion: April 2014
Expected Construction Phase Completion: October 2015
Expected Close-Out Phase Completion: December 2015

Sustainable Features: The project is expected to achieve (54) LEED™ points for a LEED™ Silver rating. Some of the sustainable features include:

For Part Two:
1. Reuse of existing urban site
2. Durable materials (Plaster, Glass, & Metal)
3. Large glazing surfaces and skylights to maximize natural day lighting
4. Cool Roof (White PVC)
5. No VOC paint, sealant and caulking
6. Smart bathroom plumbing fixtures
7. Dual Flush Toilets
8. Occupancy Light Sensors
9. Temperature control (thermostat)
10. Landscape Bio-swales to mitigate storm water run-off
11. Drought-tolerant planting
12. Trees and light colored paving to minimize heat island affect
PART 2 PROJECT LIST:
A. VALLEY GLEN GATEWAY BUILDING
   (COMMUNITY WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT CENTER AND ADMINISTRATION BUILDING)

PART 2
VALLEY GLEN GATEWAY BUILDING
## LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
### DEPARTMENT OF FACILITIES PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
**SUSTAINABLE BUILDING PROGRAM**

### CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION COMMITTEE (CCC)
**PROJECT TEAM ATTENDANCE SHEET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Print and Sign Your NAME</th>
<th>Print Your TITLE/Department</th>
<th>Opportunity To Participate: Yes/No*</th>
<th>Telephone/Email</th>
<th>Optional Comments Attached: Yes/No*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Print) Kenneth Vega</td>
<td>(Title) Coord. CatWorks</td>
<td>Yes ☑</td>
<td>Phone: 288-941-2976</td>
<td>Yes ☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sign)</td>
<td>(Dept) CatWorks</td>
<td>No ☐</td>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:vevega@lacitycollege.edu">vevega@lacitycollege.edu</a></td>
<td>No ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Print) Deborah McEwen</td>
<td>(Title) Dean Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Yes ☑</td>
<td>Phone: 818-778-5522</td>
<td>Yes ☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sign)</td>
<td>(Dept) Office Academic Affairs</td>
<td>No ☐</td>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:desaad@lacitycollege.edu">desaad@lacitycollege.edu</a></td>
<td>No ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Print) Lauren Dao</td>
<td>(Title) VP</td>
<td>Yes ☑</td>
<td>Phone: 288-941-2976</td>
<td>Yes ☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sign)</td>
<td>(Dept) Academic Affairs</td>
<td>No ☐</td>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:klauren@lacitycollege.edu">klauren@lacitycollege.edu</a></td>
<td>No ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Print) Paul D. Gonzalez</td>
<td>(Title) AVP of Admin Serv.</td>
<td>Yes ☑</td>
<td>Phone: 818-778-2406</td>
<td>Yes ☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sign)</td>
<td>(Dept) Admin Serv.</td>
<td>No ☐</td>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:gonzalezp@lacitycollege.edu">gonzalezp@lacitycollege.edu</a></td>
<td>No ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Print) Jennifer Fong Borucki</td>
<td>(Title) Mar. Public Relations</td>
<td>Yes ☑</td>
<td>Phone: (310) 447-2483</td>
<td>Yes ☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sign)</td>
<td>(Dept) Public Relations</td>
<td>No ☐</td>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:borucki@lacitycollege.edu">borucki@lacitycollege.edu</a></td>
<td>No ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Los Angeles Valley College, Community Workforce Development Center, Valley Glen Gateway Building, Project Number: 38V.5836.02

*Opportunity To Participate: Yes/No* indicates whether the individual attended the meeting.

The Project User Group Members acknowledge that they have had the opportunity to participate in and provide input to the project process and design.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Print and Sign Your NAME</th>
<th>Print Your TITLE/Department</th>
<th>Opportunity To Participate: Yes/No*</th>
<th>Telephone/Email</th>
<th>Comments Attached: Yes/No*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Print) Yasmin E. Aytes</td>
<td>(Title) Senior Personnel Assistant</td>
<td>Yes ☑</td>
<td>Phone: 818-947-2414</td>
<td>Yes ☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sign)</td>
<td>(Dept) Personnel Office</td>
<td>No ☐</td>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:aytesye@lacc.edu">aytesye@lacc.edu</a></td>
<td>No ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Print) Mark Real</td>
<td>(Title) Admin Secretary</td>
<td>Yes ☑</td>
<td>Phone: 818-947-2318</td>
<td>Yes ☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sign)</td>
<td>(Dept) Academic Affairs</td>
<td>No ☐</td>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:realm@lacc.edu">realm@lacc.edu</a></td>
<td>No ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Print) Maggie Lopez</td>
<td>(Title) Academic/Financial Assistant</td>
<td>Yes ☑</td>
<td>Phone: 818-947-2321</td>
<td>Yes ☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sign)</td>
<td>(Dept) President's Office</td>
<td>No ☐</td>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:lopz@lacc.edu">lopz@lacc.edu</a></td>
<td>No ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Print) Trudy Finke</td>
<td>(Title) IT Coordinator</td>
<td>Yes ☑</td>
<td>Phone: 818-469-6324</td>
<td>Yes ☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sign)</td>
<td>(Dept)</td>
<td>No ☐</td>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:finke@lacc.edu">finke@lacc.edu</a></td>
<td>No ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Print) Michelle Fansler</td>
<td>(Title) Dean</td>
<td>Yes ☑</td>
<td>Phone: 847-5437</td>
<td>Yes ☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sign)</td>
<td>(Dept) Institutional Effectiveness</td>
<td>No ☐</td>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:fansler@lacc.edu">fansler@lacc.edu</a></td>
<td>No ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Print) Sherry Berger</td>
<td>(Title) Dean</td>
<td>Yes ☑</td>
<td>Phone: 818-947-2318</td>
<td>Yes ☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sign)</td>
<td>(Dept) Academic Affairs</td>
<td>No ☐</td>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:berger@lacc.edu">berger@lacc.edu</a></td>
<td>No ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Print) Bruce Johnson</td>
<td>(Title) Project Manager</td>
<td>Yes ☑</td>
<td>Phone: 818-792-6483</td>
<td>No ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sign)</td>
<td>(Dept) Project Management</td>
<td>No ☐</td>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:bruce.johnson@lacc.edu">bruce.johnson@lacc.edu</a></td>
<td>No ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Print) Arlene Stein</td>
<td>(Title) Admin Services Asst</td>
<td>Yes ☑</td>
<td>Phone: 818-947-2339</td>
<td>Yes ☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sign)</td>
<td>(Dept) Administrative Services</td>
<td>No ☐</td>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:stein@lacc.edu">stein@lacc.edu</a></td>
<td>No ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Print) Tom A. Jones</td>
<td>(Title) Project Manager</td>
<td>Yes ☑</td>
<td>Phone: 818-947-2339</td>
<td>Yes ☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sign)</td>
<td>(Dept) Project Management</td>
<td>No ☐</td>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:Jones@lacc.edu">Jones@lacc.edu</a></td>
<td>No ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Print) Violette Amrikhas</td>
<td>(Title) Financial Analyst</td>
<td>Yes ☑</td>
<td>Phone: 818-947-2339</td>
<td>Yes ☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sign)</td>
<td>(Dept) Administrative Services</td>
<td>No ☐</td>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:amrikhas@lacc.edu">amrikhas@lacc.edu</a></td>
<td>No ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Los Angeles Valley College. Community Workforce Development Center, Valley Glen Gateway Building, No.38V.5835.02
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Print and Sign Your NAME</th>
<th>Print Your TITLE/Department</th>
<th>Opportunity To Participate: Yes/No*</th>
<th>Telephone/Email</th>
<th>Comments Attached Yes/No*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Print) Paul CASTILL 0</td>
<td>(Title) Executive Director</td>
<td>Yes □</td>
<td>Phone: 818-947-2618</td>
<td>Yes □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sign)</td>
<td>(Dept) Foundation</td>
<td>No □</td>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:CASTILL2020@LaV.edu">CASTILL2020@LaV.edu</a></td>
<td>No □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Print) Anne C. Rhot</td>
<td>(Title) Ombudsman</td>
<td>Yes □</td>
<td>Phone: 818-947-2320</td>
<td>Yes □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sign)</td>
<td>(Dept) Office of President</td>
<td>No □</td>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:adamc@LaV.edu">adamc@LaV.edu</a></td>
<td>No □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Print)</td>
<td>(Title) Academic Sgh. Pres.</td>
<td>Yes □</td>
<td>Phone: *2981</td>
<td>Yes □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sign)</td>
<td>(Dept)</td>
<td>No □</td>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:miller2020@LaV.edu">miller2020@LaV.edu</a></td>
<td>No □</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Los Angeles Valley College, Community Workforce Development Center, Valley Glen Gateway Building, No.38V.5836.02
Comments - Ann Rea Ombudsperson

