

2030 PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE – MEETING NOTES

Friday, September 18, 2015

8:30 – 10:00 pm, Doyle 4246

Attending: Kris Abrahamson, Rick Call, Frank Chong, Li Collier (for Ricardo Navarrette), Debbie Eakins (for Hilleary Izard), Robert Ethington, Robin Fautley, Karen Frindell Teuscher, Karen Furukawa, KC Greaney, Lee Martin, Ellen Maremont Silver, Kathleen Matthies, Jerry Miller, Joshua Pinaula, Doug Roberts, Jane Saldana-Talley, Leigh Sata, Eric Thompson, Julie Thompson, Alicia Virtue

Absent: Deb Albers, Scott Conrad, Eli Eggar, Tony Ichsan, Hilleary Izard, Kate McClintock, Terry Mulcaire, Ricardo Navarrette, Mary Kay Rudolph

Guests: Jeanne Fadelli

| Agenda Items | Discussion | Follow up |
|--|---|-----------|
| 1. Welcome/Introductions - Member Update - Outcomes/Agenda | Jane welcomed the 2030 Plan Steering Committee and acknowledged proxies in attendance. Dr. Chong spoke about his vision for the process and thanked Trustee Rick Call for agreeing to serve on this committee. Dr. Chong shared news that the state was moving forward with a \$9 billion facilities bond initiative that could provide \$2 billion to California Community Colleges. SRJC has the science building project in the queue and could receive up to \$30 million if the bond passes. Those funds would allow us to get further down on our list of priorities. | |
| 2. Continuous Process Improvement (CPI) | Aside from the obvious concern about when the process will begin and how employees and students can get involved, members brought forward ‘rumors’ concerning specific projects and whether or not those projects would be included on the final project list. Dr. Chong and Leigh Sata assured members that no decisions have been made and the process would remain open and transparent. | |
| 3. Internal Communications – Basecamp Collaboration Tool | Alicia Virtue was tasked to research and recommend tools we might use for internal collaboration. She explored several, including the Lib Guide used for | |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | <p>the strategic planning process, and likes Basecamp. She provided a brief demonstration. This tool would only be used for internal communication and collaboration. Participants must ask to be invited; not open to the community. Susan Brouwer will provide administrative support and serve as the point of contact. Basecamp will be used as a place to see ideas, architects and plans as we are working inside our college community. Very transparent and easy to work with, no learning curve at all.</p> <p>The expense is nominal: \$50 per year. Susan tasked with adding members to Basecamp site as they are requested. Robin was concerned that it will not be secure and public may see. Alicia assured that it will only be internal to SRJC; participants must be invited or ask to be invited. Susan will control that part of it.</p> <p>Leigh noted that Susan is also working on a website that will be open to the external community for information as we go along. This will include information about the Citizens Bond Oversight Committee (CBOC) and how Measure H funds are allocated.</p> | |
| <p>4. Communications Sub-Committee – Next Steps</p> | <p>Members agreed it was time for Dr. Chong to send an email message to dl.staff.all to update the college community on progress today.</p> | |
| <p>5. Facilities Master Plan (FMP) Selection Committee -Selection/Interview Process</p> | <p>Leigh Sata reviewed the process for selecting a firm to complete the facilities master plan. A Request for Proposals/Qualifications (RFP/Q) has gone out. Interested firms submit a Statement of Qualifications (SOQ) and those are then reviewed much like the process used to hire new employees by a Selection Committee consisting of two faculty, two managers, two classified staff, one student, and one Board member. Leigh Sata will facilitate. The committee will use a scoring system. SOQ's will be vetted by Tony and Leigh for technical qualifications. The Selection Committee will then interview all qualified firms (probably six or so) and the committee will forward three to Dr. Chong. The goal is to recommend a firm to the Board of Trustees at the November meeting. Constituent group members of the Steering Committee</p> | |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>(faculty, classified, student) were asked to work together to decide how and who would be appointed to the Selection Committee.</p> | |
