

APPENDIX

A.	MASTER PLANNING ACTIVITY #1 – MISSION, VISION, VALUES	167
B.	CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE CHANCELLOR’S OFFICE STRATIFICATION OF COLLEGES BY ENROLLMENT SIZE AND DENSITY	172
C.	SOUTH COUNTY EDUCATIONAL NEEDS SURVEY	173
D.	SOUTH COUNTY RESIDENT SURVEY RESULTS – LIST OF DESIRED CLASSES	174
E.	CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE CHANCELLOR’S OFFICE GUIDELINES – CAPITAL OUTLAY PROJECTS	175

APPENDIX A

MASTER PLANNING ACTIVITY #1 – MISSION, VISION, VALUES

Memorandum from the Office of the President

TO: Instruction Deans, Academic Directors, and Division Chairs

FROM: Educational & Facilities Master Planning Taskforce Executive Committee
(Dennis Baeyen, Susan Cotler, Michael Hargett, Sandee McLaughlin, Marie Rosenwasser, Gil Stork)

DATE: March 10, 2000

SUBJECT: USING A DIVISION OR UNIT MEETING TO DISCUSS COLLEGE
VISION/MISSION/ VALUES STATEMENT

We are asking that between now and April 20 you devote time at a division meeting to help with master planning. Most master planning processes begin with a re-examination of the existing vision/mission/values statement to determine whether any part of it should be revised. Currently, Cuesta College has only the attached mission statement, printed in the college catalogue, and the attached values statement, included in the 1999-2000 College Plan.

However, the Master Planning Taskforce members believe that now is the time to clarify and agree on the most essential values that are core to the culture of Cuesta College and to articulate a short vision statement that expresses the image and promise Cuesta College should project to its students, community, and employees.

The mission follows from the clarification of core values and the vision. Cuesta's mission statement, essentially what is in the Ed Code, is very similar to many other California community colleges. While remaining consistent with the legal basis for being a community college, we collectively may want to identify ways to differentiate or distinguish Cuesta College from other community colleges.

I've attached other colleges' vision/mission/values statements and some questions for you and your colleagues to consider as you work on this important task. The Taskforce has designated two of its members to facilitate the discussion and record everyone's input.

If some of the members of the division are absent when you hold your meeting, they can participate in a make-up campus focus group at 2:00 p.m. on Monday, April 10, 2000, in Room 5402.

In summary, please:

1. Schedule a unit or division meeting that includes time for everyone to respond to the questions related to values, vision, and mission.
2. Let your facilitators (see attached list) know when and where the meeting will be held.
3. Provide each faculty and staff member with a copy of the packet of materials labeled "Master Planning Activity #1" prior to the meeting.
4. Inform division or unit members of the web address and the make-up focus group if they can't attend your meeting.
5. Assist the facilitators with recording the input and turning it in to me as soon after your meeting as possible, no later than April 20.

APPENDIX A

-continued-

If you have any questions about what we are asking you to do, please call or e-mail me. Even if I'm not available when you call, Cami Reece is the assistant to the Master Planning Task Force and can help with your question or find out when you are available so I can call you back. On behalf of the Taskforce, thank you in advance for participating in this part of the process. You will also have other opportunities to participate in the educational and facilities planning after we have completed the work on the vision/mission/values statement.

cc: Taskforce Members

Attachments: Master Planning Activity Sheet
Campus Focus Groups Listing
Cuesta College Mission Statement
Cuesta College Vision Statement
Various Community College Mission/Vision/Values Statements

cad/E&FMP/memo39

APPENDIX A

MASTER PLANNING ACTIVITY 1

DEFINITIONS AND QUESTIONS ON VALUES, VISION, AND MISSION FOR COLLEGES

Definitions

Values: Values are the philosophical convictions and beliefs that lead to the principles and standards which guide our behavior. Individuals have a hierarchy of values that are most important to them and guide how they live their lives, and an organization has values that guide how it behaves and wants to be perceived. “Value words” are underlined on the attached material about values from Cuesta’s 1999-2000 College Plan. Usually colleges limit their core values to about six and frequently such words as “excellence,” “responsiveness,” “diversity,” “dignity” are found in other colleges’ statement of values. See Jackson Community College’s vision and values as one way to express key values.

Vision: A vision statement expresses the essential promise to the community, students, and employees about who and what Cuesta College is and intends to be for the future. It is usually only a few sentences long, can even be a phrase, and contains the highest values and commitment of the college. It is both descriptive and inspirational. It expresses what the future should look like for Cuesta College in the eyes of the students, employees, and community. See the visions of Jackson Community College, Mt. San Antonio College, and American River College for current examples of vision statements.

