Standard III.B: Physical Resources

Physical resources, which include facilities, equipment, land, and other assets, support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness. Physical resource planning is integrated with institutional planning.

III.B.1. The institution provides safe and sufficient physical resources that support and assure the integrity and quality of its programs and services, regardless of location or means of delivery.

III.B.1.a. The institution plans, builds, maintains, and upgrades or replaces its physical resources in a manner that assures effective utilization and the continuing quality necessary to support its programs and services.

Descriptive Summary

City College of San Francisco provides safe and sufficient physical resources at nine owned campuses and more than 100 rented sites throughout the City and County of San Francisco. The District owns the facilities on the Ocean Avenue, John Adams, Downtown, Civic Center and Evans campuses and the District Offices at Gough Street. The Airport Campus building is owned by the District, but is on leased land. The Mission Campus is on a site owned by the San Francisco Unified School District via a 75-year ground lease with an option for a 24-year extension beyond that time period. The Chinatown/North Beach, Southeast, Fort Mason, and Castro/Valencia facilities are all leased [III B-1]. The Chinatown/North Beach Campus is currently under construction on a site that the District owns will be a District-owned campus. The current Chinatown/North Beach, Southeast, Fort Mason, and Castro/Valencia facilities are all leased. Since the last accreditation, facility improvement work that ensures the integrity and quality of College programs and services has been undertaken at every site owned by the District [III B-1].

A successful bond initiative earned the approval of more than sixty percent of San Francisco voters in 2005, providing $246 million for facilities over the next several years. Prior to the 2005 bond initiative, the District’s only significant financial resources for improving its physical resources were $50 million from a local bond passed in 1997 and $195 million from a local bond passed in 2001. The District leveraged the $491 million obtained from these three local bonds to apply for and receive $185 million in state matching funds, bringing total resources from these sources to $696 million. The District is also seeking to raise private funding to support the construction of new facilities and renovation of others [III B-2, III B-3, III B-4].

A Facilities Master Plan has guided the institution in the planning, construction, maintenance, and upgrades and replacement of District physical resources since 2004, when it was adopted by the Board of Trustees. While a variety of factors drive the need for a systematic analysis and planning approach, the City and County of San Francisco also requires a Facilities Master Plan every ten years. The CCSF Master Plan, developed with
the assistance of a facilities planning firm experienced in college master plan development, provides a comprehensive strategy for the development of grounds and facilities to meet the College’s needs for enrollment growth, access and traffic concerns, and improving aging facilities, through the year 2015. The plan evaluated existing campus conditions relative to institutional needs, and recommended ways to organize and phase short- to long-term campus development to meet those needs. This Master Plan focused on the Ocean Avenue Campus, and also discussed planned changes at all CCSF sites and projects. The Plan has guided decision making regarding the location and timing of facilities and supporting infrastructure. It also includes guidelines for site, building, and landscape design that provide a tool for steering and evaluating the preparation of facility proposals [III B-5]. The combination of local support for the 1997, 2001, and 2005 initiatives, along with state funding enabled the College to make significant progress in the implementation of this Master Plan [III B-1].

Since the last Self Study, several large facility projects have been successfully completed in support of student learning programs, including the Mission Campus, renovation of both buildings at the John Adams Campus, renovations at the Downtown and Evans campuses, and ADA improvements at all College-owned campuses. In addition, on the Ocean Campus, the College’s single largest site, four new facilities have been completed: the Osher Child Development Center, the Student Health Services Building, the Health and Wellness Center, and the Multi-Use Building. Many smaller renovation projects have been completed at the Ocean Campus as well.

Construction began on the permanent Chinatown/North Beach Campus during 2010 and will be completed during Spring 2012. One of the future projects the College intends to construct is a new Performing Arts Center Complex (PAC). The College has secured its share of funds for this project from a local bond measure, and the state recently committed to funding the project in the 2011-12 California State Budget.

While bond funding and additional state dollars leveraged as a result of the local bond made it easier for the College to address the problems associated with many of the aging facilities, additional resources are needed to cover the costs of upgrades and repairs that have not yet occurred. At this time, the District plans to leverage additional state support through a future local bond. A date for a future local bond measure has not been determined but is expected within the next few years.