On the visitor flythrough, there was no visual indication for the office space dedicated to Ombudsperson (formerly Compliance Office). They've made the office seem to “acknowledge the process” challenge at the very least. Having said that, here is my input:

1. For the outer perimeter of the space, the door should be solid and a window (peep hole) so the person inside (me) is able to see who is on the other side of the door.

2. If a decorative feature of a glass panel is added to the outside wall, the glass needs to be frosted and not clear to protect the privacy of others.

3. The doors to the office (outside of mine) should have a traditional key lock system and not an electronic locking system.

Response
The fly through does not go into every space and area of the building, but is representative of building and spaces.

1. The inner office does have a solid wall and solid door. The door will have a peep hole or small one way vision window (see note below)

2. The corridor wall can be a solid wall and door instead of being window store front glass.

3. The lock system is traditional and not electronic.

NOTE
I met with Ms. Reed in the morning of 8/7/13. I reviewed my response with her and Ms. Reed accepted it.

Project Manager
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Looks good in general, but
1. Don't see the Senate office
2. Cannot tell which offices are which

Josh Miller
Senate President

RESPONSE

1. The fly-through does not go into every space and area of the building, but is representative of the building and spaces (SEE NOTE BELOW)
2. During the presentation, the presenter would narrate the fly-through.

Dave Johnson
Project Manager

NOTE:
On 4/1/2013, design team and I met with Mr. Miller and showed him three different options. The current design reflects the option that Mr. Miller accepted it.
### LEED 2009 for New Construction and Major Renovations

**Los Angeles Valley College - Valley Glen Gateway Building**

#### Project Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainable Sites</th>
<th>Possible Points: 26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prereq 1</td>
<td>Construction Activity Pollution Prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Site Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit 1</td>
<td>Development Density and Community Connectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Brownfield Redevelopment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit 3</td>
<td>Alternative Transportation—Public Transportation Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Alternative Transportation—Bicycle Storage and Changing Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit 2</td>
<td>Site Development—Protect or Restore Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Site Development—Maximize Open Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit 5.2</td>
<td>Stormwater Design—Quantity Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stormwater Design—Quality Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit 6.1</td>
<td>Heat Island Effect—Non-roof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Heat Island Effect—Roof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit 6.2</td>
<td>Light Pollution Reduction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Efficiency</th>
<th>Possible Points: 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prereq 1</td>
<td>Water Use Reduction—20% Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Water Efficient Landscaping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit 1</td>
<td>Innovative Wastewater Technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Water Use Reduction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Energy and Atmosphere</th>
<th>Possible Points: 35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prereq 1</td>
<td>Fundamental Commissioning of Building Energy Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prereq 2</td>
<td>Minimum Energy Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prereq 3</td>
<td>Fundamental Refrigerant Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit 1</td>
<td>Optimize Energy Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>On-Site Renewable Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Enhanced Commissioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Enhanced Refrigerant Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Measurement and Verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Green Power</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Materials and Resources</th>
<th>Possible Points: 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prereq 1</td>
<td>Storage and Collection of Recyclables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Building Reuse—Maintain Existing Walls, Floors, and Roof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit 1.1</td>
<td>Building Reuse—Maintain 50% of Interior Non-Structural Elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Construction Waste Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit 2</td>
<td>Materials Reuse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Materials and Resources, Continued</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credit 4</td>
<td>Recycled Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regional Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit 5</td>
<td>Rapidly Renewable Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Certified Wood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indoor Environmental Quality</th>
<th>Possible Points: 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prereq 1</td>
<td>Minimum Indoor Air Quality Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prereq 2</td>
<td>Environmental Tobacco Smoke (ETS) Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit 1</td>
<td>Outdoor Air Delivery Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Increased Ventilation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit 2</td>
<td>Construction IAQ Management Plan—During Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Construction IAQ Management Plan—Before Occupancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit 4.1</td>
<td>Low-Emitting Materials—Adhesives and Sealants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit 4.2</td>
<td>Low-Emitting Materials—Paints and Coatings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit 4.3</td>
<td>Low-Emitting Materials—Flooring Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit 4.4</td>
<td>Low-Emitting Materials—Composite Wood and Agrifiber Products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit 5</td>
<td>Indoor Chemical and Pollutant Source Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Controllability of Systems—Lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit 6.1</td>
<td>Controllability of Systems—Thermal Comfort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit 6.2</td>
<td>Thermal Comfort—Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thermal Comfort—Verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit 8.1</td>
<td>Daylight and Views—Daylight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Daylight and Views—Views</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Innovation and Design Process</th>
<th>Possible Points: 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credit 1.1</td>
<td>Innovation in Design: Green Cleaning Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit 1.2</td>
<td>Innovation in Design: Green Education Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit 1.3</td>
<td>Innovation in Design: Process Water Use Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit 1.4</td>
<td>Innovation in Design: 95% Construction Waste Diversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit 1.5</td>
<td>Innovation in Design: Life Cycle Assessment of Bldg. Assemblies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit 2</td>
<td>LEED Accredited Professional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Priority Credits</th>
<th>Possible Points: 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credit 1.1</td>
<td>Regional Priority: Site Development, Maximize Open Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit 1.2</td>
<td>Regional Priority: Water Use Reduction (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit 1.3</td>
<td>Regional Priority: On-Site Renewable Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit 1.4</td>
<td>Regional Priority: Daylight and Views</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Possible Points: 110</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certified 40 to 49 points</td>
<td>Silver 50 to 59 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
DEPARTMENT OF FACILITIES PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
SUSTAINABLE BUILDING PROGRAM

## CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION COMMITTEE (CCC) MEETING
BUILDING DESIGN FEATURE CHECKLIST

**College Name:** Los Angeles Valley College  
**LACCD Project Name:** LAVC Community Workforce Development Center (Valley Glen Gateway Building - Administration Center - Part 2)  
**LACCD Project Number:** 38V.5838.02  
**College Project Manager:** Eloy Relamal, Yang Management, Inc.  
**Design Consultant:** Quatro Design Group

### General Issues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1. Participatory sign-off (DES-012) reflecting all users for the specific type of space and program.</td>
<td>Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>2. Fly Through Animation depicting items noted in DES-015 and the components below to the extent possible.</td>
<td>Incorporated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Exterior Components:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1. Door Placement - Conducive to walking, pick up, and drop off patterns.</td>
<td>Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>2. Stair and Ramp Handrails – Designed to resist the retention of sun generated heat.</td>
<td>Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>3. Exterior Seating - Seating with backs and sun shading.</td>
<td>A variety of exterior seating is provided. Some seating has backs and utilizes on-site mature trees for sun shading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>4. Utilize native and/or drought resistant plant species or reclaimed water system (purple line).</td>
<td>Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>6. Recycling Bins – Provide permanent (built-in) management.</td>
<td>Incorporated. Recycling bins to be provided and installed by the College as part of the campus recycling strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>7. Sustainable Energy Generation, where possible.</td>
<td>Not Applicable. Provided by campus PV Farm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>8. Green Roof System, where possible.</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>9. Energy Efficient Exterior Lighting – specify types resistant to dust and dirt accumulation.</td>
<td>All new exterior lighting for Part 2 follows the campus-wide lighting master plan, using energy efficient lighting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Interior Components:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1. Cable Management System - Designed into floors, cabinets and furniture to avoid loose wires.</td>
<td>Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>2. Auditorium/Theater Seating - Provide staggered seating to provide appropriate sight lines.</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interior Components (continued):</td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✗</td>
<td>3. Smart Classrooms – Designed with appropriate technology and equipment for smart classroom use including: Internet access, projection technology, comprehensive computer software capability.</td>
<td>Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Dance, Practice, Recital Spaces – Provide sprung floors, benches, coat hooks, and cubbies.</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Dressing Rooms – Provide lockers and seating.</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✗</td>
<td>6. Toilet Fixture Counts – Provide additional toilets at women's restroom to balance out wait times.</td>
<td>Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✗</td>
<td>7. Bathroom Stalls and Common Areas - Shelves and coat hooks.</td>
<td>Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✗</td>
<td>8. Classroom Seating - Incorporate storage areas into seating design for books, purses, and backpacks.</td>
<td>Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Stairways – Design open stairways to attract users into interior spaces, where possible.</td>
<td>Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✗</td>
<td>10. Display Counters – Provide a vandal resistant surface.</td>
<td>Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❑</td>
<td>11. Recycling Bins – Provide permanent (built-in counter) management.</td>
<td>Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❑</td>
<td>12. Custodial Closet – Provide Custodial Closet with a separate storage room at each floor.</td>
<td>Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❑</td>
<td>13. Energy Efficient Lighting – specify types resistant to dust and dirt accumulation.</td>
<td>All new interior lighting for Port 2 follows the campus-wide lighting master plan, using energy efficient lighting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❑</td>
<td>14. FF&amp;E – Coordinate access, power and data requirements with users for all equipment and furniture as required.</td>
<td>Incorporated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments: ____________________________________________

Acknowledgement of Items in PROJECT process:

Project Architect ___________________________ Date 6.2.13

Printed Name Javier Molina, Quatro Design Group

College Project Manager ___________________________ Date 8.7.13

Printed Name Eloy Racanell, Yang Management

College President ___________________________ Date 8/7/13

Form DES-013 Dr. Susan Carleo, LAVC
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West Los Angeles College
2013 Construction Master Plan

Facilities Master Planning and
Oversight Committee

October 23, 2013
PURPOSE: To present for review the revised West Los Angeles College Construction Master Plan

AGENDA:
Opening Remarks: President Nabil Abu-Ghazaleh
Presentation: President Nabil Abu-Ghazaleh
Mr. Peter Mitsakos, WestEdge Architects
Questions & Answers: Committee Members
Closing Remarks: President Nabil Abu-Ghazaleh

TIME: 30 Minutes
SPACE PROGRAMMING & MASTER PLANNING PROCESS
resulting in WLAC CONSTRUCTION PLAN

Diagram:
- Approval of current Space Inventory & Usage
- WLAC 2012-13 Program Review
- Documentation of potential academic program growth factors
- Establish projected growth of academic curriculum, by division & overall campus
- Document current campus support requirements
  - Administrative functions
  - Student services
  - Faculty & staff resources
  - Student organizations
  - Campus facilities, M&O
  - Campus infrastructure
- Establish the type & quality of spaces required by campus support services & programs
  as required to implement the projected growth of instruction programs
- Establish the type & quality of spaces required to provide current instruction
- Establish campus construction plan alternatives
**Academic Affairs Projections**

Approved by WLAC College Council on March 7, 2013

**Admin. & Student Services Projections**

Presented to WLAC Facilities Committee on April 15, 2013

---

**DIFFERENTIAL GROWTH**

---

**AVIATION & TRAVEL**
- 2,143 ‘SCH’ Projected Growth
- 0.18% of “Total Growth”*

**ALLIED HEALTH**
- 35,845 ‘SCH’ Projected Growth
- 2.94% of “Total Growth”*

**BEH. & SOCIAL SCIENCES**
- 199,826 ‘SCH’ Projected Growth
- 16.40% of “Total Growth”*

**BUSINESS**
- 82,829 ‘SCH’ Projected Growth
- 6.80% of “Total Growth”*

**COMPUTER SCIENCE**
- 74,312 ‘SCH’ Projected Growth
- 6.10% of “Total Growth”*

**DANCE, HEALTH, P.E.**
- 0 ‘SCH’ Projected Growth
- 0.00% of “Total Growth”*

**HUMANITIES & FINE ARTS**
- 146,634 ‘SCH’ Projected Growth
- 12.03% of “Total Growth”*

**LANGUAGE ARTS**
- 104,024 ‘SCH’ Projected Growth
- 8.54% of “Total Growth”*

**MATHEMATICS**
- 222,102 ‘SCH’ Projected Growth
- 18.23% of “Total Growth”*

**SCIENCE**
- 168,446 ‘SCH’ Projected Growth
- 13.82% of “Total Growth”*

**OTHER** (Library, Counseling, Voc. Ed.)
- 10,827 ‘SCH’ Projected Growth
- 0.89% of “Total Growth”*

---

**NOTE:** Based on the projected growth of each academic division, 14.08% of the “Total Growth”** is not assigned to a particular division.