Mission: The mission identifies the major purpose or purposes for being a college or business, who is served, and principles or values under which the college/business intends to function. In the case of a community college, the purposes stem from the law—Ed Code, Title 5 and CCC Board of Governors’ amendments-- to the original legislation that created the community colleges. Cuesta College’s existing mission statement is consistent with Ed Code. It might be improved with language that distinguishes Cuesta from other community colleges, commits to results or outcomes in addition to providing programs and services, and includes the most powerful words from the vision or the values. See the missions of Lamar, Mt. San Antonio, Canada, and American River for examples of alternative language.

QUESTIONS

1. Values: what core values do you believe Cuesta College should maintain or adopt for the next decade and beyond?
2. Vision: If you were to describe your ideal vision for Cuesta College’s future, what would Cuesta College be like? What key words or phrases that reflect the values and promise(s) do you want to see in Cuesta College’s vision statement? (If you have time, write the sentence or sentences that you think would make a powerful vision statement for Cuesta College.)
3. Mission: What do you believe are the most important purposes Cuesta College is fulfilling and should fulfill in the future?
4. What do you see as the College’s greatest opportunity for growth in the future?
5. What distinguishes Cuesta College? What unique contribution(s) should the College be making in the future?
6. If you have time, put the phrases into a mission statement or edit the current mission statement.

APPENDIX A



CUESTA COLLEGE

Mission Statement

PREAMBLE

Cuesta College, as part of the California Community College system, has a unique role in higher education and in the community: providing quality education to everyone.

To accomplish its mission, Cuesta College fosters partnerships within the college and with the students, with the community, and with other educational systems.

The college and the student share responsibility for achieving the educational goals of the student.

MISSION

The primary missions of the college are to:

- Provide curricula that prepare students to transfer to four-year institutions.

The college offers courses, which satisfy lower division general education requirements and lead to upper division majors. These courses are equivalent to those available at four-year colleges and universities.

- Provide courses and programs that prepare students to enter the work force.

The college provides technical and occupational course work to prepare students for employment and to further their occupational competence through advanced training and retraining.

- Provide education, training, and services that contribute to continuous work force improvement and the advancement of California's economic growth.

The college offers up-to-date education, training, and services that reflect the changing and growing economic needs of the students and the community.

Other important and essential functions of Cuesta College are the provision of instructional support services, student services, remediation, and instruction in English as a second language. The college maintains appropriate services and resources for students, including those with special needs, to help them determine and achieve personal, educational, and occupational goals.

The college also provides continuing educational programs, which meet the cultural, educational, and recreational needs and interests of the community.

Approved by the Board of Trustees: February 2, 2000

APPENDIX A



CUESTA COLLEGE

Values Statement

Cuesta College has a commitment to excellence and student success. The College responds to the unique character of the local communities and their diverse populations and contributes to the quality of the community by sharing in the building of an environment for learning. Cuesta College strives to assist individuals to see beyond their private interests and to place their lives in the larger context of society as a whole.

CUESTA COLLEGE'S VALUES INCLUDE:

- Striving for instructional excellence by focusing upon learning success.
- Providing a broad range of services that will assist students in setting and achieving their educational goals.
- Supporting equal educational opportunity through open access.
- Offering a comprehensive and flexible curriculum to meet evolving and diverse student and community needs.
- Seeking to understand and support the characteristics, needs, goals and objectives of its students.
- Supporting each student's aspiration to fulfill his/her educational goals and to realize his/her potential.
- Treating students, staff, and the community in a sincere, caring and cooperative manner.
- Striving to recognize the uniqueness and worth of the individual, both student and staff.
- Providing learning resources that support the educational program.
- Providing and maintaining facilities and equipment required by programs and services.
- Creating a campus climate that embraces diversity and fosters respect for others.
- Supporting academic freedom.
- Providing an environment conducive to productivity and pride in accomplishment.
- Supporting staff development and innovation.
- Utilizing participatory decision-making through the shared governance process.
- Promoting open communication throughout the communities served.
- Accounting through the planning process for institutional and individual effectiveness.

