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.

III.B.1.b. The institution assures that 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.

III.B.1. Descriptive Summary. The Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration is responsible for directing and coordinating all projects relating to physical resources. These projects include planning new facilities, as well as undertaking major maintenance and renovation projects each year. The Vice Chancellor also oversees the Maintenance, Buildings, and Grounds Department, which is responsible for maintaining facilities and undertaking minor repair projects. Custodial Services, which is responsible for keeping the facilities clean and operational, is also part of the Maintenance, Buildings, and Grounds Department. The Campus Police Department ensures college-wide security. CCSF appointed an ADA Compliance Director to coordinate and resolve issues regarding access, safety, and security to ensure a healthful learning and working environment.

Centers and Sites. CCSF offers most of its classes at the Ocean Campus, Centers, and Sites. The District owns the following Campus, Centers, and Sites: Ocean Campus, John Adams Center, Chinatown Center, Downtown Center, Alemany Center (Civic Center), Evans Center, and the District Office at 33 Gough Street. The College leases the Mission Center, Southeast Center, Fort Mason Center, and the Airport Site. Additionally, the College offers classes at over 100 other sites. Since the last accreditation report, the College has undertaken some facility improvements (See District Wide Life Cycle of Physical Resources). On September 27, 2012, the Board took action to direct the Interim Chancellor to actively pursue options for generating revenue from the 33 Gough Street property and to relocate class offerings at the Castro Center and two Park Presidio sites to other appropriate Centers. The College has taken action accordingly.

Public Safety. A Chief of Police heads the College’s full-time Public Safety Department that works closely with the San Francisco Police Department (See Appendix A). The District’s Public Safety Department is a state Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST)-certified department under §30.32 (a) of the California Penal Code and provides onsite law enforcement and/or security services at the main Ocean Campus, as well as designated Centers and Sites. City College of San Francisco’s Public Safety Department uses many sources to evaluate the safety of the District’s facilities, including, but not limited to, assessing data on calls for service and type, campus population, and hours of operation, as well as monitoring crime statistics for locations within CCSF and within neighboring communities (See Appendix B). Additionally, the Public Safety Department is required to review Query Data in order to track crime trends. The information gathered from the Query Data is often disseminated through electronic means to the campus community.

In the past, the Public Safety Department operated 24 hours. Due to budget cuts, the Department now operates for 19 hours a day. For the locations that do not have Public Safety Officers on site, the Public Safety Department responds on an as-needed basis.
The College has a self-selecting text messaging alert that provides text messages to the College community regarding any emergencies. Approximately 1,000 people have signed up for the self-selecting text messaging alert service. Although this communication is optional, the College encourages its community to select this service to receive instantaneous messages as they arise. The College does not currently have protocols for using the text messaging alert service to ensure timely communication about emergencies.

The College installed alarm systems District wide, and many of the locations have installed video cameras and public announcement systems. The Chief of Police is the lead liaison, along with designated building managers, to set up and monitor the alarms and camera systems where appropriate (See Appendix I). The District also has also contracted with professional alarm companies that specifically provide services such as installation, monitoring, and maintenance.

In 2009, the District appointed an Emergency Preparedness Coordinator to ensure the District’s safety and security. The College has completed an assessment of its Emergency Evaluation Plan (See Appendix M); prepared an Emergency Response Plan Binder (See Appendix N); provided Standardized Emergency Management System (STEM), National Incident Management System (NIMS), and Incident Command System (ICS) Trainings (See Appendix O) along with “table top” exercises; collaborated with the Emergency Operation Center (EOC) for joint training and sharing of resources; created a San Francisco Colleges and Universities Resource Group for Emergency Preparedness; assigned primary Emergency Response Team personnel at each educational Center and Site; hosted Neighborhood Emergency Response Team (NERT) training for the CCSF community; participated in state-wide earthquake drills; and completed several evacuation drills. The College is in the process of updating the Emergency Plan by 2013.

**Facility Safety and Access.** The College formerly used the services of the Statewide Association of Community Colleges (SWACC), which performed regular safety inspections, however, starting in fiscal year 2012-13, the College began using Alliance for Schools Cooperative Insurance Program (ASCIP). CCSF is required to have property and liability insurance coverage in order to conduct the College’s daily operations.

CCSF also evaluates the safety of its facilities by using the Foundation for California Community Colleges-operated “Facilities Utilization Space Inventory Options Net” (FUSION), a web-based suite of tools to support the integrated management and reporting on California community college facilities throughout the state. Every three to five years, staff from the Foundation inspect, assess, and evaluate all District facilities. During this review, a FUSION employee completes a walkthrough of all District classrooms, lecture halls, offices, labs, and other facilities to develop an updated, more accurate, list of the District’s inventory, as well as the current state of usefulness (See Appendix C). FUSION conducted the most recent inventory assessment in October 2012.

