CERRITOS COLLEGE

CAMPUS TRANSFORMATION COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes

DATE: December 6, 2007

PRESENT

Campus Transformation Committee
Lucinda Aborn, DSPS/SS
David Betancourt, Faculty, Fine Arts Division
Roger Ernest, Faculty; Liberal Arts
William Farmer, Vice President, Academic Affairs
Jo Ann Higdon, Vice President, Business Services
Stephen Johnson, Vice President, Student Services
Jerry Jones, CA/OR, Bovis Lend Lease
Linda Kaufman, Confidential
Connie Mayfield, Fine Arts Division/Dean; ACCME
Dan Smith, HPEA/Dean; ACCME
Randy Peebles, Technology/Business Divisions/Dean; ACCME
Bryan Reece, Faculty Senate President
Robert Riffle, Director of Physical Plant
Deborah Shepley, tBP/Architecture
Noelia Vela, President

ABSENT
Les Bell, CSEA
Toni Grijalva, CSEA
Jason Macias, ASCC

Guests
Jeanine Prindle, HPEA
Mike McPherson, HPEA
Debbie Jensen, HPEA
Ny Bueno, HPEA
Lynn Laughon, Publications
Renee DeLong Chomiak, Counseling
Jenine Nolan, Health Occupations
Linda Rose, Liberal Arts
Suzie Payne, Fiscal Services
Kim Westby, Financial Aid
Kay Follett, DSPS
Tim Kyllingstad, Information Technology
Fran de France, Humanities/Social Sciences
Bob Hughlett, Board Member

I. CALL TO ORDER
Dr. Vela called the meeting to order at 2:04 pm.
II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM OCTOBER 4, 2007
The minutes of the October 4, 2007 were approved as presented with the included modifications submitted by Dr. Aborn. Dr. Johnson abstained.

III. PROJECT STATUS
- Soccer Field: The soccer field is 90% complete with the sod and fencing installed.
- Infrastructure: There are three (3) phases of the infrastructure project. Phase I is approximately 50% completed. Phase II has been bid and in the process of being awarded. Phase III is under review.
- Automotive Technology New/Remodel: For both Auto Technology projects, the plans and specifications are being finalized. These plans for the new building will be submitted to DSA by December 31, 2007.
- Classroom/Lab/Office Building: The final Classroom/Lab/Office User Group meeting for sign-off is scheduled for December 7, 2007. The final plans will be going to DSA in January, 2008.
- Gym Seismic: The Gym Seismic User Group has had their initial meeting, with another meeting scheduled in mid-December. This is a fast-track project with plans due to the State by March/April 2008.
- Pool: The pool project is currently at DSA. Mr. Riffle and the architects will be meeting soon with DSA to clarify any questions DSA has with regard to the project; this is referred to as the “back check” phase of a project.

Questions from the Committee:

Mr. Farmer requested clarification of the three (3) phases of the Infrastructure project. Mr. Jones provided to the committee a brief overview of the infrastructure phases. Dr. Aborn suggested that communication be sent when paths of travel are altered due to weather implications or construction implications. She stressed that it is important that the students know the alternate routes ASAP. Mr. Jones and Dr. Aborn will meet to discuss the best way to inform the campus community of the paths of travel.

Mr. Ernest asked if there was going to be an opportunity for the Classroom/Lab/Office User group to suggest minor additions in terms of a shade structure to the south side of the building. He emphasized that the inside and the outside of the building should be considered simultaneously. Ms. Higdon noted that two items regarding the Classroom/Lab/Office Building need further discussion. They are the shade structure and another exterior issue that has come forward. These discussions will need to take place with not only the building user group, but others as well. Dr. Peebles added that in the Classroom/Lab/Office User Group meetings, the user group had a fair amount of recommendations and input about what should happen around the building. However, he felt that there was a lack of clarity of how that information would be provided to the other user group. Ms. Higdon indicated that there was a different user group that was looking at landscape issues. Dr. Smith added that shade structures are important for a lot of areas around the campus. Dr. Vela noted that there is interior and exterior planning and the exterior needs to be planned with all that in mind.