April 20, 1999

APPENDIX B

**California Community College Chancellor's Office
Stratification of Colleges by Enrollment Size and Density**

N=106	SMALL Under 5,000	MEDIUM-SMALL 5,000-9,999	MEDIUM-LARGE 10,000-14,999	LARGE 15,000+
LOW <300 ppsm	Barstow Columbia Feather River Gavilan Lake Tahoe Lassen Mendocino Palo Verde Porterville Siskiyous Taft West Hills	Canyons Cerro Coso Craftern Hills Cuesta Cuyamaca Hartnell Mt. San Jacinto Napa Redwoods Reedley Shasta Victor Valley	Allan Hancock Antelope Bakersfield Butte Desert Merced Monterey San Bernardino Sequoias Yuba	Fresno City Grossmont Modesto Palomar San Joaquin Delta Santa Rosa Sierra
MEDIUM 301-4,000 ppsm	Santiago Canyon	Cañada Contra Costa Las Positas Los Medanos Marin Oxnard Santiago Canyon Skyline	Cabrillo Chabot Citrus Cypress Evergreen Foothill Irvine Valley Mira Costa Mission Moorpark Ohlone San Jose San Mateo Santa Barbara Solano Ventura West Valley	American River Chaffey Cosumnes DeAnza Diablo Valley Fullerton Mt. San Antonio Pasadena Riverside Sacramento City Saddleback Santa Ana Santa Monica Southwestern
HIGH 4,000 ppsm	Vista	Alameda Compton LA Harbor LA Mission LA Southwest Merritt SD Miramar West LA	Coastline Golden West Laney LA Pierce LA Trade-Tech San Diego City	Cerritos East LA El Camino Glendale LA Valley Long Beach Orange Coast Rio Hondo San Diego Mesa

*Enrollment size refers to the number of students (headcount). Density refers to the adult population of the district's service area. (ppsm=people per square mile)

South County Educational Needs Survey

Cuesta College
South County Educational Needs Survey

DIRECTIONS: Using a number 2 pencil or any dark-colored ink pen, fill in the appropriate bubbles below.

1. What is your Zip Code?

0	1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9
0	1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9
0	1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9
0	1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9
0	1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9

Office Use Only

0	1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9
0	1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9
0	1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9
0	1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9
0	1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9

2. Have you ever attended a Cuesta College Class? Yes No (If yes, skip to question 4)

3. If not, what has kept you from taking classes at Cuesta College? (mark all that apply)

- Transportation
- Childcare
- Cost
- Money for Books
- Unsure whether I was eligible to enroll
- Cuesta doesn't offer the classes I want
- Cuesta's classes aren't offered where I can attend
- Cuesta's classes are not offered at times when I can attend
- I can't speak English very well
- Other (list other reasons here) _____

4. Which of the following places would be the most convenient for you to attend Cuesta College classes?

- Arroyo Grande
- Nipomo
- Other Location (list other places here) _____

5. What times would be most convenient for you to attend classes? (mark all that apply)

- Morning (8am - 12 pm)
- Afternoon (12 - 4 pm)
- Evening (4 - 10 pm)
- Weekends

6. How could Cuesta College best serve you? (mark all that apply)

- To prepare to go to a four-year university
- Two-year Associate of Arts/Science Degree
- Career preparation
- Occupational classes
- Recreation classes
- Basic English classes
- Basic Math classes
- English as a Second Language (ESL)
- Improved job skills

7. What classes would you like to take?

8. From which of the following schools or programs have you taken classes? (mark all that apply)

- Adult Education
- Allan Hancock Credit Courses
- Allan Hancock Community Education Courses
- Cal Poly
- Chapman University
- Literacy Council
- Other School, College or University _____

9. Please provide other comments about how Cuesta College can meet your educational needs:

Thank you for your time and input!

APPENDIX D

SOUTH COUNTY RESIDENT SURVEY RESULTS

List of Desired Classes

Adult Education
Animal Care
Bridge
Candle-Making
College for Kids
Community Programs
Continuing Education
Courses for Teachers
Creative Thinking
Credit by Exam
Environmental Classes
Excursions
Flower Arranging
Gardening & landscaping
General Education
General Education Certificate
High Degree Courses
International Negotiations
Massage
Mommy & Me
Senior Classes
Senior Life Enrichment
Senior Oriented Short Courses
Short Courses
Social Services
Test proctoring for Other Schools
Transferable Courses
Weekend Classes
Wine Appreciation

California Community Colleges Capital Outlay Planning

Background

California Community Colleges capital outlay demands far exceed the available state resources to fund them. Currently, there is a backlog of over \$1.8 billion in the Board of Governors' (Board) approved proposals and over \$5 billion of identified projects in district five-year capital outlay plans. This backlog includes projects that were submitted by the districts and approved by the Board up to five years ago. Funding inadequacies, technological advances, and changes in district and state priorities have made many of the projects on the backlog list outdated.

After 1998-99, the existing general obligation bond funds for higher education will run out. Past bond acts have provided the community colleges with \$150 million per year for capital outlay projects. Proposition 1A was placed on the November 1998 ballot to provide \$9.2 billion for K-12 through higher education facilities projects for the next four years. Of this amount, higher education would get \$2.5 billion. This is less than the \$3 billion that higher education supporters had been seeking, which would have provided \$250 million per segment per year for four years. Assuming the traditional 3-way split, the current proposal would provide to community colleges approximately \$186 million per year for 4 years, and an additional \$55 million during the last 2 years of the bond for new campuses, small campuses and off-campus centers.