---

**“Total Growth”** = \( \frac{(WLAC \text{ Projected Apportionment} \times \text{‘SCH’}) - (WLAC \text{ Current Apportionment} \times \text{‘SCH’})}{(WLAC \text{ Current Apportionment} \times \text{‘SCH’}) \times (2.11)} \) = 1,218,604 SCH
WEST LOS ANGELES COLLEGE
Build-Out Program Checklist
Presented to WLAC Facilities Committee on April 15, 2013

PROGRAM LIST

1a Classroom-90 Station
1b Classroom-60 Station
1c Classroom-50 Station
1d Classroom-25 Station
1e Computer Lab-50 Station
1f Traditional Lab-25 Station
1g Specialized Lab
2 Academic Division Office Suites
3 Non-Academic Office Suites
4 Campus Services & Resources

ABBREVIATIONS LIST

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
(AA) Academic Affairs
(AH) Allied Health
(AT) Aviation & Travel
(BS) Behavioral & Social Sciences
(BU) Business
(CC) Campus & Community Village
(CL) Computer Science
(DL) Distance Learning
(HF) Humanities & Fine Arts
(LA) Language Arts
(LL) Learning Center
(LIB) Library & Learning Resources
(MA) Mathematics
(PL) Office Of Planning & Research
(SC) Science
(WE) Westside Extension

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES
(AS) Administrative Services
(BO) Business Office
(EM) Enterprise Management
(IT) Information Technology
(PF) Plant Facilities
(PP) Personnel & Payroll
(SO) Security Office

STUDENT SERVICES

DSSP&DSS
FA
ISS
KAT
LAUSD/CAT
OR

GENERAL COLLEGE

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

AS
BO
EM
PF

STUDENT SERVICES

DSSP&DSS
FA
ISS
KAT
LAUSD/CAT
OR

Legend

Note: Each “box” represents a single instance of a particular “space type”

Department Identifier, see Abbreviations List

Need Completely Met By Existing Asset(s)

Program Type Identifier, see Program List

Presented to WLAC Facilities Committee on April 15, 2013
Update to WLAC 2009 Facilities Master Plan

To optimize the effectiveness of bond funds to be expended at the WLAC College in support of the College Educational Master Plan and instructional needs, a comprehensive review was completed that:

• Confirmed existing space utilization and identified remaining requirements

• Developed an updated construction plan based on educational program growth rate projections
The following is one of 10 scenarios developed to identify the best strategy to meet the greatest number of college needs.
WEST LOS ANGELES COLLEGE

DRAFT PROGRAMMING DIAGRAM - SCENARIO ‘C’
NOT A CONSTRUCTION PLAN

Presented to WLAC Facilities Committee
on March 11 & 18, 2013
Facilities Master Plan Logic

The following strategies were utilized to update the Construction Master Plan:

- Remodel under-used or inactive spaces
- Limit new construction to unique, specialized spaces
- Locate programs to improve departmental cohesion, inter-departmental synergies, and make the campus more Student Centric
- Eliminate the need for swing space
The following slide represents spaces (as indicated by boxes) required to meet college growth to the year 2036. Boxes with check marks indicate spaces provided by the proposed construction master plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED PROJECT</th>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>TLC 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• (12) Computer Labs</td>
<td>41,280 Gross Square Feet</td>
<td>$17.99 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Office Suites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Campus Security Office / EOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Watson 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sound Stage</td>
<td>16,000 Gross Square Feet</td>
<td>$5.87 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Motion Picture Television Production Shops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Dance Studios</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dance Studios</td>
<td>4,400 Square Feet (NEW)</td>
<td>$2.20 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dance Program Storage</td>
<td>2,500 Square Feet (RENOVATION)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>HLRC Renovation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Learning Center Expansion</td>
<td>16,800 Square Feet</td>
<td>$5.11 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Digital Library &amp; Library Orientation Room</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Office Suites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>CE Renovation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Associated Student Organization &amp; Student</td>
<td>27,850 Square Feet</td>
<td>(Planned but currently unfunded, pending availability of funds from anticipated cost savings, unexpended contingencies, and value engineering)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lounge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Health Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welcome Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>MS-A Renovation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Allied Health Instruction Labs &amp; Office Suite</td>
<td>7,575 Square Feet</td>
<td>$2.13 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>SC Renovation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mail Room &amp; Reprographics</td>
<td>3,500 Square Feet</td>
<td>$0.94 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><strong>B4 &amp; B5 Bungalows</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Accessibility Upgrades to Existing Buildings:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$7.13 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elevator &amp; Sloping Walks</td>
<td></td>
<td>(District Funds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><strong>FMO-Warehouse</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• General Campus Storage Facility</td>
<td>7,500 Gross Square Feet</td>
<td>$2.35 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><strong>FMO-Office Expansion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Additional Office Suite for FMO through relocation of existing R7 Bungalow</td>
<td>1,820 Square Feet</td>
<td>$0.25 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><strong>Central Plant - North</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Chilled &amp; Hot Water Production for North Campus Buildings</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$2.12 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(District Funds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td><strong>Amphitheater</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Amphitheater: reconfigure abandoned excavation site</td>
<td>No New Square Footage</td>
<td>$1.04 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td><strong>FA-B Renovation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Omni-Acoustical Performance Lab</td>
<td>2,165 Square Feet</td>
<td>$0.34 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## WLAC Construction Program
### as presented to the CFE September 30, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Campus Budget</td>
<td>$ 400,881,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40J Funding (Distr Funds) Not Included</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Projects</td>
<td>-$ 298,177,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Planning / Project Spt</td>
<td>-$ 46,003,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$ 56,699,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAC Active Projects</td>
<td>-$ 2,622,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAC Infrastructure Projects</td>
<td>-$ 10,018,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$ 44,058,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAC Remaining Projects</td>
<td>-$ 39,827,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escalation on Future Constr</td>
<td>-$ 4,231,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BALANCE</strong></td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
<td>Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 14 Faculty Office Building | • (4) Computer Labs  
                            • Office Suites  
                            • Mail Room & Reprographics | 43,000 Gross Square Feet | Unfunded |
| 15 Student Service Annex     | • Learning Center  
                            • Assessment & Matriculation  
                            • Counseling Department | 24,000 Gross Square Feet | Unfunded |
| 16 Library Expansion      | • Reading Room Expansion  
                            • Stacks  
                            • Study Rooms | 6,650 Square Feet | Unfunded |
| 17 SC Renovation          | • (2) Specialized Science Labs  
                            • (2) Traditional Science Labs | 7,400 Square Feet | Unfunded |
| 18 Community Performing Arts Center | • Proscenium & Fly Tower  
                            • Auditorium  
                            • Public Lobby  
                            • Dressing Rooms | 13,000 Square Feet | Unfunded |
| 19 SS Renovation          | • Renovation of areas of building vacated by:  
                            1. Assessment & Matriculation  
                            2. Counseling Department  
                            • Project Required to accommodate projected growth of:  
                            1. Business Office  
                            2. Financial Aid  
                            3. Admissions & Records  
                            4. EOPS  
                            5. DSP&S  
                            6. Human Resources / Payroll / Purchasing | 9,450 Square Feet | Unfunded |
STUDENT HOUSING

On-Campus and Near-Campus Housing Options to Boost Student Success

Facilities Master Planning & Oversight Committee
October 23, 2013
Student Housing Opportunities
Action Requested

Authorize staff to study the institutional benefits/risks and the feasibility for a LACCD Student Housing Initiative.