The College recently completed a series of Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) projects in order to improve access for students with mobility disabilities. Although the College has limited resources, the College makes an effort to keep the elevators and other important systems functioning, particularly those that would limit access.
CCSF also worked with the City and County of San Francisco to install traffic lights and improvements to the pedestrian and traffic flow directly leading to the Campus, Centers, and Sites.

**Effective Space Utilization.** The Office of Instruction, along with the Center Deans, determines the utilization and allocation of classroom space in order to meet student needs. The most recent inventory count took place in Fall 2012 (See Appendix C). The recent inventory count and assessment, specifically provides information that will guide the College in ongoing efforts to determine how to effectively utilize its facilities.

The Five-Year Construction Plan also provides the capacity to load ratios for each State-recognized Center. The College uses capacity to load ratios to determine the need for future space based on enrollment projections provided by the State Chancellor’s Office. These projections are made annually.

CCSF relies heavily on the expertise of Center Deans and Department Chairs to articulate departmental and program needs regarding space. In addition, the College formerly relied on the Shared Governance Facility Review Committee where requests and projects were considered and prioritized (See Appendix D and Appendix E and “Facilities Planning,” below). Although the College has a new Participatory Governance system, a Facilities Committee still exists. The College will need to work out the details regarding facilities decision making in this new context.

**Facilities Planning.** The California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office requires that the District submit a Five-Year Construction Plan annually. (Appendix F) This Five-Year Plan provides measured utilization of lecture, laboratory, office, library, and AV/TV (media) spaces. The results are enumerated as “capacity to load ratios.” If the cap-load ratio exceeds 100%, the category of space is said to be excessive (See Appendix G).

The College has been fortunate to have received two major local bond issues to upgrade a significant portion of its facilities; however, with limited bond funds remaining, the College will need to identify facility improvement and capital outlay projects. The age of most classrooms, labs, lecture halls, etc., exceed their life expectancy and possess potential health and safety issues if the College does not develop a plan for improvements (See District Wide Replacement Costs of Physical Resources).

The College funds projects using various funding sources (See Appendix L). The College has followed a program planning process for the development of each new building. This process includes hiring an architect that meets with the future building users in order to identify their needs.

In the past, the College utilized a Shared Governance process (See Appendix D) that included college community input. The process included the following: (1) Projects Sub Committee; (2) Project Presentation; (3) [If step 2 was approved] it was forwarded to the Facility Review Committee (FRC) for consideration; (4) [If step 3 was approved] the project was recommended to the Budget and Planning Committee, which reports to the College Advisory Council (CAC); and (5) The CAC would make recommendations to the Board of Trustees FIT Committee, which would recommend the project to the Full Board for approval (See Appendix E). However, the College is currently implementing a new Participatory
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Governance system as described in the response to Standard IV.A. and will need to revisit this process.

Historically, the College has not had a way of synthesizing information gathered from the departments with regards to maintenance and replacement. Therefore, some of those needs have not been addressed. However, recently CCSF has made improvements to processes such as Program Review and Annual Planning, which will inform the college at large about program and service needs by better centralizing the planning process (See Appendix J).

**Technology Planning.** CCSF’s Information Technology Services (ITS) supports the College and all its departments by maintaining classroom and administrative technology; providing technical expertise and services to improve productivity, effectiveness, and efficiencies. ITS is customer centric and empowers the CCSF community by providing needed technology that in turn improves student success (See Appendix K). However, with the reduction of state funding, the College has fallen behind in replacing instructional equipment to support the needs of the distance delivery modes the College offers. See also the response to Standard III.C.

**III.B.1. Self Evaluation.** Since the ACCJC team visit in March 2012, the College has made begun addressing the ACCJC Recommendation regarding physical resources (Recommendation 9) and is on course with its plans to fully address that Recommendation and this Standard.

The College has assembled a workgroup with representatives from various disciplines to examine all Centers and Sites (see “Special Focus: Centers and Sites” at the end of the response to the Standards). The workgroup has been responsible for incorporating all costs required to appropriately operate and maintain existing facilities, whether owned or leased, into its annual and long-term planning and budgeting processes. Coupled with this, the College has focused on developing mechanisms for the annual allocation of the required human and fiscal resources to effectively and equitably operate and maintain physical resources at locations where it offers courses, programs, and services.

Some of the College’s Centers and Sites are under various lease agreements. As a result, the College is responsible for maintaining facilities to the extent agreed upon for each location. As with the facilities the College owns, facility conditions at some of the leased educational Centers and Sites have also exceeded their life expectancy and require significant attention.