The capital outlay program has multiple stages. After receipt in February and subsequent review of Final Project Proposals from the districts (in addition to reviewing the districts' five-year capital outlay plans and Board previously-approved projects), the Chancellor's Office prepares a preliminary list of "new start" (versus continuing) projects eligible for scope approval by the Board. This list is submitted to the Board for review and comment at its July meeting. Shortly after the state's annual Budget is enacted and refined project information is provided by the districts, the Chancellor's Office reviews the preliminary list of scope-approved projects according to Board priority criteria (Attachment A). Once that analysis is complete, the final list is placed as an action item on the September Board agenda for project scope approval. The proposed capital outlay plan (Attachment B) for the next fiscal year is prepared from the project scope approval list. This plan is submitted to the Department of Finance by August 15 for consideration in the upcoming Governor's Budget, and appears as an action item in the September Board agenda.

Project Scope Approval Process

To apply for state capital outlay funds, community college districts annually submit project proposals to the Chancellor's Office in two parts. The first part, called an Initial Project Proposal (IPP), is a three-page concept paper. The second part, called a Final Project Proposal (FPP), is a complete proposal with justification and budget detail. Projects are to be initially submitted to the Chancellor's Office for review by July 1 using the three-page IPP form. After evaluating the IPPs, the Chancellor's Office notifies the districts of those IPPs to develop into FPPs due the following February for possible submission to the Board for project scope approval. It is

expected that each district will discuss in the FPP the relationship of the proposed project with the district's comprehensive educational and facility master plans. It is further expected that the districts will explore why there is no viable alternative other than to support the proposed project.

“Project scope approval” means that the project meets the Board's criteria for prioritizing capital outlay projects and may be eligible for funding pursuant to the requirements, standards, and guidelines outlined in the *Education Code*, Title 5 of the *California Code of Regulations*, the *State Administrative Manual/Capitalized Assets, Section 6800*, and the *Facilities Planning Manual* (formerly known as the *Capital Outlay Handbook*) for the California Community Colleges.

Projects are currently prioritized into categories according to Board-established priority criteria (Attachment A). Within each major category (A, B, and C in the Board's priority criteria) highest priority is given to completing projects that have been previously funded. Requests for equipment to complete a project (A2) are also a very high priority; only life-safety projects are given higher priority (A1). The next priority is for infrastructure projects when failure or loss would otherwise result (A3). After the completion of previously funded and new Category A projects have been prioritized, the next category considered is for planning studies (B1) and new or remodeled instructionally related projects (B2). Category B2 projects are prioritized based on the ratio of the college's space deficiency (capacity) to enrollment growth (load), or “capacity-to load ratio.” The last category consists of new child development, theater arts and physical education projects that promote a complete campus concept or provide for other capital outlay needs (C1-C4). Current Board criteria provide that eighty percent of the funds remaining after completion of previously-funded and Category A projects shall be expended on Category B2 “new start” projects and the other twenty percent on Category C new start projects. Projects are approved according to Board criteria in single or a combination of phases known as: acquisition (a), studies/master planning and preliminary plans (p), working drawings (w), construction (c), and equipment (e). At the request of the Board, the Chief Business Officers Facilities Task Force continues to discuss further revisions to the existing criteria to incorporate new factors such as temporary structures and technology renovations.

Based on the Chancellor's Office review of the FPPs, the districts' five-year capital outlay plans and Board previously-approved projects, the eligible “new start” (versus continuing) projects are prioritized by the Board criteria and are presented to the Board annually for review and approval of project scope. This list includes, at most, one qualified project from Category B2 *and* one project from Category C1 per authorized site.

Funding Approval Process

From this prioritized list of scope-approved projects, the Chancellor's Office develops an annual capital outlay plan for submittal to the Department of Finance prior to August 15 for consideration of funding in the next year's Governor's Budget. All Category B projects are prioritized for funding on the basis of existing facility capacity to current/projected enrollment load (“*capacity-to-load ratio*”). All Category C projects are prioritized for funding 1) if the proposed project does not add to or replace an existing facility of similar use on the campus, and 2) by the date the college was established.

At most, this plan includes one scope-approved project from Category B *or* one scope-approved project from Category C per authorized site. This ensures that only one “new start” project per year is funded per authorized site. If more than one scope-approved project is eligible for funding from Categories B and C per authorized site, the highest prioritized project from the district’s five-year plan is proposed for funding. Funding of these projects each year is contingent upon their ability to meet the Governor’s priorities and the availability of money to meet those needs. The Administration and legislative committees, among others, scrutinize all capital construction projects to determine if the projects fit within current priorities, i.e., seismic, life-safety, vital infrastructure, major code deficiencies, and increased instructional access.

An appeals process is available if a district feels its project was omitted in error from either the scope approval or proposed funding lists. Districts are first urged to contact their facilities planner at the Chancellor’s Office for an explanation of their project’s priority status. If the district still feels its project should be on the list, districts may appeal in writing to the Chancellor.