Study Activities:

• Campus Presidents to identify “opportunity” sites on-campus and potentially available for a student housing project;
• Identify and explore feasibility with potential private sector partners engaged in student housing development;
• Identify and research potential funding options and deal structures;
• Preliminarily assess campus operational impacts (i.e., food service, operating hours, security);
• Identify potential student demand for housing (veteran's, out of state, international, athletes, and traditional college experience).
Student Housing Opportunities

Background

On-campus living facilities have traditionally only been available to students attending four-year Baccalaureate-granting institutions. Increasingly, community colleges across the nation have began to develop on-campus housing programs.

• 11 California colleges provide dormitories and housing Assistance. *California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office website

• Nearly 100 Community Colleges nationwide provide on-campus housing opportunities for their students. *The College Finder

• On-campus housing offered at community colleges in 29 States.

• Student housing CAN raise enrollments, increase revenue, add diversity and improve student success and transfer rates.
Student Housing Opportunities
Background - Continued

• As traditional four-year schools have become more selective and expensive, there is a population of students who would like to live away and have the traditional college experience starting with their first two year enrollment in a Community College.

• Rural Community Colleges have had housing for a number of years. The housing options are either on-campus or nearby provided by private owners. Traditionally urban community colleges have been commuter focused.

• International and Out-of-State student demand for housing is always present. International students or Out-of-State students must find housing to attend a California Community College. If these students plan to attend a urban based Community College, their housing choices have been limited to finding a market rate apartment or finding a “homestay” opportunity.
Student Housing Opportunities
Background - Continued

• On campus housing availability can increase recruitment opportunities and enrollment of international and out-of-state students.
• On-Campus housing can also be an affordable option for veteran’s and their families.
• Colleges and Universities have relied on private industry to fill their needs for revenue generating facilities. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the growth of privatized student housing. The privatized student housing market has matured and Public Private Partnerships (PPPs) have been deployed very successfully across the country.
• Numerous student housing projects with many thousands of student beds using a PPPs model have been executed by Century Development Corp. (now known as Campus Living Villages) and American Campus Communities, and others.
Student Housing Opportunities

QUESTIONS?
RESOLUTION – Reaffirm and Enhance the Community Economic Development Program For Proposition A, Proposition AA And Measure J

DRAFT

WHEREAS, The mission of the Los Angeles Community College District is “to provide our students an excellent education that prepares them to transfer to four year institutions, successfully complete workforce development programs designed to meet local and state needs, and pursue opportunities for lifelong learning and civic engagement;” and

WHEREAS, The Los Angeles Community College District (“District”) adopted a Resolution to Establish a Community Economic Development Program for Proposition A on October 17, 2001; and

WHEREAS, The Los Angeles Community College District (“District”) established Board Rule 7103.17 on January 14, 2004 regarding the Policy on Opportunities for Local, Small and Emerging Businesses; and

WHEREAS, The Los Angeles Community College District (“District”) has undertaken a large volume of construction and modernization work resulting from the passage of Propositions A, AA and Measure J; and

WHEREAS, Local taxpayer dollars fund Propositions A, AA and Measure J; and

WHEREAS, The passage of these bond measures has resulted in numerous contracts for projects, including management, architecture, design, master planning, engineering, construction and construction management, equipment and furnishings; and

WHEREAS, The District’s Board desires to reaffirm its recognition of the opportunity to contribute to the economic growth of the local community by incorporating local, small, emerging and disabled-veteran owned businesses (“LSEDVB”) in these new contracts; and

WHEREAS, Through the adoption of the Community Economic Development Program, contractors and consultants have been encouraged to utilize LSEDVB neighboring each of the colleges and within the district boundaries; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Trustees believes that the goal of 28 percent participation from “LSEDVB” firms in bond program contracts can be improved; and
WHEREAS, The Board of Trustees hereby desires to reaffirm and enhance its commitment to continue its mission to contribute to the development of the local community by hiring local, small, emerging and disabled-veteran owned businesses; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Board hereby re-establishes its Community Economic Development Program for Proposition A, Proposition AA and Measure J projects and shall include the following elements:

1. Community Economic Development Program geared to encourage consultants and contractors to achieve a goal of 30 percent participation by local, small, emerging and disabled-veteran owned businesses (“LSEDVB”) in new contracts; and

2. Workforce Development Program geared to involve local residents living in the areas neighboring the District’s colleges in all bond-related opportunities; and

3. College Internship programs geared to involve the LACCD students on each of the Bond Programs; and

4. Special Opportunity Programs geared to train and assist the disadvantaged in training and job opportunities on the Bond Program.
Business Outreach S/L/E/DVBE Utilization Report
As of June 30, 2013

1. Background

On January 14, 2004, the Board of Trustees adopted a policy (7103.17) on opportunities for Small, Local, Emerging, and Disabled Veteran Business Enterprises to contribute to the economic development of the community.

The Board policy establishes a 28% participation goal of Small, Local, Emerging, and Disabled Veteran Business Enterprises on awarded facilities contracts each fiscal year.

2. Program Goal

The primary goal of the Business Outreach Program is to promote and track the participation of Small, Local, Emerging, and Disabled Veteran Business Enterprises on BuildLACCD’s construction, professional services, and design build contracts.

“Small” businesses are those which fall within the limits to gross revenue established by the federal Small Business Administration for the type activity conducted by the business.

“Local” businesses are those with a principal office located in Los Angeles County.

“Emerging” businesses are those in operation for less than five years.

“Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise” means a business enterprise certified by the Office of Small and Minority Business, State of California, Department of General Services, pursuant to Military and Veterans Code 999, or an enterprise certifying that it is a DVBE by meeting all of the following requirements: (a) it is a sole proprietorship at least fifty-one percent (51%) owned by one or more Disabled Veterans, or in the case of a publicly owned business, at least fifty-one percent (51%) of its stock is owned by one or more Disabled Veterans; or a subsidiary wholly owned by a parent corporation, but only if at least fifty-one percent (51%) of the voting stock of the parent corporation is owned by one or more Disabled Veterans; or a joint venture in which at least fifty-one percent (51%) of the joint venture’s management and control and earnings are held by one or more Disabled Veteran; (b) the management and control of the daily business operations are by one or more Disabled Veterans; provided that the Disabled Veteran(s) exercising management and control of the business enterprise are not required to be the same Disabled Veteran(s) who is/are the equity Owner(s) of the business enterprise; and (c) it is a sole proprietorship, corporation, or partnership with its home office located in the United States and which is not a branch or subsidiary of a foreign corporation, foreign firm, or other foreign-based business. The terms “foreign corporation” foreign firm” and Foreign-based business” shall be deemed to mean a business entity that is incorporated or which has its principal headquarters located outside the United States of America.