The College’s Maintenance, Buildings, and Grounds Department responds to maintenance requests requiring immediate attention, such as plumbing leaks, lighting issues, and broken elevators, among others. For large-scale facilities improvements, however, the College has not utilized a centralized process to connect its 10-year Facilities Master Plan to planning and budgeting activities. However, all College programs and departments participate in the annual cycle of Program Review (See Appendix J and Program Review Files in Library), and Program Review has become the primary mechanism through which College units identify their resource needs—including facilities and equipment—to support learning and/or operations and through which each unit formally requests their required resources for the upcoming fiscal year (see also the response to Standard I and Standard III.C.1.c.). This process provides a mechanism for facilities and equipment to enhance the operation and effectiveness of the institution, because these requests should be based on data that physical
resource needs and should link to the Facilities Master Plan. While in the past the program review process has not been linked to facilities improvements or equipment purchases, in the future the result of this process will correct a current deficiency in the College’s ability to prioritize large capital improvement projects.

In 2003, the District Facility Condition Assessment Report indicated that existing District facilities were in generally poor condition, and only limited improvement has taken place since then. Despite this, programs and services are not compromised; they are still operational. The College continues to work toward bringing its facilities and equipment up to date. For example, the College has hired a consultant to assist in ensuring the use of standards and guidelines as an outside control mechanism to avoid overbuilding projects and evaluate needs for space based on existing and reasonably projected FTEs for program areas. In addition, the College now has an up-to-date FUSION database that it can use to assess, prioritize, and implement facility improvements.

While the College has been able to rely on bond initiatives to build new facilities, the College needs to refocus its attention on existing facilities where conditions are potentially inadequate. However, it will cost the College a large amount of funds to upgrade its facilities and/or systems during a time when resources are scarce (See District Wide Replacement Costs of Physical Resources).

With respect to public safety, the College developed its Emergency Response Plan in 2008 and will need to update it within the next XX years/months. At the same time, the College needs to develop a regular, ongoing schedule of emergency training for employees.

### III.B.1. Actionable Improvement Plans

The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plans associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adopt, create, and implement the Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) Model;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Designate an individual to monitor the FUSION website and TCO Model;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Replace the former supervisor of Physical Resources, as well as designating an additional individual as a back up;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research and implement Association of Physical Plan Administrators (APPA) of Universities and Colleges;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitor the Districts expenditures for each Center and Site separately;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop and implement a plan in order to fund and replace facilities that have outlived its life expectancy; For example, at registration students are asked to voluntarily donate one dollar to the Associated Students. The District should consider asking the students to voluntarily donate one dollar toward maintaining the districts buildings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Include the following positions into the staffing plan:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| Waste Management/Recycle;  
| Lock Smith;  
| Mail Services;  
| Shipping and Receiving; and  
| Engineer;  
| Teach the CCSF community the importance of waste management, in addition to encouraging the community to recycle;  
| Increase custodial and recycling staffing in order to accommodate the growing college needs;  
| Increase staffing in the Facilities Office;  
| Hire a Superintendent for the District;  
| Review the organizational structure of Finance and Administration to determine the appropriate number of office and departments to effectively maintain operations;  
| Create a Buildings and Grounds Unit;  
| Provide budget support to invest in District recycling infrastructure;  
| Improve teambuilding and leadership;  
| Continue to use other college processes, such as Program Review and Annual Planning, to create a priorities list for Facilities and Planning to effectively create process and action plan;  
| Streamline all College Plans;  
| Base future bonds on the FUSION data and then assess the budget;  
| The College can stand to improve its approach to ensuring a healthy working environment by establishing ergonomic standards and other safety upgrades;  
| Lastly, Physical Resources cannot be reviewed as an isolated Standard. It has provided the foundation of all services and programs provided to students. Physical Resources affects not only financial planning, but it also has a direct impact on our instructional and support services, as well as the overall brand of the institution. Therefore it is imperative that all College constituent groups share responsibility in the ongoing improvement of our facilities.  
| Hire Project Managers for future buildings and maintenance projects;  
| Develop protocols for using the text messaging service to ensure timely communication about emergencies |

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 improvement goals and reflect projections of the total cost of ownership of new facilities and equipment.
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 evaluations as the basis for improvement.

III.B.2. Descriptive Summary. The College has a 10-year Facilities Master Plan that prioritizes capital outlay projects for the District. Additionally, the College uses Program Review and other department-level requests to consider maintenance priorities for the District. See also the response to Standard I.B. and III.B.1.