Prioritizing Capital Outlay Projects: General Criteria

1. Capital outlay projects are annually prioritized based on criteria set by the Board of Governors. Projects are approved in these phases:
 - Acquisition (a)
 - Preliminary Plans (p)
 - Working Drawings (w)
 - Construction (c)
 - Equipment (e)
2. Only after it has been determined by the district and the Chancellor's Office that there is no viable alternative to constructing or remodeling a facility will a proposed construction or remodeling project be considered for state funding.
3. Available funds will first be expended on Category A projects followed by Category B and Category C projects which have received prior funding from the capital outlay program for preliminary plans (p) and/or working drawings (w). Eighty percent of the funds remaining in any given fiscal year shall be expended on Category B “new start” (versus continuing) projects and the other 20 percent on Category C “new start” projects.
4. The Board of Governors may make exceptions to established priorities when it determines that to do so will benefit community colleges.

Prioritizing Capital Outlay Projects: Priority Criteria

Category A – To activate existing space.

1. Remediates an existing condition that poses an imminent danger to the life or safety of students, staff, or the public including emergency exit for disabled persons (*life safety projects*).
2. Equipment for previously funded projects.
3. Replacement or alterations to infrastructure when failure or loss would otherwise result.

Category B – To provide for new space or remodeling of existing space for instruction and for academic and administrative support facilities.

1. Master plans and preliminary plans when major deficiencies exist and it is projected that the district will receive capital outlay funding within five years.
2. Remodeling and new construction of classrooms, teaching laboratories, libraries, and learning resource centers (including land acquisition costs and site development when necessary to site facilities). Projects within this classification will be prioritized on the basis of existing facility capacity to current/projected enrollment load (“*capacity-to-load ratio*”):
 - a. Remodeling projects
 - b. New construction of classroom or teaching laboratory
 - c. New construction of library or learning resources space
3. Remodeling and new construction of academic and administrative support facilities (including offices, student support facilities, land acquisition, and site development costs when necessary to site facilities). Projects within this classification will be prioritized on the basis of existing facility capacity to current/projected enrollment load (“*capacity-to-load ratio*”):
 - a. Remodeling projects
 - b. New construction of faculty offices
 - c. New construction of administrative office space
 - d. New construction of other support facilities

Category C – To provide for other capital outlay projects and promote a complete campus concept.

1. Physical education facilities, performing arts (theater) facilities, and child care/development facilities. (*Category C1 projects are prioritized for funding: 1) if the proposed project does not add to or replace an existing facility of similar use on the campus, and 2) by the date the college was established.*)
2. Cafeterias, maintenance shops, warehouse, energy conservation projects, and other support facilities.
3. Other capital outlay projects that promote a complete campus.
4. Renewal and improvement of existing instructional and support facilities.

Life-Safety Projects

Background. The number of “life-safety” construction projects (*Category A1*) has risen greatly in recent years. The impact of this trend is that many classroom projects are not being built in high growth areas of the state because life-safety projects have first claim on available funds. The following qualifying criteria for life-safety projects are a response to these concerns. The basic premise of these criteria is to require documentation of the unsafe condition from a qualified third party. Not qualifying as a life-safety project does not preclude the project for consideration within the existing criteria for capital outlay. Districts are expected to participate to the extent practicable in a locally funded program of routine and deferred maintenance on an annual recurring basis.

Definition. A life-safety project is a capital outlay project for the remediation of an existing condition that poses an imminent danger to the life or safety of students, staff, or the public including emergency exit for disabled persons.

Qualifying Criteria. To qualify as a life-safety project, the project:

1. Must be supported by evidence of the danger to safety in the form of a study by a qualified building or safety professional detailing the unsafe condition.
2. If a building replacement is proposed, the project:
 - a. Must be accompanied by a comparison between the estimated cost to retrofit the existing building versus the estimated cost to build a replacement building. The cost to retrofit must be more than fifty percent of the cost to build a replacement in order for the replacement project to qualify for funding;
 - b. Must include usage that is the same as the usage in the building being replaced.
3. Must include plans and funding for the demolition of the building or condition being remediated.

Criteria for Prioritizing Capital Outlay Projects

Note: These new criteria were adopted by the Board of Governors in November 1999 for projects beginning with fiscal year 2003-04 submittals. This enabled districts to have at least 60 days to develop initial project proposals (IPPs) for submittal to the Chancellor's Office by the next February 1st deadline.

Introduction

Recent history has shown there are insufficient state resources to pay for all of the community college facilities needs in California. Therefore, to continue to provide access to a quality education for the state's community college students, the following priority criteria have been developed to guide the investment of limited state capital outlay funds into eligible projects.

