Workgroup 15: Special Focus on Centers and Sites
December 2012 Update and Action Plan for Accreditation Report

Introduction:
Given the references to centers and sites throughout the ACCJC Recommendations, the Interim Chancellor formed a "special focus" workgroup #15 to look specifically at issues concerning CCSF centers and sites. The goal of the workgroup since August 2012 has been to analyze and assess the issues regarding centers and sites as referenced in the accreditation recommendations and to identify and collect data necessary for a fiscal and programmatic analysis of them.

The references to centers appears in several of the Recommendations, primarily in Workgroup 1 (Mission), Workgroup 2 (Effective Planning Process), Workgroup 5 (Student Services), Workgroup 8 (Physical Resources), and Workgroup 10 (Financial Planning), and it was felt that the work would be better coordinated and more effective if addressed by a single group. Workgroup 15 members include the Chancellor in addition to administrators, staff, faculty, and student representatives.

The following is a list of centers that the committee has focused on:
- Airport
- Chinatown/North Beach
- Civic Center
- Downtown
- Evans
- Fort Mason
- John Adams
- Mission
- Southeast

Update:
Since August, members of the group have met and collected the following information, which has begun the process of allowing them to complete a programmatic analysis of each center:
- Centers defined
- Foundation Grants reviewed
- Real estate value assessed
- Data regarding program and course offerings/sections per center
- Student data by center (including zip codes)

To date, the committee has also reviewed other information about the cost and productivity of each center. These data have been in a variety of formats with a range of information. Since the goal is to create a cohesive plan in a standardized format that can give CCSF and external stakeholders a programmatic analysis of and operational costs for each center, a template was provided to each Dean to collect data deemed relevant for analysis and the final report. This information should be provided to the workgroup before the end of the year.

The workgroup also needs to understand the productivity potential for each center and,
therefore, needs a solid understanding of Center Utilization/Capacity of each center. These data are not easily gathered right now, but it will be necessary to gather them before the analysis and final report are complete.

In related workgroup studies, Workgroup 5 – Student Services has focused on planning steps to conduct a comprehensive review and assessment of all student support services across the entire District, including the main campus and all centers. This effort is specific to the task identified in Recommendation 5 for the College to communicate plans for delivery and prioritization of student services regardless of location but also pertains to the work being completed in Workgroup #15.

A calendar and specific steps were finalized at Workgroup 5’s September 26, 2012 meeting. Preliminary discussion and planning are focused on a process to ensure the development of guiding principles to identify needed support services; a definitive process designed to engage students and all student services personnel, including faculty, classified staff, and administrators; and a process to conduct needs and cost analyses of the delivery of services.

The review and assessment will provide opportunity for input from all constituent groups through focus groups led by administrators within Student Services. Findings and recommendations resulting from the review and assessment will be presented to the accreditation steering committee in early Spring 2013 and will inform the future plans for student services at all the CCSF centers.

In other related matters, Workgroup 8 – Physical Resources has been examining the costs of ownership associated with the District’s physical resources. To understand how the annual budget items pertained to District facilities and maintenance, the workgroup reviewed the College’s annual budget and major chart of accounts. This review revealed several challenges related to center based budgeting, confirming that the College has not had a practice of allocating or expending money by campus/center.

In light of this challenge, Workgroup 8 looked to other college models for facilities/physical plant plans. Through consensus, the workgroup felt that the College would benefit from developing and implementing a Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) model for its campus and centers. In reviewing documents from Santa Monica College, Workgroup 8 found a model that incorporated principles based on the Association of Physical Plant Administrators (APPA) staffing standards. It was decided that APPA staffing standards could be utilized by the College to determine appropriate levels of staffing in Buildings and Grounds, Facilities, Custodial services and the like. This TCO Model will be used in Workgroup 15’s efforts to analyze center’s costs.

Finally, Workgroup 7 – Human Resources is currently looking at the level of administrative and staff support for centers beyond the Ocean Campus and will report back during the early 2013 timeframe (Check with Gohar??).

Several concrete steps already been made concerning CCSF sites. The Board approved three recommendations related to site closures on September 27, 2012. The first was to consolidate the course offerings that had been offered at the Castro site (approximately
20-25 sections) to other centers throughout the city. The Castro site was located at a junior high school that operated as a College site in the evening. This move will allow the classes to be offered in a more appropriate facility for higher education and provide cost savings from cancelation of rent and reduction of staff time needed to oversee the facility.

Coincidentally, these classrooms contain District-owned furniture that was desperately needed at other sites in order to increase classroom capacity and increase productivity. The College ceased buying new desks/chairs several years ago, and some faculty have indicated a willingness to accept additional students in their classes if more chairs were available.

Similar to the first recommendation regarding the Castro site, the second recommendation was to relocate classes currently offered at the two Park Presidio sites to other centers.

The third recommendation was to immediately begin the process of pursuing options for generating revenue from the 33 Gough Street property. This property is in a prime location for development, located one block off of Market Street. The facility does not receive a Foundation Grant and houses fiscal and administrative staff. The goal is to relocate those staff to other District-owned property.

Organizational changes to help streamline the reporting structure of the Centers have also been already made: three interim Vice Chancellors reverted to their previous status, two as Deans and one as Associate Vice Chancellor. The administrators responsible for centers resided within both Academic Affairs and Student Development, which created reporting inefficiencies. The new structure will streamline reporting lines and create greater cost efficiencies as the College continues to work on the organizational structure for the layers beneath the Vice Chancellors.