3. Applicability

The Small, Local, Emerging, and Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise participation goal applies to construction, professional services, and design build contracts managed by facilities, advertised on or after December 17, 2003, and are at least fifty percent (50%) funded by Proposition A/AA and/or Measure J.
4. **S/L/E/DVBE Utilization**

A summary of S/L/E/DVBE participation statistics from December 17, 2003 through June 30, 2013 for **BuildLACCD** are listed below. For additional data, please refer to the attached reports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Total Applicable Contract Amounts Awarded *</th>
<th>Combined S/L/E/DVBE Awarded Amount</th>
<th>Combined S/L/E/DVBE Utilization %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003/2004</td>
<td>$34,160,320</td>
<td>$24,633,242</td>
<td>72.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/2005</td>
<td>$83,396,268</td>
<td>$56,941,979</td>
<td>68.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/2006</td>
<td>$105,686,988</td>
<td>$97,393,614</td>
<td>92.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/2007</td>
<td>$309,010,168</td>
<td>$147,893,738</td>
<td>47.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/2008</td>
<td>$376,427,015</td>
<td>$287,252,018</td>
<td>76.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/2009</td>
<td>$491,626,530</td>
<td>$251,139,874</td>
<td>51.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/2010</td>
<td>$502,949,410</td>
<td>$207,629,858</td>
<td>41.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/2011</td>
<td>$408,221,583</td>
<td>$237,417,837</td>
<td>58.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/2012</td>
<td>$146,734,315</td>
<td>$62,999,462</td>
<td>42.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/2013</td>
<td>$76,313,210</td>
<td>$30,204,479</td>
<td>39.58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total includes only those Design-Build contracts which have held a post-award meeting.

5. **Analysis**

The report demonstrates that the Build-LACCD program has met and exceeded the 28% goal each fiscal year. It is noted that the cumulative for the calendar period from December 2003 through June 30, 2013 is **55%**. This is based on an appropriate cumulative awarded dollar amount of $2,534,525,807 of which $1,403,506,101 was awarded to Small, Local, Emerging, and Disabled Veteran Business Enterprises.

Trend explanations are suggested below:

a. The period, from fiscal 2011/2012 to 2012/2013 shows a decline of 3.35%. This slight decrease is attributed to the design build projects that had been awarded to a design team and have not fully issued sub-contractor solicitations. An increase is expected upon receipt of full data from the design build team. However, the cumulative S/L/E/DVBE utilization is at 55%.

b. The period, from fiscal 2010/2011 to 2011/2012 shows a decline of 15.23% S/L/E/DVBE participation on the bond program due to the moratorium within LACCD Sustainable Building Program. However, the cumulative S/L/E/DVBE utilization remained unchanged at 56%.

d. The period, from fiscal 2008/2009 to 2009/2010 shows a decline of 9.8%. The slight decrease is attributed to the introduction of design-build projects in the latter part of 2008. With the typical design-bid-build projects, sub-contractors are selected at the beginning of the project. On design-build, sub-contractors are selected after DSA provides final approval; therefore full data is not available at the time the contract is awarded. For this reason, we are now only included Design-Build contracts after they have held a post-award meeting which is held shortly prior to construction commencement.

e. This period, from fiscal 2007/2008 to 2008/2009, shows a decline of 25.23%. The percentage shows a decrease due to the 30.6% increase in committed contracts ($115 million). We believe that this is due to fewer actual construction starts in the period and an increase in design awards; therefore, few subcontract awards to smaller firms.

f. The tremendous surge in construction contracts in 2006/2007 from 2005/2006, up 92%, shows the acceptable cycle trend of the Bond program. As the committed dollars soared, there was a 52% increase in the actual dollars awarded to the S/L/E/DVBE businesses. This is a positive result even though the percentages of the totals have decreased.

6. Conclusion

Through the Program Management Team’s efforts, the Board of Trustee’s goal from the date of the adoption of the Community Economic Development program have been met and exceeded each fiscal year. The total committed dollars reaching the Small, Local, Emerging, and Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise awards has been growing and now totals over $1,403,506,101: 55% of total committed dollars.
Business Outreach Cumulative Awarded Contracts by Campus
As of 6/30/2013

Chart reflects the achieved cumulative percentages of contracts awarded to Small/Local/Emerging/Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise (S/L/E/DVBE) per campus, which is divided by the total applicable awarded contracts per campus.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Information technology departments at community colleges provide services to more than 13 million students annually.\(^1\) Community colleges are distinguished from other types of higher education institutions by their institutional missions, the populations they serve, and the degrees and certifications they confer. However, as institutions of teaching and learning, they have congruent responsibilities with all higher education institutions to provide the technological infrastructure, support, and services that students, faculty, and staff need to be successful in their respective roles. ECAR engaged in a research project about IT services in community colleges to identify the strengths, opportunities, and challenges of community college IT.

This report is the product of a secondary analysis of data from the EDUCAUSE 2011 Core Data Service (CDS)\(^2\) and the report ECAR National Study of Undergraduate Students and Information Technology, 2011.\(^3\) Data from these sources are utilized to assess the current status of six IT service areas at community colleges. Findings show that community colleges are leaders in the area of the technology of teaching and learning, are quite similar to other higher education institutions in IT resource allocation and IT management, and lag slightly in IT governance and sustainability; IT risk management presents the biggest opportunity for progress. The results of this study offer evidence rather than anecdotes about the status and nature of community college IT.
KEY FINDINGS

IT SUPPORT OF TEACHING AND LEARNING IS A PARTICULAR STRENGTH.

- Fewer community college students own mobile devices, and community colleges meet students’ needs for computer access through campus-based computers or loan/check-out programs.
- Community college students report that faculty excel in using the technology students value for academic success.
- Expectations for instructor use of technology are being met—the wish list for instructor use of technology is lighter for community colleges than for students attending other types of institutions.
- The majority of community college students report good or excellent access to online services, such as online course registration, and community colleges offer more distance education-related support than other types of institutions.
- Community colleges outpace others in online learning and the deployment of learning technology and practices.

IT RESOURCE ALLOCATION AND IT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES ARE SIMILAR TO OTHER TYPES OF INSTITUTIONS.

- Community colleges allocate about the same per total FTE as other types of institutions; IT expenditures are about $645 for each FTE at community colleges and across most other types of institutions.
- Community colleges serve more students with fewer IT staff, compared to other types of institutions.
- Although outsourcing remains relatively uncommon in higher education, community colleges generally outsource IT services at higher rates than other types of institutions.

IT GOVERNANCE AND IT SUSTAINABILITY PRACTICES ARE OPPORTUNITY AREAS FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES.

- Community colleges are more likely to have IT included in their strategic plans and have representation on the president’s cabinet or higher, but faculty and students are less often included in the IT advisory process when compared to other types of institutions.
- Community colleges embrace some sustainability practices that involve central IT programs to minimize energy consumption and campus-wide programs to minimize energy consumption of desktop technology.
- Community colleges lag behind other types of institutions in many areas of IT sustainability, including establishment of policies on carbon neutrality and submetering of power for data centers.

MANAGING IT RISK POSES A CHALLENGE TO COMMUNITY COLLEGES.