General Criteria

1. Capital outlay projects are annually prioritized based on criteria set by the Board of Governors. Projects are approved in these phases:
 - Acquisition (a)
 - Preliminary Plans (p)
 - Working Drawings (w)
 - Construction (c)
 - Equipment (e)
1. Only after it has been determined by the district and the Chancellor's Office that there is no viable alternative to constructing or reconstructing a facility will a proposed project be considered for scope approval and state funding.
2. Completion of previously state-funded projects will have the highest priority for funding in each category. Projects within Category A and D will be prioritized in the subcategory order shown. Projects within Categories B through F will be prioritized on a basis of least cost to state community college facilities related funds. (Technical enhancements to this basis to ensure equitable competition among projects will be further defined in consultation with the ACBO Facilities Task Force.) Collaborative partnerships may enhance a project's eligibility if the collaboration reduces a project's state cost. Additional selection criteria also exist in Categories B, D & E.
3. State funding for all equipment projects will be consistent with the Group II equipment guidelines. Requests for instructional equipment for an education building or education center that is constructed through a public-private partnership or that is acquired without state funding can compete for funding in Categories B through F after the project scope has received Board of Governors approval through the normal submittal process.
4. Current state regulations restrict the use of state capital outlay funds for student centers, stadia, dorms, parking lots, and single-purpose auditoriums (Title 5, *California Code of Regulations*, Section 57001.5 (d)).

5. The Board shall propose for funding no more than one scope-approved "new-start" project per authorized site in any given fiscal year.
6. The Board of Governors may make exceptions to these criteria and funding percentages when it determines that to do so will benefit the community college system.

Specific Criteria

Category A - To provide for safe facilities and activate existing space.

(No more than 50% of funds available in any given year)

To provide for existing safe facilities/infrastructure and to equip previously, state-funded construction projects.

- A1 Imminent danger to the life or safety of the building occupants -- with adequate documentation from a qualified independent third party (least cost/no growth)
- A2 Equipment to complete previously state-funded construction projects
- A3 Seismic Deficiencies -- potential seismic risk (least cost/no growth)
- A4 Immediate infrastructure failure (least cost/no growth)

Category B - To increase instructional capacity.

(Up to 50% of funds available in any given year after funding Category A projects)

To provide for reconstruction of existing space, construction of new space, and purchase of equipment to meet existing enrollment and provide for increased instructional capacity in classrooms, laboratories, libraries/learning resource centers and instructional audio and visual services (including land acquisition costs and site development when necessary to site facilities). Only projects at or below 100% capacity-to-load ratio upon project completion initially qualify for funding within this category. Completion of previously-funded Category B projects will have the highest priority for funding in this category.

- Reconstruction of existing space
- Construction of new space

Category C - To modernize instructional space.

(Up to 25% of funds available in any given year after funding Category A projects)

To provide for reconstruction or replacement of existing space and purchase of equipment to improve instructional programs and/or service delivery in classrooms, laboratories, libraries/ learning resource centers and instructional audio and visual services. Projects in this category increase instructional efficiency and/or enhance instructional delivery systems through changes in teaching methods, improved technology and other infrastructure changes. However, projects in this category will not cause or increase the overbuilt status of a site, and do not utilize capacity-to-load ratios to determine project eligibility. Completion of previously funded Category C projects will have the highest priority for funding in this category.

- Reconstruction of existing space
- Replacement of existing space

Category D - To promote a complete campus concept.

(Up to 15% of funds available in any given year after funding Category A projects; funds may be shared with Categories E and F, as necessary, to fully fund a project)

To provide for reconstruction of existing space, construction of new space and purchase of equipment to promote a complete campus concept. Projects that introduce never before available basic services to complete a campus are given preference for funding over projects that replace or add to an existing facility of similar use. Completion of previously funded Category D projects will have the highest priority for funding in this category.

- D1 Physical education, performing arts, child development facilities, and other capital projects which promote a complete campus
- D2 Cafeterias, maintenance shops, warehouses and capital energy projects

Category E - To increase institutional support services capacity.

(Up to 5% of funds available in any given year after funding Category A projects; funds may be shared with Categories D and F, as necessary, to fully fund a project)

To provide for reconstruction of existing space, construction of new space and purchase of equipment to meet existing need and provide for increased capacity for administrative, instructional, student and other support services (including land acquisition and site development costs when necessary to site facilities). Only projects at or below 100% capacity-to-load ratio upon project completion initially qualify for funding within this category. Completion of previously funded Category E projects will have the highest priority for funding in this category.

- Reconstruction of existing space
- Construction of new space

Category F - To modernize institutional support services space.