It should be noted that the College’s bond program has included the creation of a Citizens Oversight Committee as required by law. This independent group meets at least four times per year and issues its own independent report on bond-funded projects. In addition, the Board of Trustees’ Facilities Infrastructure and Technology Committee (FIT) meets monthly and includes all bond-funded projects on its agenda. The FIT Committee reviews formal resolutions to spend bond funds and recommends approval or disapproval to the full Board of Trustees on such items.

In cooperation with the State Chancellor’s Office, the College undertook a major effort to inventory and assess the condition of all of its buildings during the 2003 fiscal year, and then
again in 2010. The result is a comprehensive report on the physical state of all existing facilities, the District Facility Condition Assessment Report. This report is the basis from which the College submits applications to the state for funding maintenance and renovation projects. The College has begun to undertake maintenance and renovation projects cited in the report [III B-5, III B-7].

The data in the 2010 District Facility Condition Assessment Report include a Facilities Conditions Index (FCI), for each facility. The FCI is the ratio of the repair cost to the replacement value of the facility. An assessment of ten percent or greater is considered poor and a score of five percent or lower is considered good. It is recommended that facilities with an FCI rating of 60 to 70 be replaced instead of repaired. As a result of these findings, the District set a higher priority on plans for renovating and replacing facilities with the worst conditions. Forty bungalows that exceeded an FCI rating of 60 percent have been slated for replacement and 17 of those have already been removed.

The Report showed many of the District’s older facilities are in poor condition and stated an overall FCI of 37.4 percent [III B-7 p.1]. Given that 20 of the 32 buildings assessed were constructed prior to 1975, and in need of repairs, a somewhat low rating is to be expected. Some older facilities, such as the John Adams Campus main building, have been renovated since the last Self Study [III B-5].

While the 2005 bond provided some of the needed funds for modernization projects, another local bond issue will be needed to complete this effort. This is certainly the case for the Science Building, which has an FCI of 74 percent, and where more than $50 million is required for renovation work to replace elevator, mechanical, and electrical systems and interior finishes and furnishings that have exceeded their useful service life and are failing [III B-7 p.18]. Similarly, additional funds of at least $40.5 million will be needed to modernize the Horticulture, Creative Arts, Arts Extension, and Visual Arts and Horticulture buildings, which were constructed between 1960 and 1972. Many of the remaining original building system components are at least 40 years old and in need of repair or replacement.

The District Facility Condition Assessment Report suggests that in a ten-year period from 2010 through 2020, the District could expend more than $180 million to maintain or replace existing facilities to provide a reasonable FCI rating of less than ten percent [III B-5]. It can be concluded that renovation of the District’s older buildings, such as Science Hall and Civic Center Campus, would be significant expenditures. These buildings have not had any extensive renovation or refurbishing similar in scope to the 2008-09 John Adams Campus modernization. Any necessary replacement of the original building systems in these aged buildings would be a costly capital improvement, and any limited state funding may also require supplementation by other funding sources. Because of limited funds, it may be worthwhile to evaluate which aged, aging facilities should be selected for modernization, and which may be taken offline after the construction of the 2005 bond projects.
bond-funded new facilities has been completed.

Self Evaluation

The College meets this Standard.

City College of San Francisco provides safe and sufficient physical resources. The District has developed major new facilities and improved existing facilities that promote student learning and achievement. There has been significant participation in the facilities-planning processes through regular Shared Governance activities as well as user groups for design and remodeling of specific facilities. The College has successfully secured state funding for one additional project and another bond initiative is planned to secure funding to meet the objectives of the Facilities Master Plan.

The physical resources at all locations where the College offers courses, programs, and services are constructed and maintained to assure access, safety, security, and a healthful learning and working environment. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of physical resources and uses the results of the evaluations as the basis for improvement. Additional funding will be needed to upgrade some of the District’s older buildings, such as Science Hall and the Civic Center Campus, or these facilities will continue to deteriorate. In addition, projects that have been put on hold from previous bond issues will need to be completed before new ones are attempted, such as the Environmental Horticulture/Floristry Center and the Broadcasting and Visual Arts buildings.