- While doing well with security basics, community colleges are below average when compared to other types of institutions in all but a few areas of risk management.
- Fewer community colleges than other types of institutions report having a disaster recovery plan and secondary power sources, making them more vulnerable than their counterparts during catastrophic events.
COMMUNITY COLLEGES MEET STUDENTS’ NEEDS FOR COMPUTER ACCESS

According to the results of the 2011 ECAR student technology study, community college students own the same number of technology devices (about 11) as students enrolled at other types of institutions. However, the devices owned by community college students are less likely to be mobile-capable (see Figure 1). Nearly all students own a computer (97% of community college students and 99% of other students), but community college students are particularly underrepresented when it comes to owning a mobile computing device.

CDS data tell us that community colleges are less likely to have a policy requiring students to own or lease a computer (10% of community colleges, compared to 49% of other types of institutions), but they are more likely to provide on-campus cluster or kiosk-style computer workstations, laptop or tablet checkouts or loans, and computer workstations in classrooms that are accessible when classes are not scheduled. Looking at the percentage difference in student ownership of and access to computers best illustrates this story (see Figure 2).
Figure 2. Student Computer Ownership of and Access to Computers

Students owning a computer
Students owning a mobile computing device
Lab/cluster workstations
Kiosk workstations
Loanable laptops/tablets
Workstations in classrooms

Percentage difference in ownership of and access to computers

Community college students own fewer mobile computing devices...
...but have more opportunities for institution-provided computer access.

All other U.S. higher education greater
Community colleges greater

Figure 3. Effective Use of the Technology Students Value

Mean scores for the devices students value for academics and their ratings for how effectively these devices are used by their instructors.
COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY EXCEL IN USING TECHNOLOGY THAT STUDENTS VALUE
In comparing the technology that students value for their academic work with their ratings of effectiveness for how instructors use that technology, community colleges rate very well, according to the 2011 student study data. Community colleges outrank other types of institutions in both volume and magnitude of technologies that instructors use best and that students value the most (upper right quadrant of Figure 3).

COMMUNITY COLLEGES GENERALLY MEET STUDENTS' TECHNOLOGY EXPECTATIONS
When we asked students which technologies they wished instructors used more often, respondents at community colleges showed areas of congruence and divergence with students at other institutions. In looking at students' wish list data as a proxy for measuring the extent to which student expectations are met, community college students' technology needs are met more so than those of non-community college students (that is, community college students are more satisfied than other students; see Figure 4).
COMMUNITY COLLEGES PROVIDE THE ONLINE SERVICES THEIR STUDENTS VALUE

All types of institutions are doing well in terms of offering online services that students value. Community colleges take the lead in delivering some services to students online, such as course registration and textbooks. Community colleges have the most room to grow around making transcripts available online and offering online library resources (see Figure 5). Across higher education, student demand and expectations are not projected to decrease, so it will be an ongoing challenge for institutions to satisfy student demand in this arena.

Compared to other types of institutions, community colleges generally offer comparable or even larger numbers of IT services to support teaching and learning. Community colleges outpace other institutions in the areas of distance education and online learning but lag in providing student technology assistance in supporting faculty technology use (see Figure 6).

COMMUNITY COLLEGES OUTPACE OTHERS IN ONLINE LEARNING AND DEPLOYMENT OF LEARNING TECHNOLOGIES AND PRACTICES

Roughly the same percentage of students at community colleges and other institutions (79% and 80%, respectively) prefer courses with some online components, but more community college students have taken a course entirely online (70% and 59%, respectively). In line with this finding, community colleges report greater levels of broad deployment of e-learning and distance education learning technologies, compared to other types of institutions (see Figure 7).
Figure 6. Support Services for Teaching and Learning

- Community Colleges
  - Individual training in use of educational technology
  - LMS training and support for faculty
  - CMS/LMS operation
  - Special support services for distance education
  - Assistance available from instructional designers
  - Instructional tech. center available to all faculty
  - Special facilities for distance education
  - IT expertise provided by teaching/excellence center
  - Grants/awards for innovative use of instructional tech.

- All Other U.S. Higher Education

Figure 7. Deployment of E-Learning Practices

- Community Colleges
  - E-learning (wholly online courses)
  - Distance learning: local instructor
  - Hybrid courses
  - Document management tools
  - Information literacy requirement
  - Distance learning: local students
  - Interactive learning
  - Collaboration tools (e.g., Google Apps, SharePoint)
  - Learning objects
  - Facebook
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Percentage of institutions reporting support services for faculty are available

Percentage of institutions reporting broad deployment of selected learning technologies or practices
IT RESOURCE ALLOCATION IS APPROXIMATELY $645 PER FTE FOR NEARLY ALL TYPES OF INSTITUTIONS

It’s no surprise that IT organizations that support larger numbers of staff and students allocate more resources to IT. In fact, almost three-fourths of the variability in total central IT resource allocation can be explained by Carnegie class and total institutional FTE (employees and students). What is unexpected is that the estimated amount spent per total FTE is the same for most types of institutions. Figure 8 shows the estimated relationship between total FTE and central IT funding for community colleges. The real story about resource allocation is told by the slope of the line, showing that IT expenditures increase at about the same rate for most Carnegie classes as FTEs increase. The estimated resource allocation per total FTE is $645 for all schools except private doctoral institutions ($1,168 per FTE) and private liberal arts bachelor’s institutions ($1,347 per FTE). Although these estimates are based on data collected in 2011, there was no significant difference in estimates from 2009 to 2011.
COMMUNITY COLLEGES SERVE MORE STUDENTS WITH FEWER IT STAFF

Community college IT support staff serve an average of 850 FTEs each. This is 36% more than the 626 FTEs per IT support staff reported by other types of colleges (see Figure 9). IT support staff include the help desk, desktop computing, user support, training, computer store, and other types of support services staff.

Figure 9. Ratio of IT Support Staff per Student
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All Other U.S. Higher Education

1:626

36% greater than all other U.S. institutions
OUTSOURCING IS STILL MORE A TOPIC OF CONVERSATION THAN ACTION FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES

In these difficult economic times, outsourcing is on the minds of many as a potential cost-reduction strategy. The CDS survey asked both about outsourcing IT services and outsourcing IT functions. Though community colleges lead in most areas, outsourcing is still relatively uncommon (see Figure 10). Only 4.5% of community colleges are outsourcing three or more functions, and 5.3% reported that "all or nearly all" of their IT staff were provided through an outsourcing arrangement with an external supplier. (The latter are not exactly the same institutions as the former.) But community colleges are nonetheless three times as likely as other institutions to have outsourced three or more functions and twice as likely to have outsourced all or nearly all IT staff.