CCSF uses the results of the Five Year Construction Plan, which is submitted annually to the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office (See Appendix E) to measure the utilization of various spaces within the District. In addition, CCSF uses the FUSION system to standardize and streamline the management of the College’s facilities. (http://ccsfusion.org/) Since the College completed its last self-evaluation study in Fall 2012, the District has conducted and completed the District Facility Condition Assessment in the FUSION database in which it inventoried and assessed the physical condition of all buildings (See District Wide Life Cycle of Physical Resources). The Five-Year Construction Plan that the College submits to the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office identifies projects for major renovation (See Appendix E). Buildings in need of renovation that the College has identified in the past include the Downtown Center, Arts Building, Evans Center, Science Hall, Rosenberg/Learning Assistance Center, and Cloud Hall.

In recent years, the College has completed facilities improvements based on the availability of funds for physical resources. However, due to a lack of coordinated efforts, the maintenance requests have not been closely linked to the Facility Master Plan. With the enforcement of the new planning system, the College will start linking the requests to the Facility Master Plan. The College has used bond funds in order to improve the most critical and immediate requests for facilities, and also to complete some maintenance and operation projects (See Appendix L). Although the College has submitted annual information to the State Chancellor’s Office, at this time, the College has limited physical resources to undertake new and old facilities improvements.

In the past, City College of San Francisco’s efforts to provide the total cost of ownership, a concept that seeks to measure not just the cost of planning and construction, but the cost of operating a facility over its expected lifetime, have been limited. According to the Vice-Chancellor of Finance and Administration the College is in the process of replacing a vacant facilities position that will be responsible to develop, implement and maintain the total cost of ownership model to use when making decisions about facilities equipment. In addition, the College has created the District Wide Allocation of Physical Resources (See District Wide Allocation of Physical Resources) to assist in the creation of the future Total Cost of Ownership Model.

The College does, however, have long-range capital plans that meet the College’s Mission (Appendix E). The College has considered and developed these long-range plans based on the needs expressed by community, faculty, and students. At this juncture, all capital plans are on hold.

In an effort to continue providing students with facilities that offer newer classrooms and facilities to meet their needs, including accessing and engaging in College wide programs and courses, the college constructed new buildings, such as the Wellness Center, Student...
Health Center, Multi-use Building, and the Chinatown-North Beach Center. The Performing Arts Center on the Ocean Campus, when constructed, will provide 59,454 ASF of new instructional space for the Music, Drama, and Performing Arts programs. It is scheduled for completion in 2013 – 2014. Plans for other long-range projects including modernization of a number of buildings has been delayed due to the lack of funds. However, the College also recognizes that it also has many facilities that are older and has room for improvement on its existing physical resources. The College plans to pursue a state bond issue in 2014. In the meantime, the District has made efforts to optimize the use of facilities given the resources it has.

Although resources for purchasing equipment is often limited throughout the District, the Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration is responsible for prioritizing and approving necessary equipment purchases as requested by the various departments.

III.B 2. Self Evaluation. Since the last evaluation, completed in Fall 2012, the College has convened a workgroup to examine the physical resources of the College. The workgroup is making recommendations on how to continue making physical resources part of the College-wide planning process. The College needs to integrate a number of its plans with each other. The College needs to continue developing an effective process that includes a regular review and evaluation of classrooms, equipment, and other physical resources. Now that the 2012 inventory is complete, the College is in a good position to develop this regular review.

The College currently does not have evidence that the institution bases its physical resources decisions on the results of evaluations of programs and service needs. The College does document and has evidence that Program Reviews are completed in the Research and Planning Department. Departments use the Program Review process as a way to inform the College community on departmental needs (See Appendix J). Although the results of the Program Reviews are incorporated into the Annual Plan, the College lacks execution on the reports findings except during emergencies. The new protocols and process of prioritization regarding Program Review should address these issues.

CCSF is aware that the Education Master Plan is outdated and needs to be updated and revised. The Education Master Plan should essentially link to other College plans including the Strategic Plan and Facilities Plan. One of the primary focuses of all College plans should be to make the learning environment better for the entire college community. Although the College does not have a formal process to ensure that capital projects support College goals, the College is working on updating the outdated plans in order to ensure the alignment between the plans and College goals.

Some long-range capital plans have been listed since the mid 2000s and continue to be on the College’s list of capital improvement projects. However, the College has not maintained the linkage between facilities needs and institutional planning, and personnel generally do not have a shared understanding of how the process works. In the past, this has resulted in College units working independently to promote individual program or unit needs, at times not fully engaging the planning process. Consequently, discussion and decision making about facilities needs occurs at Board meetings without proper discussion and prioritization having taken place through the institutional governance structure.