| <p>6. Connecting the Educational Master Plan (EMP) to the Facilities Master Plan (FMP) – “Bridging” Document</p> | <p>Concerns were shared about the STEM building and new science building; will we still get it if we do not get the State of California matching? If we get the State Bond, that will be around \$30 million. We will leverage. State Bond is in process right now.</p> <p>There are rumors out there that there will be no new science building. Leigh thanked everyone for keeping us informed about staff/faculty concerns so we can continue to address those concerns in our communications.</p> <p>There are several different aspects of science programs, including the Agriculture program, will all of these be addressed?</p> <p>Dr. Chong expressed that construction prices are going up due to a building boom and the economy, we need to get started asap to take advantage of the current costs as they will increase. There are other local community colleges that did not have a local bond in place and now are trying to scramble to pass one to take advantage of the State Bond that will match funds. Dr. Chong, Tony and Leigh talked with other colleges at the CCFC conference. We do not know if we will get it the State Bond money yet. Need to check out other local JC’s that have done this.</p> <p>Question: If we don’t get the State of CA money, will we still build a STEM building?</p> <p>Ellen: We should include a sub-committee focused on safety issues.</p> <p>Leigh: We still have some Measure A projects that did not get done, we need to revisit that and be sure to include them.</p> | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>Leigh: We want each building we are working on to have “faculty champions” these people will be the ones we go to make decisions about the buildings. Statement: We should have faculty and classified staff champions. Especially necessary to have a classified champion as they will be in touch with aspects that faculty are not.</p> <p>Leigh: We would like to get started on some smaller projects, like new furniture and picking paint colors by spring 2016. Perhaps launch some demonstration classrooms where student and faculty can test out furniture and various teaching/learning environments. We will get furniture and equipment manufacturers in for a demo “butt” day to test out chairs, etc. They will come in and do a furniture and fixtures fair. There are all kinds of specialty companies out there that have chairs and other items of furniture. We can have them come and give us demonstrations.</p> <p>Leigh: Consider students who are already coming from high schools that have “switched over” to more flexible learning environments coming to SRJC for a degree and in facilities that are not up to date; will not be a draw. Consider some “Starbucks” areas, places where students can study and lounge.</p> <p>Statement: if we want to drive enrollment we will need to upgrade our facilities. We want students to come in and want to come to SRJC and that will require upgrading.</p> <p>Leigh: We need to assess which programs are most important in the community? Dental? Culinary? All of the community depends on SRJC. Get in contact with community to find out some of the biggest areas, take that into consideration when we grow.</p> | |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>Dr. Chong: Roseland Southwest Center; we need to decide if we continue to rent or make a permanent facility. That area is growing and the Southwest Center is not yet permanent.</p> <p>Dr. Chong: met with HSI Task Force and demographic trends will be important.</p> <p>Dr. Chong – “don’t put your fresh perspective away”</p> <p>IPP (Initial Project Proposal) and FPP (Final Project Proposal) – FTES growth – identify areas that will require upgrades.</p> <p>ADA ISSUES – Need to consider buildings that are not ADA compliant now.</p> | |
| 7. Proposed Subcommittee Opportunities | Opportunities for Participation: IT, Sustainability, ADA Plan, Fixture, Fittings and Equipment (FFE), Architectural standards, Signage and Graphics, Maintenance and Operations (Facilities). | |
| 8. Principles for the Process – Final DRAFT Review - Robin | Robin led a final review of the Principles for the Facilities Master Planning process. With minor edits, the principles were approved. Copies of the final version will be distributed. | Robin will finalize and send to Susan for distribution. |
| 9. Stakeholders – Final DRAFT Review - Eric | Eric led a final review of the list of Stakeholders. With no edits, the list was approved. | |

Next Meeting: Friday, October 16 – 8:30 – 10:00 am – Doyle 4246

Notes submitted by Susan Brouwer