The Facilities Master Plan has guided the institution in the planning, building, maintenance, and upgrading and replacing of its physical resources since 2004, when it was adopted by the Board of Trustees. In cooperation with the State Chancellor’s Office, the College undertook a major effort to inventory and assess the condition of all of its buildings during fiscal year 2003 and then again in 2010. The result is the comprehensive District Facility Condition Assessment Report, which showed that many of the District’s older facilities are in poor condition. The report stated the overall FCI was 37.4 percent [III B-7 p.1]. The College has begun to undertake maintenance and renovation projects cited in the report. While bond funding and additional state dollars leveraged as a result of the local bond made it easier for the College to address the problems associated with many of the aging facilities, additional resources are needed to cover the costs of upgrades and repairs that have not yet occurred.

The College should plan for an upcoming local bond issue for upgrades and repairs and replacement or new facilities.

Planning Agenda

Implement the recommendations of the 2010 District Facility Condition Assessment Report. None.

2. Plan for an upcoming local bond issue for upgrades and repairs and replacement or new facilities.
III.B.1.b. The institution assures that the physical resources at all locations where it offers courses, programs, and services are constructed and maintained to assure access, safety, security, and a healthful learning and working environment.

Descriptive Summary

The dramatic efforts the College has made to improve physical resources demonstrates its commitment to providing a state-of-the-art environment for student learning programs and services, in addition to improving access, safety, and security, and creating a healthful learning and working environment. Completed projects and those, such as the Performing Arts Center Complex, that have not yet begun, are developed to support and advance student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness.

In addition to constructing new facilities, major renovation and maintenance projects are undertaken every year on District campuses to support academic programs. During 2008-10, more than $18 million was expended to improve access for students with mobility disabilities. In addition to the ADA work, other renovation projects have included the creation of dedicated spaces for the Asian Pacific American Student Success (APASS), Math Engineering Science Achievement (MESA) and TULAY: Filipino-American Success programs as well as a Veterans Educational Transition Services (VETS) center. The Multi-Use Building, completed in 2010, includes two new parking lots and crosswalks with traffic lights to ensure better traffic flow and pedestrian safety.

Finally, work is undertaken on an ongoing basis to maintain the quality, safety, and function of the buildings. These efforts are conducted both by District employees in the Department of Buildings and Grounds as well as on a work-order basis with the City’s Department of Public Works.

The Facilities Construction and Planning Office is responsible for directing and coordinating all projects concerning physical resources; this includes planning new facilities as well as undertaking major maintenance and renovation projects each year. This office closely coordinates efforts with the College’s Buildings and Grounds Department, which is responsible for maintaining facilities and undertaking minor repair projects. The Buildings and Grounds Department includes Custodial Services, which is responsible for keeping the facilities clean. These functions are all a part of the organization overseen by the College’s Vice-Chancellor for Finance and Administration. Security is provided by the Campus Police Department, which reports directly to the Chancellor’s Office.

Self Evaluation

The College meets this Standard.

The dramatic efforts the College has made Improvements to improve physical resources in the last six years demonstrate its commitment to providing a state-of-the-art environment for student learning programs and
services, in addition to improving access, safety, and security and creating a healthful learning and working environment. Projects completed to date and Physical resource improvement projects such as the Performing Arts Center, that have not yet been started, are developed to support and advance student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness.

**Planning Agenda**

None.

**III.B.2.** To assure the feasibility and effectiveness of physical resources in supporting institutional programs and services, the institution plans and evaluates its facilities and equipment on a regular basis, taking utilization and other relevant data into account.

**III.B.2.a.** Long-range capital plans support institutional goals and reflect projections of the total cost of ownership of new facilities and equipment.