Dr. Peebles requested clarification with regard to the dollar amounts allocated to the Auto Technology Remodel Project. Ms. Higdon replied that the construction budget is for pure construction costs only. This is the amount the College goes out to bid on. There are many costs beyond the actual construction costs that are included in the program costs. Some examples are: a) funds to DSA to review and approve the project,
and b) funds for a local DSA inspector to be on campus during a construction project. Ms. Shepley added that the numbers reflected in the implementation plan are not construction costs, they are total project costs.

IV. MEMO FROM FACULTY SENATE
Dr. Reece presented to the committee three (3) Faculty Senate memos. They are:

- Memo dated October 4, 2007 to Dr. Vela from Bryan Reece regarding Instructional Spaces;
- Memo dated November 6, 2007 to the Campus Transformation Committee from Faculty Senate regarding Health, Physical Education and Athletics Division and Campus Transformation; and
- Memo dated November 20, 2007 to the Campus Transformation Committee and Facilities Planning Committee from Faculty Senate Leadership regarding Decision-Making.

Dr. Reece read directly to the Campus Transformation Committee the memo dated November 6, 2007. In brief, this memo outlined the feelings from the HPEA faculty after their meeting with Ms. Higdon and Mr. Riffle. Dr. Reece also highlighted that with regard to the November 20, 2007 memo, the Facilities Planning Committee concurred with the last paragraph which reads:

The Campus Transformation Committee should start holding meetings more regularly (e.g., two times per month.) Minutes from the committee should be distributed and posted to a CTC. Changes to the Campus Transformation Plan must be submitted to appropriate advisory groups and the CTC prior to adoption of the changes. The Master Plan (including sequencing and budget related documents) should be available to the public. CTC should work to include more decision making input.

A committee discussion ensued with regard to advisory groups and it was suggested that a representative from all divisions/areas be members of the CTC committee. By doing this, these division/area CTC members could share the information with their respective divisions/areas with regard to the information that is presented at the CTC meetings. Mr. Ernest added that the architecture of what has been suggested is a move in the right direction. Dr. Reece added that stakeholders want to feel like they have had a chance to have real input into the process. They want to have division input on the proposed actions in their area so they know how each project is impacting the other. Mr. Farmer made a motion that there be a faculty representative from every instructional division added to the CTC committee; that there be a faculty member from counseling; faculty member or administrator from DSPS and EOPS; and that there be an increase of managers from 3 to 4, with an equal number of classified representatives; and a total of 2 ASCC members. There were a couple friendly amendments to add different areas on campus. The motion with the friendly amendments were discussed and agreed to. M/S/P. The motion passed unanimously. The proposed committee structure is as follows:

- College President
- Vice President of Academic Affairs
- Vice President of Business Services
- Vice President of Student Services
- Director of Physical Plant
- Dean of DSPS
• Chief of Campus Police
• Director of Student Activities
• Faculty Senate President
• A faculty representative from every Instructional Division
• A faculty representative from Counseling Services Division
• Staff or Faculty or Manager Representative from Student Support Services Division
• Staff or Faculty or Manager Representative from Admissions, Records and Services Division
• Staff or Faculty or Manager Representative from Adult Education/Community Services/CITE
• Staff or Faculty or Manager Representative from Information Technology
• Staff or Faculty or Manager Representative from Business Services/Human Resources
• Staff or Faculty or Manager Representative from Public Relations
• 4 Management representatives appointed by ACCME
• 4 Classified/confidential representatives appointed by CSEA
• 2 Student representatives appointed by ASCC.