Figure 10. Practices for Outsourcing IT Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Community Colleges</th>
<th>All Other U.S. Higher Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-mail for students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS/LMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library management system**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help desk**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info. sys./ERP, transaction sys.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operation**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info. sys./ERP, app development**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print services**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info. sys./ERP, project management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of institutions reporting IT service is outsourced to an external supplier

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at the .01 level
COMMUNITY COLLEGES PLAN FOR IT STRATEGICALLY BUT HAVE LESS REPRESENTATION FROM FACULTY AND STUDENTS IN THEIR ADVISORY PROCESS

Community colleges report including IT in their institutional strategic plans at higher rates than other types of institutions (86% and 73%, respectively). Most community college IT departments (89%) receive advice from the president’s cabinet or above, a general IT services committee, and a separate committee for administrative information systems (see Figure 11).

Community colleges involve faculty and students as advisors in IT governance at lower rates than other types of institutions. The most common type of student involvement is through IT-related advisory groups that exist outside central IT. However, when community college students are involved in a central IT advisory committee, they are much more likely to be included as voting members than at other types of institutions.

**Figure 11. Advisory Practices for IT Governance**

- **Community Colleges**
- **All Other U.S. Higher Education**

- President’s cabinet/senior executive oversight
- Faculty advisory committee
- Student advisory committee

Percentage of institutions reporting that central IT receives advice from other constituencies.
COMMUNITY COLLEGES EMBRACE SOME SUSTAINABILITY PRACTICES

Community colleges are leaders in two notable areas of sustainable practices: having a central IT program to minimize energy consumption, and having a campus-wide program to minimize energy consumption of desktop technology. In both instances, the proportion of community colleges deploying these practices is about 10% higher than the percentage of other higher education institutions.

SUSTAINABILITY EFFORTS ARE UNDER DEVELOPMENT FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES

In looking at 11 areas of sustainability, community colleges demonstrate more maturity around campus-wide or central IT programs to minimize energy consumption—these practices are moderately common. In the remaining areas, community colleges are not presently leaders. Community colleges lag the most in four areas (see Figure 12):

- Policy for sustainability
- Signatory to ACUPCC
- Policy on carbon neutrality
- Greenhouse gas (GHG) baseline survey

Figure 12. Sustainability Practices
COMMUNITY COLLEGES ARE DOING WELL AT SECURITY BASICS BUT LAG WHEN IT COMES TO IT SECURITY ACTIVITIES

All types of institutions are doing well at IT security basics, with more than three out of four having firewalls at external Internet connection(s), having requirements to expeditiously patch or update all critical systems and institutionally owned or leased computers, and IT security personnel having the authority and ability to disable network port services.

Community colleges outpace their counterparts when it comes to some security practices, such as assessing risk in central IT systems and infrastructure (78% versus 63%) and requiring end-user authentication for wired access to workstations (66% versus 50%). However, they are lagging in many other areas we asked about regarding information security activities (see Figure 13).
DISASTER RECOVERY—BETTER THAN CROSSING FINGERS BUT ROOM TO GROW

About one in three community colleges (34%) and one in five other institutions (18%) lack a secondary power source (see Figure 14). About one in four community colleges (28%) report that they don’t have a disaster recovery plan for their data center, whereas only 8% of other types of institutions lack a plan. The term “data center” is used broadly here and includes everything from ERP data to research computing data. Most institutions haven’t tested their disaster recovery plans recently; however, of those institutions that have recovery plans, community colleges and other institutions test their recovery plans at about the same rate (about 20%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Community Colleges</th>
<th>All Other U.S. Higher Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary power source</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster recovery plans</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster recovery plans recently tested</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of institutions reporting that secondary power or disaster recovery practice is in place and system was recently tested.
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This review was made possible by assessing data gathered through two annual EDU-CAUSE data-collection projects: the Core Data Service survey and the annual student technology survey. Broad institutional participation in these surveys allowed for a comparative breakdown of responses by Carnegie class. This provided two benchmarking metrics inherent in the results: The first considers how community colleges, as a group, compare to other types of institutions, while the second considers how individual institutions compare to other community colleges. Our findings are based on the former, while our recommendations are intended to be in the context of the latter. The power and utility of these recommendations hinge on your ability to internalize the findings by comparing your institution’s practices to the norm and to note where kudos are deserved or where strategic improvements can be made. Consider these questions before reading our recommendations for facilitating improved practices:

1. What do you know about the technologies your students own and how well IT services are meeting their needs?
2. What support do you currently provide to help faculty use technology in teaching?
3. How many students, faculty, and staff does each IT support FTE service? What is your IT cost per FTE?
4. Does your institution’s strategic plan include IT? Do faculty and students have a voice in IT planning?
5. Do you have a program to minimize IT energy consumption, and, if so, how comprehensive is this program?
6. How safe are your data centers?
7. Do you have a disaster recovery plan, and, if so, when was the last time it was rehearsed?
8. Do you participate in CDS and the student technology surveys to give your institution access to benchmarking data about IT?

Your answers to these questions will allow you to maximize the utility of the following recommendations:

IT TEACHING AND LEARNING
- Recognize that fewer community college students own mobile devices and assess your institution’s efforts to meet student needs for computer access through campus-based computers or loan/check-out programs.
• Identify the technology that students value for their academic success, make that technology available, and continue to support faculty use of that technology.
• Assess the status and availability of student-facing services, applications, and websites and be prepared to meet students' evolving expectations for on-demand access.
• Continue to be leaders in the domain of distance education; pinpoint areas in which there is room to improve through regular benchmarking, and strategically target improvement efforts in those areas.

IT RESOURCE ALLOCATION
• Consider how your institution measures up to the overall average of $645 in IT expenditures per total FTE, and consider whether your institution is under or over this mark by design or by chance.

IT MANAGEMENT
• Consider opportunities to outsource IT functions and services with external suppliers.

IT GOVERNANCE
• Include IT in institutional strategic plans and have IT leadership representation on the president’s cabinet or higher.
• Include faculty and student representatives in the IT advisory process.

IT SUSTAINABILITY
• Continue to be leaders in sustainability practices that involve central IT programs to minimize energy consumption.
• Work toward improving sustainability practices in other areas such as establishment of policies on carbon neutrality and submetering of power for data centers.

IT RISK
• Consider how well data are protected at your institution, whether there is a current and achievable disaster recovery plan in place, and the frequency of testing that plan.
METHODOLOGY

Information Technology Services in Community Colleges: Strengths, Opportunities, and Challenges is the product of a secondary analysis of the EDUCAUSE 2011 CDS survey and ECAR National Study of Undergraduate Students and Information Technology, 2011. A total of 133 of the 827 CDS respondents were from community colleges, and the remaining 694 institutions were aggregated into a comparative “all other U.S. higher education” group. A full version of the CDS report is available at www.educause.edu/cds. A total of 1,122 community college students from 398 different institutions were included in the 2011 student technology survey sample; the remaining 1,878 students from other types of institutions were aggregated into a comparison group of “all other U.S. higher education.” The student study data were weighted to represent a national sample of undergraduate students. A full version of the 2011 student technology study report is available at www.educause.edu/ecar. Statistical significance is noted where applicable.

ENDNOTES


EDUCAUSE is a nonprofit membership association created to support those who lead, manage, and use information technology to benefit higher education. A comprehensive range of resources and activities is available to all EDUCAUSE members. For more information about EDUCAUSE, including membership, please contact us at info@educause.edu or visit www.educause.edu.