WORKGROUP #15 MEETING SUMMARY:
Workgroup #15 has met five times since August (check with Gohar??). Below is a summary of the material covered in each meeting.

During the first meeting, on August 17, 2012, members introduced themselves and the Chancellor explained the initial charge of the workgroup. Members reviewed the many references to centers and sites found within the recommendations. The workgroup focused on further defining its charge, exploring possible activities, and identifying the kinds of information necessary to conduct an analysis of CCSF’s centers and sites. The Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration provided an overview of the types of centers and sites the college utilizes, e.g. Category A (College and Centers that receive Foundation Grants); Category B (leased sites, no foundation grants and pay significant rent); Category C (leased sites, no foundation grant, pay very little amount of rent); Category D (owned sites).

On September 6, 2012, the Deans of the centers and sites provided background information and reports about each of their centers, including what sections are offered, programs and/or departments represented, how many faculty teach, how many staff
work there, hours of operation, how space is used and what student populations are served. They presented their information in different formats with varying levels of detail.

At the **October 29** meeting, several topics were discusses to further investigate the finances and management of resources for each center:

FCMAT Findings and Analysis – The group discussed the plan to develop accounting protocols and criteria to evaluate and change descriptions of off-campus locations and to account for expenditures to figure out real costs. The group reviewed FCMAT data concerning the foundation grant funds for the Ocean Campus and state-approved centers and the costs for rent, utilities and enrollment.

Course Sections/FTES/Productivity per Center – The committee discussed the data that Pam Mery handed out concerning section count by center and FTEs, including:

a. What neighborhoods students attending come from for each center. The committee discussed the data that Pam Mery provided about student attendance at each center by neighborhood zip code to help determine how students would be effected if CCSF decided to close certain centers. The group discussed the data and whether students cluster around a center or if they go to a program they are interested in no matter where it is held. Is there a unique draw to each center?

b. Center Utilization/Productivity – The group discussed how to track center capacity and determined that the group needed more information about center utilization when looking at the possibility of consolidation of classes. Currently, there is no centralized place to get this information. Peter Goldstein and JoAnne Low are gathering the utilization information for the centers for the January 2013 meeting.

c. Total Cost of Operation draft – Dean Bell passed out a physical resources report outlining what it would cost to run a center. There wasn’t enough data to determine what it currently costs to run each center. The group agreed that they needed to figure out the current staffing and facility costs per center to determine a baseline figure, including rent, utilities, staff and other budget items.

At the end of the meeting, Dr. Thelma Scott-Skillman asked the deans to identify a baseline of these costs in a cost estimate template that she was going to provide to them. The group would have a standardized format for each center to more accurately understand and analyze the data. The workgroup would review the data in those templates at the next meeting.

At the **November 13** meeting, Center Deans were present to discuss the costs associated with their Centers and to share the cost estimate template. The group underlined the need to understand cost issues associated with centers template to make it simpler to ID these costs. The Deans shared their experience about using the template to reflect current costs, including:
• questions about faculty split assignments
• the fact that faculty assignments do not necessarily reflect productivity due to the cost difference among faculty
• a confusion over the combination of 11–12 FTEF and FTES data with the 12–13 costs data. The group did agree that using last year’s budget data would not the most relevant approach. An example of this is that the current staffing for the new Chinatown center is much different from the old Chinatown center.
• the need for more direction on what the program will be at each site to be viable (?? Ck with Gohar for meaning)
• that it was a tedious exercise

There was discussion about the purpose for the completing the cost estimates. The response was that there was a need to have more informed discussions on centers and their productivity. The intention of the template was not be exact since data change but to start with a standard format for comparison purposes.

There was consensus that an average faculty cost would be easier to use to complete the template. Peter Goldstein said that he would provide the average costs per FTEF (FT & PT combined) for 11–12; other costs used in the template should be actual costs for 12-13.

At the December 4 meeting, the workgroup discussed each of the Center’s updated templates and raised questions concerning which average faculty cost should be used and how to determine benefit costs for staff. The templates were approaching a standardized form, but Deans were asked to refine the work one more time for the final meeting of the year on December 10.

NEXT STEPS:
The following needs to be gathered by Workgroup #15 in order to complete a report that provides a fiscal and programmatic analysis of CCSF’s centers:
• All center data from standardized template collected, reviewed and analyzed
• Human Resources allocation examined
• Standardized template of center utilization/productivity collected
• Standardized template of center utilization/productivity analyzed
• Consideration of the proximity to alternative locations/transportation
• A business plan for each center
• List of options for more cost-effectively and efficiently serving students generated (for example: consolidation, elimination, property sales, property leases, etc.)

Challenges to Managing Centers:
The group should also recommend ways the college can provide Deans the tools that will help them better manage going forward, including how to:
• Implement Total Cost of Operation Model
• Measure cost/productivity
• Accurately do Enrollment Management
• Create a more systematic planning process at each center
• Manage employees and class sections, including:
- Employees whose managers are absent from the center
- Creating clarity about who evaluates classified employees
- Providing a feedback loop concerning employee performance
- Scheduling employees
- Scheduling classes

**Final Report:**
Given that many factors within the other Recommendations will affect the analysis of this workgroup (e.g., administrative structure, staffing plans, financial decisions, and board direction), this analysis is to a certain extent dependent upon the outcomes of other decisions. The ultimate outcome of this will be recommendations for a comprehensive set of options for serving students as cost-effectively and efficiently as possible.