Mike McPherson from the HPEA division spoke to the committee as a guest and shared the following:

• He wanted to let the committee know that the HPEA division is a unique division in that they cover a broad spectrum of sports and classes and everybody relates to everybody else. They have men and women sports, and they are very conscientious to ensure that they are supporting everyone equally.
• The faculty in the division have not been very happy with the process for a long period of time. They have made that perfectly clear. They were unhappy with the inference made at a recent board meeting in which some of the board members had the feeling that we were pleased and happy with the whole process.
• The HPEA Division has a concern with losing instructional space in their area. He asked if the HPEA Division wants to keep the soccer field at the current location, is this the committee that makes the decision. Dr. Vela replied that this committee, like all other committees is a recommending committee. The ultimate decision-making body would be the Board of Trustees.
• Mr. McPherson then asked the committee to recommend to the Board the following: a) that construction stop on the new soccer field; b) take whatever monetary resources that are available and renovate the old soccer field to the level of the new soccer field; c) that the parking lot not be built in the proposed location (current soccer field); and d) the HPEA Division requested that they be allowed to provide input and direction regarding any remaining funds that have not been spent for field renovation. Dr. Vela acknowledged Mr. McPherson’s recommendations and reminded the committee that after the bond measure was passed in spring 2004, there was an acknowledgement of a tremendous number of needs that this campus had and an acknowledgement that the $210 million dollars would not be enough for all of the needs. She wanted to be clear that every division/area has far more needs than this master plan ever acknowledged or intended to meet. She wanted to make the committee cognizant that the recommendations made by this group are not made in isolation. Ms. Shepley provided to the committee a brief description of how the projects were identified. She noted that a master list of projects identified
categories of money which were not specific. It was very clear that not all the campus would be touched. She noted that the most dramatic change on the previous master plan included a large parking structure [750 spaces at a cost of approximately 17 ¼ million.] When the discussion was brought forward that there were more needs on the campus than there were dollars in the bond, the question asked was does the campus really need to spend that much money on a parking structure, or can we find surface parking and re-distribute the funds to more areas of the campus. Dr. Reece asked who was involved in all the decision making and identification. Ms. Shepley responded that there were meetings and break-out discussions. In 2005 there was a break-out discussion regarding the fields, when there was a discussion of adding more surface parking and changing the configuration of the fields. It was very clear with the addition of more surface parking that the elimination of the parking structure would affect field areas of the campus. A series of meetings were also held to talk about how to maximize the use of the field space, which included changing the turf in the stadium.

- There was further discussion regarding HPEA’s impression of the discussions that took place in 2005 with regard to the field areas. Dr. Vela noted to the committee that if the HPEA request is recommended to go forward, the following questions need to be addressed: a) how do you address losing the parking lot and where do you gain those parking spots; and b) where will the Child Development Center be re-located. She reminded the committee that the campus is one campus, we are all inter-linked. Ms. Higdon added that what also needs to be addressed are the “lay-down” areas for the future construction projects. These lay-down areas affect the current parking lots and take a considerable amount of space. In closing, Ms. Higdon indicated that for the time being, a hold can be placed on the new soccer field. Dr. Smith added that the College cannot wait too long on a decision, as the soccer teams cannot play on the current soccer field anymore; some instructional issues need to be looked at further.

V. ACCESS TO CAMPUS TRANSFORMATION COMMITTEE INFORMATION
This item will be brought back at a future meeting.

VI. WEB SITE
Mr. Riffle presented to the committee a power-point presentation which highlighted a draft version of the new GO Bond Web site. The committee made the following suggestions:

- Glossary of terms
- Sense of the project timeline
- A list of the project user groups
- CTC minutes

Ms. Higdon noted that it was her intention to provide the committee with a “quiet posting” on the web for just the CTC members. This would give the committee an opportunity to peruse the Web site at length and then to provide Mr. Riffle any comments and recommendations. She will have Mr. Riffle follow up with IT to ensure that this process is done and members have this opportunity to review the Web site. An e-mail notification will be sent to each committee member when this has been completed. The committee thanked Mr. Jones and his staff for their work on the Web site.
VII. **ITEMS FROM THE FLOOR**
Dr. Aborn requested that the Liberal Arts Building Concept be placed on the agenda for the next CTC meeting. She indicated that after the Liberal Arts Building Concept was presented at the last CTC meeting, questions have come forward that she feels need to be addressed. Ms. Higdon requested that the questions be forwarded to her in advance so that the responses can be prepared for the next meeting.

VIII. **NEXT MEETING**
The next meeting is scheduled for January 17, 2008 at 4:00 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:34 p.m.