(Up to 5% of funds available in any given year after funding Category A projects; funds may be shared with Categories D and E, as necessary, to fully fund a project)

To provide for reconstruction or replacement of existing space and purchase of equipment to improve program and/or service delivery in administrative, instructional, student and other support services. Projects in this category increase administrative and support services efficiency and/or delivery systems. However, projects in this category will not cause or increase the overbuilt status of a site, and do not utilize capacity-to-load ratios to determine project eligibility. Completion of previously-funded Category F projects will have the highest priority for funding in this category.

- Reconstruction of existing space
- Replacement of existing space

**Excerpt from Presentation by Fred Harris
California Community College Chancellor's Office**

California Community Colleges Facilities Problem Statement

- Tidal Wave II enrollments are engulfing us now
- \$16 billion in unmet needs conservatively projected through 2010
- State may provide only 25% of that need
- Local bonds, other resources, alternative delivery methods and increased utilization are needed to fill the gap

Facilities Process Streamlining: What are the (\$\$\$\$!) benefits?

1. Save money by shortening time to complete projects by 2+ years like UC & CSU.
2. Receive lump-sum funding for all project phases in one appropriation like UC & CSU.
3. Improve ability to complete projects on time and within scope & budget.
4. Enter all project information only once online.
5. Increase access for Tidal Wave II enrollments
6. Enhance Ability to Obtain Funds
 - Increase State funds
 - Successful Local Bond Campaigns
7. Spend Money Effectively
 - Allow every district to develop highly competitive projects for state funding
 - Comply with Prop 39 requirements

Capital Outlay Priority Criteria

Board of Governors' Policy

- In November 1999 the Board of Governors adopted a new priority criteria policy developed with the ACBO Facilities Task Force and based on the Legislative Analyst's Office recommended framework
- "Least cost to the state" stretches scarce state resources to meet Tidal Wave II enrollments
- "Least cost" to be structured as an incentive in lieu of a required match

Capital Outlay Priority Criteria

The Old Categories

- A – To activate existing space (including Critical Life Safety)
- B – To provide for growth in instruction, academic and administrative support space
- C – To promote a complete campus

Capital Outlay Priority Criteria
The New Categories

A1 - Critical Life Safety A2 - Equipment to Complete Projects A3 - Seismic Retrofit A4 - Infrastructure Failure	B - Instructional Growth C - Instructional Modernization D - Complete Campus E - Institutional Support Growth F - Institutional Support Modernization
--	---

Old vs. New Categories

To Activate Existing Space (Category A)

Old	New
A-1: Critical Life Safety (includes Seismic Retrofit) A-2: Equipment to Complete Projects A-3: Infrastructure Failure	A-1: Critical Life Safety A-3: Seismic Retrofit A-2: Equipment to complete projects A-4: Infrastructure Failure

Old vs. New Categories

To Increase Capacity (New Categories B & E)

Old	New
B-1: Campus Master Plans and Studies B-2: Instructional Growth B-3: Institutional and Support Facilities -Growth	No comparable category B: Instructional Growth E: Institutional Support Growth

Old vs. New Categories

To Complete a Campus (New Category D)

Old	New
C-1: Physical Ed, Performing Arts, Child Development C-2: Cafeterias, Maintenance Shops, Warehouses, Energy projects	D-1: Physical Ed, Performing Arts, Child Development D-2: Cafeterias, Maintenance Shops, Warehouses, and other facilities for a complete campus (not Energy projects)

Old vs. New Categories

To Optimize Existing Space (New Categories C & F)

Old	New
C-3: Other Facilities for a Complete Campus C-4: Renewal of existing facilities	C: Instructional Modernization F: Institutional Support Modernization

Annual Allocation Targets

- Category A: no more than 50%
- Category B: at least 25%
- Category C: at least 12.5%
- Category D: at least 7.5%
- Category E: at least 2.5%
- Category F: at least 2.5%

Summary of Priority Scores

Categories B through F

- 200 total eligibility points possible per project in each category.
- Local Contribution Incentive = 1 point for each 1% savings on state supportable costs; up to 50 points max; only 25% of total score; more projects get funded.
- Other factors earn most of the eligibility points: available space, enrollment growth, future space needs, design, program benefit, elimination of trailers, etc.