**Descriptive Summary**

The College’s major facilities planning documents are linked with the Facilities Master Plan, the Annual Plan and the Strategic Plan. In addition, on an annual basis all departments and major cost centers state their facilities needs and goals in their Program Review reports. For long-range facilities planning, the College is linking the Program Review process, which gathers feedback directly from the programs and departments, more closely with the Facilities Master Plan. Departments are asked to develop clear statements about the need for and the impact of new facilities, major renovations, and new equipment on their departments and programs. All requests require supporting utilization and other data that substantiate need. As all College programs and departments continue to participate in the annual Program Review process, the planning and assessment “feedback loop” will be more streamlined, which will ensure evaluation of the facilities and equipment on a regular basis, taking utilization and other relevant data into account in how the College supports academic programs and student support services [III B-1, III B-6, III B-7, III B-8, III B-9].

The Facilities Review Committee (FRC) makes recommendations on both long-range and short-range facilities plans for all College campuses based upon the College’s priorities. The Committee meets on a regular basis to solicit ideas from faculty, staff, administrators, and students for major and minor facilities projects and equipment upgrades [III B-10].

In the past, the College’s efforts to provide for the total cost of ownership, a concept that seeks to measure not just the cost of planning and construction but also the cost of operating a facility over its expected lifetime, have been limited. More recently, the College established a users’ group for design review and total cost of ownership in the planning for the College’s next project, the new Performing Arts Education Center Complex [III B-11][A6].

In support of institutional goals and cost effectiveness of physical facilities, the College has
dedicated considerable energy to improving its operation of physical resources by developing the physical facilities component of a Sustainability Plan that the Board of Trustees adopted in December 2009. The College has become more proactive with respect to environmental issues surrounding new construction while trying to drive long-term energy cost savings. In all of its current projects, the College has directed its architectural teams to incorporate conservation of resources in their final designs to the extent that construction budgets allow. Sustainable design, planning, architecture, indoor/outdoor environment, and Leadership in Energy and Building Design (LEED) Green Building standards are addressed in the 2004 Facilities Master Plan approved by the Board. The College is proud that the Multi-Use Building, completed in July 2010, is expected to receive a LEED Gold rating. The Chinatown/North Beach Campus when completed in 2012 is expected to receive a LEED Gold rating as well.

Self Evaluation

The College meets this Standard.

The College plans rather comprehensively for upgrading, replacing, and maintaining its facilities and major equipment. Moreover, it has developed part of a Sustainability Plan. However, the College’s past efforts to provide for the total cost of ownership have been limited. More recently, the College established a users’ group for design review and total cost of ownership in the planning for its next project, the new Performing Arts Education Center-Complex. The College should continue to focus efforts on determining total cost of ownership for all upcoming building projects.

Planning Agenda

Focus efforts on determining total cost of ownership for all upcoming building projects.

None.

III.B.2.b. Physical resource planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of physical resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement.

Descriptive Summary

The College has integrated facilities planning into its institutional planning process while systematically assessing the effective use of physical resources and using those results as a basis for improvement. Fostering a strategic approach to addressing the physical resource needs of its students, faculty, and staff, this process makes effective use of the College’s Shared Governance System, including the planning and budgeting process, to evaluate and, when possible, to dedicate resources to these needs.

The College’s Shared Governance Facilities Review Committee actively participated in the
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development of the Facilities Master Plan. Adopted in 2004, this ten-year plan for building, replacing, and renovating College facilities was developed with the assistance of a facilities planning firm experienced in college master plan development [III B-1]. The District has other assessment mechanisms for evaluating the feasibility and effectiveness of physical resources in supporting institutional programs and services. For example, the District Facility Condition Assessment Report, which was discussed earlier in this Standard, provides a periodic inventory and assessment of the physical condition of all buildings [III B-1, III B-5, III B-10].

The College also has an extensive strategic planning process for the construction of new facilities and the upgrading and maintenance of existing facilities. Each year the Shared Governance Facilities Review Committee recommends to the Board of Trustees projects to be submitted to the California State Chancellor’s Office in priority order for capital project funding. This list, commonly known as the Five-Year Construction Plan, is submitted to the Board of Trustees for approval early in the spring of each year. Upon approval by the Board of Trustees, the plan is then submitted to the State Chancellor’s Office [III B-439].

Physical resource planning is also fully integrated into the College’s yearly institutional planning process. Shared Governance committees meet at regular intervals throughout the semester to discuss and evaluate facilities needs. The committees involved in this discussion include: the Facilities Review Committee (FRC); the Sustainability Subcommittee; the Campus Projects Subcommittee; the Parking and Traffic Subcommittee; the Works of Art Subcommittee; and the Health and Safety Subcommittee. There are also regular reviews, such as the bi-annual insurance safety inspection report, and special reports, such as the annual space inventory and facilities condition reports, that assess the use of College facilities. As discussed earlier in this report, the annual Program Review reports from departments and major cost centers also describe their facilities needs and goals. Recommendations from the annual Program Review for facilities upgrade and maintenance are usually based on faculty and staff input related to improving the physical environment for student learning.

For example, the Works of Arts Committee, a subcommittee of the FRC, operates in conjunction with other facilities-related committees to obtain, maintain, and enhance the many works of art associated with the College. Since the last Self Study-, CCSF has acquired several new pieces of art, including the Whale Fountain on the main Ocean Campus, the “Our Work Our Life” mural at the Evans Campus, the large Aztec Calendar on the front of the new Mission Campus, as well as other murals, lithographs, and even some dinosaur skeletons. Restorations of mosaics, murals, sculptures, and busts have been completed. A critically needed physical assessment of the Diego Rivera mural is planned. Other projects to bring more art to District campuses are also in progress. Some of these works of art, such as the Diego Rivera mural, are integrated into the curriculum [III B-1410].

Integrated planning is also accomplished through the planning, budgeting, and assessment system that is led by the shared governance College Planning and Budget Council [III B-4511]. The planning process begins with the Strategic Plan, which is supplemented by the Facilities Master Plan, Technology Plan, and Sustainability Plan. From the Strategic Plan,
other more detailed plans are developed, such as the Annual Plan, Annual Budget, and Assessment Reports. This system-wide evaluation, planning, and implementation process fully integrates physical resources as a component. This process assures that physical resources are designed and used to meet the College’s educational mission.

The College actively seeks input from the general public on major facilities projects. The College specifically sought public input and support for the District Facilities Master Plan by conducting multiple public hearings as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and by offering multiple community-outreach meetings that were not required by CEQA. The College works with many neighborhood groups and city agencies to integrate its facilities plans with the City’s General Plan and neighborhood planning goals [III B-16].

Since the last Self Study, the College has significantly improved communications related to facilities across departments and offices. The Facilities Review Committee and its Campus Projects Subcommittee review all plans and proposals for both renovations and new construction. In addition, each major facility has a Building Users Group (BUG) that develops needs proposals for departments and building users. Before any facility has major changes implemented, the BUG group must be consulted. This process has promoted more meaningful interactions between the Office of Academic Affairs and the Office of Facilities and Planning to assure the quality of programs and services as well as the health and safety of students.

Self Evaluation

The College meets this Standard.

The College has integrated facilities planning into its institutional planning process while assessing the effective use of physical resources and using the results obtained from a variety of sources (e.g., BUG groups, Program Review, the District Facility Condition Assessment Report, and strategic planning processes) as a basis for improvement.

Planning Agenda

1. Review the need for a more formal evaluation process for systematically assessing the effective use of physical resources and using those results as a basis for improvement.
2. Complete the physical assessment of the Diego Rivera mural.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard III.B Evidence</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<p>| Reference | Title | Hard Copy | Web Address |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III B-1</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>District Facilities Master Plan, June 10, 2004 - Other Campus Plans &amp; Sustainable Planning &amp; Design</th>
<th>Hard Copy</th>
<th>Web Address</th>
<th><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/MP/PDF/0406/04-05_Other_Campus_Plans+Sustainability.pdf">http://www.ccsf.edu/MP/PDF/0406/04-05_Other_Campus_Plans+Sustainability.pdf</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III B-23</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>11/97 General Obligation Bond Election Book list of projects, project schedules and current Controller’s report on budgets, encumbrances &amp; expenditures, August 20042001</td>
<td>X</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/VCFA/bond_info_2001.htm">http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/VCFA/bond_info_2001.htm</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III B-56</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>District Facility Condition Assessment Report, August 29, 20142003[A11]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>