Summary of Priority Scores

Categories B & E – Growth

(200 total pts, 50 pts max for each element)

1. Enrollment Growth = 5 year WSCH growth volume at each site; additional points for extraordinary growth >10%
2. Immediate Need = initial capacity/load ratios < 100%
3. Project Design = proposed design provides for increased needed space < 100% cap/load
4. Local Contribution = directly mitigates need for state funds; more projects get funded

Summary of Priority Scores

Categories C & F – Modernization

Building Status (150 pts max)

- Facility Condition Index (FCI); Age of Building used until FCI is available (120 pts. max)
- Activates Unused Space, coded 050 in space inventory (30 pts. max)

Local Contribution (50 pts. max)

- Directly mitigates need for state funds; more projects get funded

Summary of Priority Scores
Category D - Complete Campus

(200 total pts, 50 pts max for each element)

<p><u>Age of Site</u></p> <p>1. 1 pt. for each year in excess of 10 years old</p> <p><u>Program / Services Benefit</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brings off-site course offerings on campus (<u>20 pts.</u>) • New degree or certificate (<u>20 pts.</u>) • Meet infrastructure code or enrollment growth (<u>10 pts.</u>) <p><u>Project Design</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replaces Portables (<u>50 pts</u>); or • Replaces inadequate permanent facilities (30 pts); or • Expands existing facilities (<u>20 pts</u>) <p><u>Local Contribution</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directly mitigates need for state funds

Capital Outlay Priority Criteria
Match vs. Local Contribution

No	Yes
Required Project by Project Match	<p><u>Local Contribution Incentive</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhances a Project's Priority Ranking by 25% • Provides system match

Analysis of Proposed 2003-04 Capital Outlay Plan

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 31 of 55 (56%) new starts provided a local contribution.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local contributions provided a minimum 23.5% "system" contribution to total project costs.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 additional projects will be funded in 2003-04.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$100+ million in additional funds to be available in 2004-05.

Old vs. New
Ranking Methods: A-1, A-3

Old	New
<p>A-1: Critical Life Safety includes Seismic Retrofit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rated Occupancy Code 	<p>A-1: Critical Life Safety</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same Method <p>A-3: Seismic Retrofit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seismic Zones and building rating • Rated Occupancy Code

Old vs. New
Ranking Methods: A-2

Old	New
A-2: Equipment to Complete Projects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based upon rank of construction phase 	A-2: Equipment to Complete Projects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same Method

Old vs. New
Ranking Methods: Equipment Only

Old	New
Equipment only requests (construction locally funded) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projects previously not allowed to be funded by state 	Equipment only requests (construction locally funded) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classified in B – F Categories • To be treated like other new starts

Old vs. New Ranking Methods: A-4

Old	New
A-3: Infrastructure Failure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Age of building for building specific proposals • Age of campus for site-wide proposals 	A-4 : Infrastructure Failure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Age of building (until Building Facility Condition Index is available) • Building Condition rating (building specific proposals) • Age of campus for site-wide proposals

Old vs. New
Ranking Methods: B

Old	New
B-2: Instructional Growth <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ending capacity load ratio in predominant space type 	B: Instructional Growth <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eligibility points: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enrollment Growth 2. Immediate Need 3. Project Design 4. Local Contribution

Old vs. New
Ranking Methods: E

Old	New
B-3: Institutional and Support Facilities – Growth <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ending capacity load ratio in predominant space type 	E: Institutional Support Growth <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eligibility Points: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Enrollment Growth Immediate Need Project Design Local Contribution

Old vs. New
Ranking Methods: C

Old	New
C-2: Energy Projects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Age of Campus C-4: Renewal of Existing Facilities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Age of Campus 	C: Instructional Modernization <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replacement highly discouraged Two factors generate eligibility points: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Building Status Local Contribution

Old vs. New
Ranking Methods: F

Old	New
C-2: Energy Projects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Age of Campus C-4: Renewal of Existing Facilities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Age of Campus 	F: Institutional Support Modernization <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replacement highly discouraged Two factors generate eligibility points: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Building Status Local Contribution

Old vs. New
Ranking Methods: D-1

Old	New
C-1: PE, Performing Arts, Child Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Age of Campus 	D: PE, Performing Arts, Child Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Four factors generate eligibility points: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Age of Site Program/Services Benefit Project Design Local Contribution

Old vs. New
Ranking Methods: D-2

Old	New
C-2: Cafeterias, Maintenance Shops, Warehouses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Age of Campus C-3: Other Facilities for a Complete Campus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Age of Campus 	D-2: Other facilities for a complete campus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four factors generate eligibility points: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Age of Site 2. Program/Services Benefit 3. Project Design 4. Local Contribution

Proposed Education Bond

\$12 billion in each November 2002 & 2004 ballot:

- \$9.6 billion for K-12
- \$2.4 billion for Higher Education
 - ❖ \$866 million for Community Colleges
 - ❖ \$667 million for California State University
 - ❖ \$667 million for University of California
 - ❖ \$100 million for Joint Projects
 - ❖ \$100 million for New Campuses and Centers

Energy Initiatives

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$49 million to reimburse colleges for increased energy costs or energy conservation projects in 2000-01 and 2001-02
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 9 California Community College projects funded with \$8 million from Energy Commission's 3% loan program
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$357,000 grant from PG&E for HVAC training in Northern California:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 150 student scholarships
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 150 faculty staff fellowships
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other statewide partnerships and trainings